CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

33287

CONTAINING

THE PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES

OF THE

FIFTIETH CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION.

VOLUME XIX.

WASHINGTON:
GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE.
1888.

VOLUME XIX, PART X.

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD,

FIFTIETH CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION.

cratic Secretary of the Treasury, who it is said has himself contributed $10,000 to the campaign, and of whom it is said, whether truthfully or not I do not know, that his nearest relative has contributed twice as much.

It seems to me to be pretty small business for the Democratic party to be now attempting to get money out of the subordinate officials and clerks of the Government with the vast agencies that they have for the collection of money. In looking over the deposits in the national banks I found several banks that held a million dollars of the people's money. I found some banks that held $1,100,000 of the people's money, and for that they had deposited simply $1,000,000 of Government bonds. I do not say but that it is safe. I do not say but that the money is safe in the national banks, but I do say when the Government is a debtor to the extent of a thousand million dollars and more, drawing on an average more than 4 per cent., it would have been in the interest of public economy and public decency that this money should have been paid on the public debt, when it might have been paid on the public debt in such a way as to have saved to the Government at least 2 or 2½ per cent. upon the money from which no benefit whatever is now derived, except, as suggested on my right, for campaign purposes.

Before the session closes I propose to go into details to show the enormous amount of money that has been lying in the Treasury of the United States when bonds might have been bought at prices that would have paid the Government on its money a fair interest, an interest almost equal to what the Government investors are now realizing on their bonds when you consider the premium.

But, Mr. President, I do not propose upon this resolution to go into any examination of this question. I only rose to reply to what the Senator from Missouri had said on one point. I want to add further before I sit down that I do not myself know, when there is certified to a public officer from the Civil Service Commission a list to be appointed, how it is possible for him to know, without a violation of his official oath, whether they are Democrats or whether they are Republicans. I understand that the man who whispers in his ear that the appointee is either a Democrat or Republican is guilty of a misdemeanor under the law, and I understand that he who communicates that secret is no more guilty than the man who receives it.

If to-day there is in the administration of public affairs any method adopted or winked at by which the appointing power can know the political position or political belief or political affiliation of the men appointed, not only is that officer guilty of an infraction of the law, but some citizen must also have been guilty of an infraction of the law who furnishes him with the information. I called attention to that yesterday, and I only want now to call attention to the statute, because the Senator from Missouri seemed to think that it was perfectly consistent with proper administration that the Department should know, and should then, if it saw fit, make a selection of Democrats to the exclusion of Republicans. Section 5 of the act of January 16, 1883, declares that if any person shall—

Report upon the examination or proper standing of any person examined hereunder, or aid in so doing, or who shall willfully and corruptly make any false representations concerning the same or concerning the person examined, or who shall willfully and corruptly furnish to any person any special or secret information for the purpose of either improving or injuring the prospects or chances of any person so examined, or to be examined, being appointed, employed, or promoted, shall for each such offense be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor, and upon conviction thereof shall be punished by a fine of not less than $100, nor more than $1,000, or by imprisonment not less than ten days, nor more than one year, or by both such fine and imprisonment.

I repeat, if there is any knowledge as to the political condition of these applicants conveyed to any officer who has the power of appointment, unless it is conveyed by the applicant himself, the conveyor and the receiver are both guilty of a misdemeanor under the law.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The question is on agreeing to the resolutions submitted by the Senator from Maine [Mr. HALE].

Mr. BUTLER. Let the resolutions be read.

Mr. HALE. There is an amendment pending.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The Senator from Maine had a right to modify his original resolution. It will be treated as one proposition, with the modification included.

The Secretary read the resolutions, as follows:

Whereas it is alleged that an order has been issued from the War Department in form and terms as follows:

"[Confidential.]

"WAR DEPARTMENT, ORDNANCE OFFICE,
"*Washington, D. C., January 4*, 1886.

"*To the commanding officers of the national armories at Springfield, Mass., and Rock Island, Ill., and of the United States arsenals at New York, West Troy, N. Y., and Philadelphia, Pa., Boston, Mass., Benicia, Cal., etc.:*

"SIR: While arsenals and the armories are not intended to be converted into political machines, two political parties in this country are recognized. It is therefore ordered that hereafter, in employing and discharging employés of any and all grades, other things being equal and qualifications satisfactory, Democrats will be favored; the object being to divide the force in the different grades gradually between Democrats and Republicans. This rule will apply to women and children, as well as to men, and will be strictly enforced.

"Respectfully, your obedient servant,

"S. V. BENÉT,

"*Brigadier-General, Chief of Ordnance, U. S. Army.*"

And whereas it is further alleged that, in pursuance of such order, changes and removals of persons employed by the Government in the United States arsenals and armories have been made, and that honorably discharged soldiers of the Union Army and their wives and children have thus been removed: Therefore, *Resolved*, That the Secretary of War be, and is hereby, directed to forthwith transmit to the Senate full information as to the order above named, and to state fully what necessities of the Department required that said order should be issued; and to further inform the Senate why an order issued from the military department of the Government upon public business was marked "confidential;" and also to report fully all changes that have been made of persons employed in the United States arsenals and armories since said order was issued, and especially to inform the Senate whether, at the Rock Island arsenal, the wife and children of a former Union soldier have been removed under said order.

Resolved, That the Secretary of War is further directed to transmit to the Senate copies of any further orders or circulars relating to the employment of persons in any part of said Department since March 4, 1885, together with copies of all correspondence between the Department and any of its officers or subordinates or any other person relating to the politics of any of its employés.

Mr. HOAR. I should like for my own satisfaction, if the mover of the resolution has no objection, to ascertain also another fact, and that is what measures have been taken by the War Department to learn the political opinions of the women and children in its employ. I will move to add that to the resolution.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. Will the Senator from Massachusetts send the proposed amendment to the desk?

Mr. HOAR. I will dictate it to the Secretary. At the end of the first resolution I move to add:

And also to inform the Senate what measures have been taken by the War Department to learn the political opinions of the women and children in its employ.

Mr. HALE. I have no objection to that. I think it is a proper amendment.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The Chair understands the Senator from Maine to modify his first resolution so as to include what has been dictated.

Mr. HALE. Yes, sir.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The resolutions will be read as modified.

The Secretary read as follows:

Resolved, That the Secretary of War be, and is hereby, directed to forthwith transmit to the Senate full information as to the order above named, and to state fully what necessities of the Department required that said order should be issued; and to further inform the Senate why an order issued from the military department of the Government, upon public business, was marked "confidential;" and also to report fully all changes that have been made of persons employed in the United States arsenals and armories since said order was issued; and especially to inform the Senate whether, at the Rock Island arsenal, the wife and children of a former Union soldier have been removed under said order; and also to inform the Senate what measures have been taken by the War Department to learn the political opinions of the women and children in its employ.

Resolved, That the Secretary of War is further directed to transmit to the Senate copies of any further orders or circulars relating to the employment of persons in any part of said Department since March 4, 1885, together with copies of all correspondence between the Department and any of its officers or subordinates or any other person relating to the politics of any of its employés.

Mr. SAULSBURY. Mr. President, I suppose this resolution has answered the purpose for which it was brought before the Senate. It has furnished the text for a tirade against the Administration and the Democratic party and against the people of the South, and I suppose that was the object proposed in offering the resolution. I do not desire to enter into the kind of discussion that has been indulged in with reference to it, but I want to express my opinion in regard to the character of the debate which has ensued upon it. In my humble judgment such debate in such a cause and on such a resolution is disreputable to this body.

The Federal Administration has been attacked, been misrepresented, been traduced, simply for the purpose of capturing votes in this country in the next Presidential election. That is the truth and the whole truth about this entire debate. The President of the United States has been held up as a violator of every pledge he has ever made in reference to the subject of civil-service reform. While he has kept in office a very large percentage of Republicans opposed to him and men who voted to keep him out of the Presidential office, while he has given, as I believe, just cause of complaint to his own political friends for the favor which he has shown to the other side of this Chamber, and to the friends of the other side of this Chamber, he is now, on the eve of a Presidential election, traduced as a violator of plighted faith and pledges, and held up before the country in that character without any justification or excuse whatever.

It is true that many changes have been made since President Cleveland came into office, but I venture nothing in saying that in the great majority of cases where the changes have occurred they have taken place upon the expiration of the terms of the incumbents that he found in office. There have been some removals and there ought to have been many more, but he has been lenient towards his political foes and suffered them to hold on to the offices which they occupied when he came into power until their terms of office had expired. In the State in which I live we have but one collector of customs, not a very important office, because the State is a very small State; the late incumbent of that office was appointed in the last few months of President Arthur's term, and yet he was permitted by President Cleveland to fill

out his term of office, having at his command a certain class of patronage affecting light-houses down in the Delaware Bay as well as the assistant collectors of customs, etc., throughout the State. With that fact standing out—and it is not an isolated fact, for similar cases have occurred, if not with reference to collectors of customs with reference to other officers all over this country—the President has suffered the party's term to expire of its own limitation and then filled the office with a friend of his Administration. Yet he has been maligned, been misrepresented both as to his motives and his action.

This resolution was introduced for the purpose of furnishing an occasion, I suppose, to indulge in these harangues and tirades against the Federal Administration. I want to express myself with reference to this resolution. What does it mean? It seems the Secretary of War, or some official under him, gave an order the purpose of which he says was to equalize the employés between the two great parties. He says, in so many words, that the object of that order was to divide the force in the different grades gradually between Democrats and Republicans. He found these places filled by Republicans, and very naturally he desired, as his party desires, and as the country knows he has a right, to give to the men of his own way of thinking an equal share in the emoluments that are derived from these offices.

There have not been as many changes as ought to have been made. I heard some time ago of a bureau in the Treasury Department where there were from twenty to twenty-five officials above the class that are subject to the civil-service law, and not more than four or five changes have been made in that bureau since the Administration came into power. I do not hesitate to say that if I had been Secretary of the Treasury and any bureau officer under me had retained such a proportion of his political enemies in his office, I should dismiss him from the office and put in a man who would make proper changes, and if I were the President of the United States, I would see that every head of Department should mete out justice in his appointments to the party that placed me in power. I should be guilty of ingratitude if I did not do it, if I had knowledge that such was not the case.

I have not much respect for this civil-service reform, I mean for the statutory form provided for. I believe in civil-service reform and I believe that the parties charged by the Constitution and laws of this country with the responsibility of administering the Government ought to see that the agents it has in its employ are men of capacity, men of integrity, men of honesty, men of fidelity to the trust reposed in them. I believe in that kind of civil-service reform. I believe that every man selected for public office ought to be faithful to the duties intrusted to his care. Whether he is a Democrat or Republican, he should be a faithful man. I would not be a public butcher and cut the throat of every man who differs from me in politics; but I would give to the Republican party, if I were President, no advantage over my own friends in the distribution of the patronage of the Government. While I believe in that kind of civil-service reform which holds the agents of the Government to the strictest responsibility and the strictest fidelity, I do not believe in that kind of civil-service reform that provides for a competitive examination, and that a man who can pass before a commission the best examination, a man giving the best answers to the questions propounded, must necessarily be preferred to other men.

There is many a dead-beat, there is many a man that has not character enough to sustain him in his neighborhood, who can pass a better civil-service examination than many worthy men fully competent to discharge all the duties and who would be faithful in the discharge of the duties committed to their care; and yet because the fellow has had a better education, has been sent perhaps to some college and graduated there, with not energy enough to make the money that buys the bread to feed him, too lazy or too indolent often to be of any service in any position in life, is selected because he has passed a civil-service examination at a higher grade than some worthy man fully competent and familiar with the duties required of him. He is kept in the background while this dead-beat, this man whose advantages in early life were superior may have the place which ought to have been given to this worthy man. I believe in no such civil-service reform as that.

If I had my way, I would repeal the statute and revoke every rule and order that has been made under it by President Cleveland or anybody else. I have but little patience with that kind of civil-service reform. You may go through now any of these Departments, and there are men whom President Cleveland found there, some of whom are destitute of character and many of them destitute of that industry and those qualifications which fit men for the positions. I went myself to one of the Secretaries some two or three years ago and I said to him, "You have a man in your employ that I meet occasionally; he is drunk every time I see him." "Well, sir," said he, "tell me who he is and I will turn him out." "I will not do it," said I, "because you will not let me have anything to say as to who will fill his place. If you will not allow me any consideration as to who shall fill his place, I am not willing to act as a spy on your men and have them turned out. I shall not assist you, because you will not assist me and my friends in getting places."

There is that class of men in the service, and they ought to be turned out, whether Mr. Cleveland or Mr. Harrison is elected. I would not discharge a faithful official simply because he was a Republican, provided there was not an undue proportion of Republicans in the service over which I presided; but I would turn out, whether he was a Democrat or a Republican, every man who was inefficient, every man who was a lazy drone, every man who did not perform his duties satisfactorily to me as head of the department.

I shall not enter into this general discussion about the people of the South indulged in by the Senator from Colorado. Reckless assertions are frequently made without evidence, too frequently made for the good reputation of the Senate of the United States. I shall not enter into the discussion about the contributions to political funds.

I suppose that men have always given something to defray the legitimate expenses of the party to which they belong. I suppose they will always do it. The Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. HOAR] bravely acknowledged that he would do it, and he intended to do it in this campaign to the extent of his ability. I suppose men do that everywhere, contribute something of their means to the support and maintenance and defraying the legitimate expenses of the party to which they belong. All these criticisms about the check of the President, about the checks of the heads of departments, and all such stuff falls idly upon the public mind.

We flatter ourselves, I suppose, that we shape public opinion and make votes for our party by these discussions, but I have no hesitation in saying that there has been no discussion within the last thirty days in this Chamber that has had any effect upon the public mind, or will change the public vote in any section of this country. In the earlier stages of this session, when the tariff question was brought prominently before the mind of the American people by the vigorous message of the President of the United States, there was discussion which was necessary and proper for the information of the country; but the people have drunk in the wholesome sentiments of the President's message, and are imbued with the sentiments which he has advanced, and all these discussions of late amount to but little. In fact, so far as the influencing of votes is concerned, I would rather have the influence of a half a dozen green grocers located at the cross-roads throughout the country than all the influence which these political tirades in this Chamber can make for any party.

Mr. President, I shall not enter into those discussions. I could arraign the Republican party for its past malfeasance and misfeasance and wrong-doings if I saw proper, but I stand here to say that no man can lay his hands upon any corruption of the present Administration. Whatever may be the faults of Mr. Cleveland in other respects, his administration has been clean and pure. There have been no contracts given out with the distinct understanding that contributions should be made by the contractors in the public service to aid the political party to which they belonged. I do not say that such contracts ever were made, but men have been greatly slandered who have held public positions in this country if such were not the fact; but so far as this Administration is concerned I defy any living man to bring home to the Administration, to the knowledge of President Cleveland or any head of Department, any single instance of corruption, direct or indirect, remote or immediate. While I have not been myself the most fulsome flatterer of the President of the United States, yet I take it upon myself to say that no administration has ever been cleaner and purer, or more honest in its purposes and conduct with regard to the high functions committed to its care than the present Administration. And, sir, while President Cleveland may be traduced during this canvass in the vain hope that it will clip his wings in the flight he is to make over this country in November, he will live in the estimation of his countrymen, live in the history of his country, long after his traducers are forgotten.

Mr. DAWES. I do not wonder, Mr. President, that the Senator from Delaware [Mr. SAULSBURY] is tired of this debate. I am a little surprised that in a peroration of such a flight and such a bold assertion of the immortality of the present Administration, he should not take more concern to assure the people for what it would live so long and for what it might be remembered so long. History discloses many instances of people who will live on its pages and in the memory of the world, not for any great good they have accomplished or any great achievement, but for far other reasons; and the wicked will be remembered, I am afraid, in these degenerate times, quite as long as any good that can be discovered in this present Administration.

I rose, however, simply to state that the revelations of this debate are but the fulfillment of prophecy. Those who were here when the civil-service law was enacted, and will call to mind the debate which then occurred, will discover in what has been unfolded under this Administration just what the public were told was capable of being accomplished under this law, even by those earnestly in favor, if possible, of some legislation that would work a cure of an evil so inbred as to be incurable by enactment and the result could come only by conversion.

There were those who voted for this bill in sincerity and in an earnest effort to join with those who had more confidence in the efficacy of the bill than they had and who tried to the best of their ability to find some other form of law that would reach this great evil. They were told then that under an administration so disposed this law might

be wrenched into the most efficient instrument of the spoils system possible to be invented, and what clearer demonstration, what more perfect fulfillment of prophecy than the revelations of this debate?

After all, it teaches us what little confidence can be placed in profession, and how impotent is the skill of man in devising legal instrumentalities to prevent the evil minded, if they have the power, from accomplishing their ends. If a man in the administration of public affairs with this law before him, is so disposed, he can accomplish marvelous good with it and lift up the civil-service out of the mire and degradation of the past into a higher plane and a more effective and honest administration of the public service. But with it, if he is so disposed, he can administer it as I have stated, as has been done so plainly under an administration that reached power by professing greater desire and purpose of accomplishing good under it than anybody else. And yet, after all, by manipulation it has accomplished what has been unfolded here to the people of this country in the name of the civil-service law, the like of which can not be found on the records of the past, unjustifiable as was the conduct of the past, and so gross was it as to force upon the country some sort of legislation to cure it.

Until this nation shall put in authority an administration that shall have the courage and the power behind it to hold every official under it to a personal responsibility for the result, no attempt by legislation or by preaching to elevate the civil service of the country will accomplish anything. When a President of the United States shall have the disposition, the courage, and the moral backing behind him on entering the White House to assemble seven men and say to each one of them, "Into your hands I place this portfolio, and I clothe you with all the power I have for the administration of the duties of your portfolio, but if it goes wrong I hold you personally responsible for your head;" and when that minister shall assemble the heads of the bureaus under him necessary for the discharge of his duties and says to each one of them, "I hold you personally responsible for the proper discharge of the duties of this bureau, and I give you *carte blanche* as to the instrumentality to work out that result, but what goes wrong in that bureau falls on your head"—I say when the time comes when a President, whether he be a Democrat or a Republican, can stand in the White House and inaugurate such a system as that, the civil service, in my opinion, will be put on a proper basis. It will be improved or prostituted just according to the heart and purpose of the party that puts the President in the White House.

When such a system of individual and personal responsibility for the discharge of the duties of each office shall prevail, from the President clear down to the most immaterial official, holding each one personally responsible to his own head for what is accomplished under him, no official will stop in the employment of any man under him to inquire whether he be Republican or Democrat, but only whether he is the best man possible for him to select to accomplish what must be accomplished on pain of official death.

That is the responsibility I long to see inaugurated in this Government. That is the only responsibility I expect ever to see that will lift this civil service up out of party work and party dirt to a true and exclusive devotion to the public service; and the depth of the mire into which it will be dragged in each succeeding administration will be measured only by the disposition of those who are clothed for the time being with the power of administration.

So it was thought and so it was put upon record when this law was enacted. So it has proved in the first administration called upon to administer it. Never in all the history of party politics as connected with official life has there been such a demonstration of the difference between profession and practice in this regard as in this Administration—an administration with all these practices brought home to it, with all these violations of professions which were accepted by those who placed it in power, before the country with solicitations for contributions contrived by a thin device deliberately for the purpose of escaping the phraseology of the law, with an extension of solicitation from the highest officer in the Government down to the humblest policeman who walks in the shadows of the night about the streets of Washington City, with a universal address to all officers called upon, with percentage of salary named and fixed, to contribute their share in support of the party in power, now coming before the country in these colors and in these garments for the verdict of the people.

If this Administration with all its sins of commission and omission upon its shoulders shall be accepted again by the people, do they not have the indorsement that there is no length or depth of degradation and prostitution of the civil service to party behests that they are not justified in the future to indulge in?

The Senator from Delaware may think this an unpleasant and perhaps he may think it an unprofitable subject of debate, when the conduct and course of this Administration is presented to the public for approval or disapproval, but to my mind if these practices, if these violations of pledges and professions shall go for naught with the American people, the civil service of this country has nothing to hope of elevation, efficiency, or purity under this Administration.

Mr. STEWART. Mr. President, I have been observing the operations of this civil-service law since its passage, hoping that a means had been devised and put into practice that would remedy the objections to the former mode of appointing officers and that would be better than the general provisions of the Constitution without special legislation. I have come to the conclusion, without reference to party at all, that the law is a bad one; that instead of fixing responsibility and securing reliable officers it has a tendency directly the other way. It removes responsibility from the proper place and places it where the community are utterly unable to know who has done the deed.

Under the system that formerly existed appointments to office were made on the recommendation of gentlemen in Congress and out of Congress. Their recommendations were made matter of record, and they were held responsible in their districts and by the country, and whatever may be said it was dangerous for any Senator or Representative to recommend worthless men or worthless women to office. He might go on for a little while, but his constituents would discuss it at his coming election, and as a rule ambitious and honorable men took great care to recommend to office only suitable persons. Of course they made mistakes occasionally. The system was not perfect. Abuses grew up which called the attention of the country to it. Besides, abuses that did not exist were alleged, and such abuses as did exist were exaggerated by those who were unable to secure appointments; and the press took up the question and demanded a reform in that respect.

What is the reform? What kind of a law have we? In the first place it does not and could not take from the President the appointing power. That is lodged with the President by the Constitution. The law provides that the President shall appoint three commisioners. They are appointed and removable at his pleasure. Of course he can secure men who will do his bidding. That is the first proposition. The next proposition is that there shall be an examination under certain rules. Here is a chance for great partiality in the examination. If by examination you could ascertain exactly the qualifications, moral as well as intellectual, of all persons applying for office, if you could determine by an examination the fitness of person for office, that would be right. But still there is every opportunity to favor particular classes and individuals, to furnish them in advance the questions to be answered, to help them through, and to embarrass those it is desired to keep out. It is impossible in human nature to make that examination perfectly fair, I do not care how it is provided for. It is necessarily held in secret. It is not in human nature to make it fair where there are contending parties, and you can not have a secret examination of that kind, the result to be determined by men belonging to different parties, which is fair to all applicants for place. If it could be so, as was well stated by the Senator from Delaware, you would not necessarily determine the fitness for office, you would not determine the moral qualities by a mere examination. There are other things to be taken into account. Character, responsibility, can not be determined by giving the answers to a few questions.

I say that the test is insufficient, it is too narrow. The chance for fraud and deception exists everywhere in that step. Then comes the next step. Four persons are selected and sent to the appointing officer, from whom he is to select. Is there any law which will prevent him from ascertaining who these four persons are and what their politics are? You may have all the law you will, but the officer who makes the selection will know by some means, by some wink, and you can not punish him for it. The more criminal statutes you have the more they will be violated. It is impossible to execute such a law; and consequently when the names of four are sent to the head of a Department he selects the one he desires to appoint to accommodate some friend or for some purpose that is not known to the public, and the responsibility rests nowhere.

A member of Congress is not even allowed to testify as to the qualifications of an applicant. He can only say whether or not he is of a good moral character, and it is an ungrateful task to file a protest against the moral character of applicants. If the applicant has not such a character that a Member of Congress can conscientiously recommend him, he would not do so, but he does not want to be put into the position of being an accuser. Consequently the man who represents the people has no power to prevent the appointment, because he is unwilling to become a public accuser, although he may know very well that this person has not such a character, such business habits, and such a standing in the community as would entitle him to first-class confidence; that he is not such a man as he would select. Then the applicant is slipped in and the responsibility is nowhere. You can not fix the responsibility. An officer has been put in, and you may go the rounds and nobody is responsible for the transaction.

It is a secret machine and it will work a demoralization of the civil service. Besides, it places all the power in the hands of the President, if he is disposed to use it. He can remove the civil-service examiners; he can remove the Civil Service Commissioners. It places the whole power in his hands, a power that he is unable to execute himself and must trust to others, to secret agents in fact. The President of the United States can not know the people in the various districts over this vast country. Somebody must select them. There must be some mode of selecting them, and I say the mode devised is a mode that will not work well because it removes responsibility from everybody. No-

body is responsible, for it is a secret institution; nobody is responsible for its workings. It can be said "according to the best examination this man has gone through;" and you have the places filled by unworthy men and nobody is responsible for the appointments. I say the old system of the Constitution, under which appointments were made on the recommendations of citizens, including members of Congress, whose recommendations were on file, so that somebody was responsible, was better than this secret system of thimble-rigging that has been recently invented.

Mr. President, this law ought to be repealed for one reason if for no other: it is a law to promote duplicity and lying. It is a law the very execution of which will breed a race of rascals, because its method is secret and there is no responsibility anywhere. The people will learn of the secret ways of manipulation. The President himself can not tell, nobody can tell the machinery by which men are worked into office. There is an examination on questions which may be as irrelevant to what the man is to do, what is required to be done, as possible, having no reference to it, and when that is done he gets a certificate. If it is fairly done, it is an accident. This one or that one will get a position in advance or will by accident answer some very easy questions, have hard questions put to him and get through by accident without any real test of his qualifications for the place desired. Then comes the manipulation of the four names that are certified.

The members of Congress who represent their districts are excluded; in fact, this law disqualifies them as witnesses. The testimony of a member of Congress can not be taken as to the qualifications of an applicant for office. The testimony of the representatives of the people is inadmissible. The presumption is that the representatives of the people are not competent to testify before an officer having the appointing power. Think of the idea that we are not! If that were true, it they are not as a mass fit to be believed on this question, this Government can not last a year. If the testimony of the representatives of the people of the United States in Congress assembled, who have been selected by the suffrages of the people of the various States, can not be taken as to the qualifications of persons for office, the country has reached a point where it can not exist. Such an idea is absurd. Their testimony ought to be received.

This law goes on the supposition that the people only elect rogues to Congress, men who lie, whose testimony can not be received by those officials having the power of appointment. It is degrading to the public service to put such a provision in the law. It is demoralizing to it to say that members of Congress, who are responsible to their constituents, can not testify as to the qualifications of an applicant, while some secret emissary, for money or for gain or for corruption can, by various arts, worm himself or some other person into office under this irresponsible régime or arrangement and you can not put your hand on a responsible party.

I say, for the honor of Congress, for the good of the service, we ought to return to the practice of holding somebody responsible for recommending persons to office. I know no better class to hold responsible than Senators and Members of Congress. It is said they used their power for patronage; that they advanced themselves; that they got into office by this means their friends. I tell you, sir, if they make bad recommendations their appointments never do them any good. I have known many Members of Congress and Senators to be defeated for re-election because they made bad recommendations.

But how will you defeat these secret, under-ground proceedings? How will you defeat the schemers who manipulate civil-service reform? Why should it be presumed that three men selected by the President who will take the position of commissioners will be better men than those selected by the people, when those three men are shielded from all responsibility by pretending that they are doing it according to the rules, and that if anybody is to blame it is the rules and not they? I ask what presumption is there that these three men will be better men than members of Congress, and what presumption is there that these three men will know more? They can not know the character and standing of the applicants. It is impossible. No one man in this country can have a universal acquaintance. Their acquaintance is limited; they are liable to be imposed upon every day, and nobody is responsible, and nobody can be called to account when a mistake is made in these examinations.

Then, when the examination is over, four names are sent to the appointing officer, and he shields himself under the certificate of examination, and he is not responsible; and when you appeal to the President he says, "All this is done under the civil-service rules; it is done in pursuance of the law; I can not control it; I can not remedy the evil."

This is the system. There is no redress anywhere. You may fill all the offices with irresponsible, worthless men under this system and there is no remedy. I say unless a better remedy than this can be devised, unless something better than the civil-service law can be invented, it had better be repealed and a law passed that nobody shall be prosecuted for what has already occurred under it. I think that would be a good idea right now before Congress adjourns to repeal the law and pass an act of oblivion, and let us know who appoints to office, let us know who is responsible for it, and let us know something about it.

I do not believe in secret machines; I do not believe in secret organizations, because rogues who have time to attend to such matters will succeed and honest men will fail. I believe the honor of the country requires that an act of oblivion be passed for all violations of this law, which are numerous and which never can be punished in the very nature of things, and, perhaps, ought not to be punished because the law itself is so defective. I think we ought to have an act of oblivion and start anew under the Constitution and let us know who puts men in office and why they are put there and let our constituents know, and then I think we shall be able to make some improvement.

We have now the spoils system under this law intensified; the spoils system placed in the hands of spoilsmen alone, not placed in the hands of a man who is indorsed by his people, but placed in the hands of men who have the time to manipulate the system, in the hands of men who have no interest in the country, in the hands of secret agents, secret workers, and as long as you have this law you will have scandals under any administration, because as long as human nature remains the same trickery and fraud will be practiced where trickery and fraud are encouraged by law.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. Is the Senate ready for the question on the passage of the resolutions?

Mr. VEST. Let the resolutions be read.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The resolutions will be again read.

The Secretary read the resolutions of Mr. HALE as modified.

Mr. VEST. Mr. President, I have not the slightest disposition to say a word about these resolutions, and to be very frank I care nothing about them, but there are one or two expressions contained in them which I think entirely improper in resolutions of inquiry. If I caught the reading correctly, and I listened as attentively as I could, the language is, "What orders have been issued as to the politics"—please read that over, Mr. Secretary. I object to the assumption of a fact which I know nothing about and care very little about and do not believe to exist.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The Secretary will read the clause referred to by the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. VEST. The part as to what orders were issued or what measures taken to ascertain the politics.

Mr. HALE. The last clause of the first resolution.

The Secretary read as follows:

And also to inform the Senate what measures have been taken by the War Department to learn the political opinions of the women and children in its employ.

Mr. VEST. I object to that form of expression in a resolution of inquiry, not because it is on this subject, but on any other. It should read "whether any measures have been taken to ascertain the politics; and if so, what."

Mr. HALE. "What measures, if any."

Mr. VEST. That will do.

Mr. HALE. The suggestion is correct. The language to which the Senator refers was not in the original resolution. It was suggested by another Senator.

Mr. VEST. I do not know anything about it.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. Does the Senator from Maine propose to modify the resolution by inserting the words "if any?"

Mr. HALE. Yes, sir.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The modification will be stated from the desk.

The SECRETARY. After the word "measures" it is proposed to insert "if any;" so as to read:

And also to inform the Senate what measures, if any, have been taken by the War Department to learn the political opinions of the women and children in its employ.

Mr. VEST. The same thing occurs in another part of the resolution, I think. I am not familiar with it, and not able to specify it, but I so recollect it. As to women and children, I think it is.

Mr. HALE. I think it does not occur in any other place.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The clause has just been read.

Mr. VEST. Then it is in another one. It occurs twice, it seems to me.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The resolutions will be sent to the Senator from Missouri [Mr. VEST] for his inspection.

Mr. VEST. I believe I was mistaken as to the language of the resolution.

Mr. HALE. I do not remember any other place where the language alluded to occurs.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The question is on agreeing to the resolutions of the Senator from Maine [Mr. HALE].

The resolutions were agreed to.

FOURTH-CLASS POSTMASTERS.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. If there be no further morning business, the Calendar under Rule VIII is in order.

Mr. REAGAN. I ask the indulgence of the Senate to call up Senate bill 3501, Order of Business 2284.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The title of the bill will be stated.

The SECRETARY. A bill (S. 3501) relating to the classification of post-offices and amendatory of the act approved March 3, 1883, entitled "An act to adjust the salaries of postmasters."

Mr. DAWES. At the adjournment last night the Senate had under consideration a bill called up by the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. SABIN]. The Senator from Minnesota had the promise informally that if an adjournment was had the bill should be taken up this morning on the motion of the Senator from Vermont [Mr. EDMUNDS] and completed. The Senator from Minnesota was obliged to leave this morning, and the Senator from Vermont is not here.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The Chair therefore recognized the Senator from Texas [Mr. REAGAN].

Mr. DAWES. I venture to ask that the Senate may redeem the plighted pledge made last night to the Senator from Minnesota.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. Does the Senator from Texas yield?

Mr. REAGAN. I ask the Senator from Massachusetts if the bill alluded to by him will take much time?

Mr. DAWES. I do not think any discussion will be had upon it.

Mr. REAGAN. The bill to which I have called attention is one which relates to the interest of 50,000 postmasters and the postal service otherwise. It is a bill that I do not think, when it is read, Senators will object to.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. If there be no objection, the bill called up by the Senator from Texas will be considered as in Committee of the Whole.

Mr. DAWES. I would like the ruling of the Chair as to the unfinished business.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. There is no unfinished business during the morning hour.

Mr. DAWES. Will there be at 2 o'clock?

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The unfinished business at 2 o'clock will be House bill 9151, known as the Northern Pacific forfeiture act.

Mr. DAWES. I have done my duty to the absent Senator. I do not feel under any further obligation.

Mr. ALLISON. I have been compelled to be absent from the Chamber for some days, and ask the indulgence of the Senate to call up a small private bill.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The Chair has recognized the Senator from Texas [Mr. REAGAN], and his bill is before the Senate as in Committee of the Whole, and was about being read.

Mr. ALLISON. Very well; I shall not interpose. I was not aware of it.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The reading of the bill will proceed.

The bill S. 3501 was read and considered as in Committee of the Whole.

Mr. HALE. I want to ask the Senator from Texas one question. I ask that in the course of any remarks which he has to submit on this bill he will explain whether there is any class of postmasters covered in its provisions whose salaries are not increased by this measure.

Mr. REAGAN. Yes, sir, I will.

Mr. President, I think a brief explanation of the pending bill will be sufficient. It will be remembered by Senators that petitions have been received from all parts of the country for the increase of the compensation of fourth-class postmasters. There was application for the increase of the compensation of second and third class postmasters, but that was provided for, as will be remembered by the Senator from Maine, in the bill appropriating for the expenditures of the Post-Office Department by allowing pay for rents, fuel, and lights. Nothing in that bill, however, affected the interests of fourth-class postmasters.

There are of this class of postmasters, as appears by the letter of the Postmaster-General of May 3, 51,592. The bill provides to increase their pay. Under the law as it now is when the receipts of an office are $50 a quarter, amounting to $200 a year, or less, the percentage allowed to the postmaster is 100 per cent. This bill provides that up to the amount of $60 a quarter, that is, $240 a year, they are to have 100 per cent., and in that proportion. It is a very small increase, but it is an increase.

The aggregate amount which the bill would carry above the present aggregate for the payment of this class of postmasters is estimated by the Postmaster-General to be $287,043. By a calculation which I have made that would make an average annual increase of compensation of fourth-class postmasters of $5.52, and it would make an average increase of their quarterly pay of $1.35. Some of course would get more and others less. I merely refer to that to show the rate of increase.

I suppose Senators are so well informed upon this subject that it is hardly necessary to take up the time of the Senate by any protracted discussion of the question. Formerly the rates of postage were higher than now. When we reduced the postage on letters, for instance, from 3 to 2 cents a letter, there was a corresponding reduction of the percentage on postage-stamps that went to the postmasters, and a reduction of their compensation. The reduction of the postage on letters and the reduction of the postage on other mail matter, especially fourth-class matter, has very largely increased the labors of these fourth-class postmasters.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The hour of 2 o'clock having arrived, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumes the consideration of the unfinished business, which is the bill (H. R. 9151) to forfeit certain lands granted to the Northern Pacific Railroad Company, and for other purposes.

Mr. REAGAN. I ask permission to have the pending bill continued.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The Senator from Texas asks unanimous consent that the unfinished business be informally laid aside. It will be so ordered if there be no objection, and the consideration of the bill called up by him will be continued.

Mr. REAGAN. I was explaining that while the duties and the labors of this class of postmasters have been increased their compensation has been reduced, and the Department believe that an increase is proper, and this bill was prepared in the Department as it is. The Senate Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads believe this increase ought to be made, and have instructed me by the unanimous consent of those of the committee who were present to report the bill to the Senate and ask the favorable action of it.

What I have said shows how the necessity for this increase comes about, and it is an increase to but a small extent and is in response to petitions which certainly are based upon justice. Surely there should be some increase. The Post-Office Department recommend this increase and the Senate committee recommend it.

In response to the inquiry of the Senator from Maine [Mr. HALE] I ought to say that there is no increase in the bill for any postmasters except fourth-class postmasters.

There are some other provisions in the bill that are simply intended to remedy the administration of the Post-Office by preventing postmasters from making commissions of postage-stamps and stamped envelopes, which the Department deem to be necessary and which I suppose is to prevent such things as selling postage-stamps for goods in order to get an increase of percentage. The postmasters ought to be confined to the legitimate selling of stamps for the business of the Department.

This covers the idea embraced in the bill, and unless something more is called for I will not occupy the time of the Senate.

Mr. TELLER. I should like to ask the Senator what the percentage of increase is by this bill?

Mr. REAGAN. The precise percentage I can hardly state. Perhaps it is 3 or 4 per cent.

Mr. TELLER. Three or four per cent. on the present salaries of these postmasters?

Mr. REAGAN. I gave this illustration: Under the present law, where a postmaster gets $50 or less for a quarter, making $200 or less for a year, he gets 100 per cent., with a gradual reduction of his percentage as the receipts go up. Under this bill he would get 100 per cent. on the first $60 a quarter; he would get 100 per cent. on the first $240; and then there is a corresponding reduction. It is a very slight increase in the compensation. Of over $8,000,000 paid to fourth-class postmasters, according to last year's statement, it will make an increase of two hundred and eighty and odd thousand dollars, or an average of $5.52 to each of these postmasters for a year, or an average of $1.35 a quarter.

I shall be glad to have the favorable action of the Senate upon the bill, for it is certainly one that appeals to our sense of justice, and has the indorsement of the Department and the committee.

Mr. ALLISON. I call the attention of the Senator from Texas to the fact that this bill is to take effect on the 1st day of July, 1888. I suppose the object of that provision is that these postmasters' salaries may relate back to that particular moment of time. Is that it?

Mr. REAGAN. The recommendation upon which the bill was prepared and sent here by the Department is dated September 11, and I suppose the object is to make this increase take effect from the 1st day of July now past.

Mr. ALLISON. I think it had better take effect at the end of the present fiscal year. I think it had better take effect on the 1st of July, 1889. Then there would be an opportunity of adjusting the appropriations in accordance with it. I think that would be better.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. Does the Senator move an amendment?

Mr. ALLISON. I should like to hear the last section of the bill read.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. Section 5 will be read.

The Secretary read as follows:

SEC. 5. That this act shall take effect and become operative on the 1st day of July, 1888, and not sooner, except that it shall so far take effect from the 1st day of April, 1888, as to require the Postmaster-General to classify the post-offices as third-class offices which become so by virtue of this act and fix the salaries, and make any allowances they may be entitled to by law, to take effect July 1, 1888.

Mr. ALLISON. Certainly this statute should not be retroactive. We shall get into the trouble that we have been in for some years about what is known as the Spalding act if we undertake to make this retroactive. It ought to take effect in the future, and so far in the future as to make it absolutely certain that nobody will come here with a claim. I think a bill of this importance, increasing the compensation of postmasters all along the line in various ways, certainly should not

take effect until the beginning of the next fiscal year; and I submit that to the Senator from Texas as a wise provision.

Mr. REAGAN. Ordinarily I should agree with the Senator from Iowa, but the returns are all in in this case and the justice and necessity for this change are so manifest that, unless it would work inconvenience, I should regret very much to see these postmasters denied an increase of salary for another year when the returns to enable the Department to make the adjustment are now in, and show as well as they will show at the expiration of another year who would be entitled to the benefit of this increase.

Mr. ALLISON. There are some penal provisions in the bill which I think might make it a little awkward to have it take effect retroactively, and besides this is a small compensation to each postmaster and they have got on with the present compensation for a great many years. I think in increasing their compensation in this way we had better make it take effect in the future. Therefore I suggest some future day, either the 1st of July, 1889, or the 1st of April, 1889.

Mr. EDMUNDS. It ought to be the fiscal year.

Mr. ALLISON. It ought to begin with the first of the fiscal year, and I make that motion if the Senator from Texas will not agree to modify the bill.

Mr. REAGAN. I need only repeat what I have said, that by the reduction of the postage and the loading of the mails with a large additional amount of mail-matter, the result of the percentage of postage-stamps canceled by postmasters was reduced and their salaries were reduced. The injustice is so manifest that petitions have been universal from them asking a restoration of the rates or a compensation proportioned to the labor which they render.

This amendment perhaps about brings the compensation back to where it was before, and it is in answer to the demand made from the country generally, as I have stated, a demand which covers the claims of fifty-one thousand and odd postmasters, and is so just that the Department first recommended in a communication to the other House and then in a communication to the Senate that this measure of relief should be given to take effect at the date prescribed, and the Senate Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads concur with the Postmaster-General in the belief that this is just.

There is no trouble, as I understand; and I do not see how any trouble can arise in making the classification on the returns that were in at the close of the last fiscal year, so that if the act takes effect from the beginning of the present fiscal year there will be no more difficulty than there would be in making the classification under the returns at the end of this fiscal year. It is simply a question whether we will do justice to these postmasters now, or defer that justice to the end of the fiscal year. I trust the amendment of the Senator from Iowa will not be adopted.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PASCO in the chair). The Secretary will report the amendment.

The SECRETARY. In section 5, line 3, it is proposed to strike out the word "eight" and insert "nine;" so as to read:

That this act shall take effect and become operative on the 1st day of July, 1889.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the amendment. [Putting the question.] The ayes appear to have it. The ayes have it, and the amendment is agreed to.

Mr. REAGAN. I will not call for a division on the amendment, as there may not be a quorum here.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will call the attention of the Senator from Texas to the remainder of the section to see whether any other changes should be made to correspond with the amendment just adopted.

Mr. REAGAN. I suppose that would make it proper to strike out the words commencing after "1888," in the third line, down to the work "1889," in the fourth line.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The proposed amendment will be stated.

The SECRETARY. In line 3, after the date "1888," it is proposed to strike out:

And not sooner, except that it shall so far take effect from the 1st day of April, 1888.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The proposed amendment will be agreed to if there is no objection. The Chair hears none, and it is agreed to.

Mr. ALLISON. Then "1888" ought to be struck out at the end of the section and "1889" inserted.

Mr. EDMUNDS. Let the section be reported as it stands.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The section will be read as amended.

The Secretary read as follows:

SEC. 5. That this act shall take effect and become operative on the 1st day of July, 1889, as to require the Postmaster-General to classify the post-offices as third-class offices which become so by virtue of this act, and fix the salaries and make any allowances they may be entitled to by law, to take effect July 1, 1888.

Mr. REAGAN. Instead of saying "as to require," it should read:

And the Postmaster-General shall classify the post-offices as third-class offices which become so by virtue of this act.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be reported.

The SECRETARY. It is proposed to amend the section so as to make it read:

That this act shall take effect and become operative on the 1st day of July, 1889, and the Postmaster-General shall classify the post-offices as third-class offices which become so by virtue of this act, and fix the salaries and make any allowances they may be entitled to by law, to take effect July 1, 1888.

Mr. ALLISON. "To take effect from and after the 1st day of July, 1889," it should be. The object I have in view is to have this law take effect thereafter and that there shall be no adjustment of accounts prior to that time, because unless we do that all these postmasters' accounts must be readjusted on the basis of this new law.

Mr. REAGAN. There is no objection to that. The first amendment being adopted, that is proper.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The SECRETARY. In section 5, line 8, after the word "effect," it is proposed to insert "from and after;" so as to read:

And make any allowances they may be entitled to by law, to take effect from and after July 1, 1889.

Mr. EDMUNDS. I move to amend that by striking out the printed words "to take effect;" so as to read:

Entitled to by law from and after July 1, 1889.

That will make it clear that it operates *in futuro*. Just strike out the printed words "to take effect," and then we shall all understand it alike.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be reported.

The SECRETARY. In section 5, line 8, after the word "law," it is proposed to strike out the words "to take effect;" so as to read:

And make any allowances they may be entitled to by law from and after July 1, 1889.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. REAGAN. I did not exactly understand that. The idea of that provision must be embraced there because this law would make some third-class offices that are not now third-class offices, and the idea was that the law in relation to classification should be carried out. Is that stricken out?

Mr. EDMUNDS. No, sir; it is the allowance to take effect from and after the 1st of July, 1889; so that making this classification their right to readjusted salary will commence on the 1st of July next. That is what I meant to do.

Mr. REAGAN. Let it be reported again.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will report the entire section as amended.

The Secretary read the section as amended, as follows:

SEC. 5. That this act shall take effect and become operative on the 1st day of July, 1889, and the Postmaster-General shall classify the post-offices as third-class offices which become so by virtue of this act and fix the salaries, and make any allowances they may be entitled to by law, from and after July 1, 1889.

Mr. REAGAN. That is all right.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendments were concurred in.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

FORT BROOKE MILITARY RESERVATION.

Mr. CALL. I ask the Senate to take up for consideration the bill (S. 3340) for the donation of Fort Brooke military reservation at Tampa, Fla., for free schools and other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. EDMUNDS. Let it be read for information.

Mr. TELLER. I shall have to object to that bill. It has not been to the committee, as I understand. I will inquire if that bill has been before the Committee on Public Lands or any other committee?

Mr. CALL. It was reported from the Committee on Public Lands.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill was reported from the Committee on Public Lands, and has once been before the Senate for consideration.

Mr. TELLER. Then it is a different bill from the one I supposed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. EDMUNDS. Let it be read for information.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be read for information.

The Secretary read the bill, and, by unanimous consent, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed its consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair understands that an amendment is pending, which was offered by the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. HAWLEY]. The amendment will be stated.

The SECRETARY. In section 1, line 14, after the word "hereby," it is proposed to strike out "granted" and to insert "allotted;" so as to read:

Five acres for a marine hospital, and 25 acres which is hereby allotted to the city of Tampa for a public park.

Mr. EDMUNDS. I do not object to the amendment, but I should like to inquire whether there is any written report on the bill?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is informed that there is no written report on the bill.

Mr. EDMUNDS. This bill has not been to the Committee on Military Affairs, which has to do with military reservations.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill was reported from the Committee on Public Lands, the Chair is informed.

Mr. CALL. Will the Senator from Vermont allow me to explain the matter to him? Under the act of Congress for that purpose this reservation was surrendered to the Interior Department for disposal as a part of the public lands of the United States. It was surrendered several years ago, and it has been a matter of contention in regard to the method in which it should be disposed of. There have been various claims made against it, some of scrip location and some attempts to make homestead entry, all of which have been disposed of by two different Secretaries of the Interior in the same way.

The reservation lies adjacent to the city of Tampa, right alongside of it, and it is necessary that something should be done in order to allow the extension of the town in that direction; otherwise the people who are locating there will be compelled to seek homes and lots for business purposes in another and not so desirable portion of the city. There is a very decided feeling, I am told, on the part of the people of Tampa that the matter should be settled, so that the land can be made use of for the convenience and advantage of the town.

Mr. EDMUNDS. I should have supposed that, considering the situation of Tampa and its growing importance as a seaport, it would have been the interest of the United States to preserve this military reservation in order that at the proper time, which I have no doubt will come, suitable fortifications and other military structures, etc., may be erected there, instead of disposing of the reservation, now that railways and steam-ships meet at that place, making it a port which will require the usual defensive works. This land ought to have been kept for that purpose; but if Congress has already decided that it shall not be, and it is turned over to the public lands of the United States, that may be another question.

Mr. CALL. I will state further to the Senator from Vermont that the location of the reservation is, in the opinion of military authorities, not desirable as a place for a fortification of any kind. It is on the Hillsborough River, which is some distance removed from the entrance to the bay; while on either side of the Bay of Tampa there are eligible positions for commanding the channel or any approach into the deep water of the harbor. Those points are at least 10 or 20 miles from the present reservation. This reservation was made at a time when it was desirable to protect the country from the Indians. It is an old reservation, having been used exclusively for that purpose.

The great object that I have had in view in the matter was to have this bill so amended that the proceeds of the sale of the lots might be donated to the town of Tampa for the industrial education of her people. The committee, however, have not approved of that idea. I thought I would submit to the Senate a motion to amend the bill, simply appropriating the proceeds of the sale of the lots as provided for in the bill to the town of Tampa for educational purposes under any limitation that might be prescribed by the Secretary of the Interior.

Mr. EDMUNDS. If I may interrupt my friend, I notice by the bill that that particular proposition has already been disagreed to.

Mr. CALL. I do not so understand it.

Mr. EDMUNDS. It is so noted on the file copy, so far as I can read it.

Mr. CALL. When the bill was up before, that motion to amend was made; but the bill went over pending the discussion of the proposition, as I remember.

Mr. BERRY. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment referred to by the Senator from Florida was disagreed to as in Committee of the Whole. The pending amendment is the amendment which was offered by the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. HAWLEY]. Of course the Senator from Florida will be at liberty to offer the same amendment in the Senate when the bill reaches the Senate.

Mr. BERRY. I rose simply to make the statement which has been made by the Chair. The amendment was disagreed to as in Committee of the Whole, but the senior Senator from Florida gave notice that he would renew it in the Senate. The bill did not reach the Senate upon its former consideration, and therefore the amendment was not offered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The pending question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. HAWLEY] to strike out in line 14 of section 1 the word "granted" and insert the word "allotted;" so as to read:

And 25 acres which is hereby allotted to the city of Tampa for a public park.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendments were concurred in.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there amendments to be offered to the bill in the Senate?

Mr. EDMUNDS. I think the Senator from Florida desires to renew the amendment he offered before. It is written already on the file copy, probably just as the Senator would like to renew it.

Mr. CALL. I renew the amendment in that form.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment proposed by the Senator from Florida will be stated.

The SECRETARY. It is proposed to add as an additional section:

SEC. 4. That the proceeds of the sales of the lots shall be donated to the city of Tampa for the support of an industrial school.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment proposed by the Senator from Florida [Mr. CALL].

Mr. CALL. I hope the Senate will adopt the amendment. This little piece of ground, of 140 acres, I believe it is now, has been made valuable entirely by the settlement and growth of the town, and by the improvements which the people have made there. It is immediately adjacent to the region of country in which are Indians who have no home and no settled location, but for whom a provision has been made in the Indian appropriation bill of this year, with the recommendation of the Committee on Indian Affairs, I believe, at least with the approval of the chairman of that committee.

I think it very desirable that as many institutions as may be available should be established there for the education of that class of people and others who are like them inhabiting the everglades of Florida, and who are upon the outskirts of a settled country. In that point of view, considering the population that is found upon the coast, I urge the amendment. They are a very excellent class of people, some from the West Indies, some from Cuba, and they are poor. They subsist by cigar-making and by fishing and gathering sponges and coral. I think it very desirable that as extensive privileges of education as can possibly be obtained should be furnished to them, and especially industrial education.

Under those circumstances I have for years been seeking to obtain an appropriation of the proceeds of the sale of this property for the cause of education in that locality. It is a somewhat peculiar and exceptional case, though similar to the case at Fort Smith, Ark., where the reservation under almost exactly similar conditions was donated to the town for the purposes of education.

Mr. EDMUNDS. May I ask the Senator from Florida how much land has already been given to the State of Florida by the United States for the support of schools?

Mr. CALL. I do not remember exactly the amount. I think the Government gave the sixteenth section in each township.

Mr. EDMUNDS. The sixteenth and thirty-sixth sections, was it not?

Mr. CALL. I know the sixteenth was given. I am not quite sure about the thirty-sixth.

Mr. EDMUNDS. That would be two sections in each township.

Mr. CALL. Only the sixteenth section was given, I am informed by the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. BERRY], who is upon the Committee on Public Lands. The sixteenth is the only one given, I remember. The Government gave, in addition to that, a large number of acres of land, I think less than 50,000 acres, for two seminaries, many years ago, which are now existing and maintained, the land having sold for a very inconsiderable sum, as it was at a time when land had very little value in Florida.

The money was invested and the State has assumed the payment, and is paying it. The funds were lost, I think, during the war, but the investment is made good by the State. The State of Florida is now maintaining those schools and paying the interest upon the money as it originally agreed to do; but it has had no large appropriations of public land for public schools, there having been only the ordinary sixteenth section.

Mr. EDMUNDS. I was under the impression that in all the admitted, new States, the sixteenth and thirty-sixth sections in each township were granted to those States for the use of schools. Perhaps I am mistaken. But certainly the State of Florida has had more than one special grant, and pretty large ones, of land there for the benefit of seminaries of learning and for other educational purposes, agricultural colleges, etc., and has shared well with all the other people of the States, new and old, in all the beneficence of the Government concerning the disposition of public lands. In that State in particular, I suppose, the amount of what were called swamp and overflowed lands that have been granted to that State would be something very large, indeed; and we all know that what forty years ago were called swamp and overflowed lands have turned out in a very large proportion to be lands of the greatest agricultural value.

So I can not see upon what principle of justice to the rest of the people of the United States the public authorities of any part of the State of Florida should take the sum of money, great or small, which is to be got from the sale of this property of the United States, for the purposes of their schools. It does not appear to me to be just.

Mr. BERRY. The Senator from Vermont is mistaken in the opinion that the Southern States received two sections of land for school purposes. The sixteenth section only I think was given to all the Southern States. The Western and Northwestern States at a subsequent period did receive two sections of land.

However, the amendment offered by the Senator from Florida was thoroughly considered by the Committee on Public Lands. The chairman of that committee is absent in Kansas. He was very much op-

posed to the amendment for various reasons, and the committee unanimously reported the bill as it now stands.

One objection made to the amendment was that there were other reservations, especially one in Kansas, at Leavenworth, that would have to be disposed of at subsequent periods, and there were reservations in various other States. If this money was given to the town of Tampa, then it would be proper to make the same donation to other towns.

Another objection urged against the amendment by the chairman of the committee was that the people in Tampa, the citizens who reside in the town, have no greater right to receive this benefit than the entire county in which it is located, or the State of Florida; that it was selecting them out and giving them particular advantages where others were entitled to equal advantages.

Those were the reasons which induced the committee to report adversely to this proposition. It is true there is a precedent, and probably more than one precedent. There is one in my own State. The reservation at Fort Smith in my State was given to the town of Fort Smith perhaps three or four years ago. For that reason it was very strongly urged that we should follow the precedent.

I felt it my duty to state the objections that were urged by the chairman of the committee in his absence.

Then the amendment, as offered by the Senator from Florida, it strikes me, is simply to establish an industrial school without any conditions attached as to the character of the school, or any security that the money will be applied in that way.

When the money was given to Fort Smith it was accompanied by various conditions about how the land was to be sold and the money received. Only the interest was to be used for school purposes, and various other conditions that I can not now recite were prescribed. The pending amendment simply provides for the support of an industrial school without stating the character of the school or whether any school of that kind has already been established.

All these, in my opinion, are objections to the amendment. They were urged, however, more strongly by the chairman of the committee than any one else upon the committee; and in his absence I felt it my duty to state his objection to the amendment, and then let the Senate determine the matter.

Mr. TELLER. The case that the Senator from Arkansas cites in his own State, which he says was used before the committee, could hardly be a precedent, because there were peculiar circumstances attending that case which I need not go into now. There was there quite a different condition of affairs from what exists in connection with this place.

As a general rule, I am quite disposed to be liberal with reference to appropriations for school purposes; but having adopted a policy to dispose of these reservations for the public good, for the interest of the entire country, I do not see why we should make an exception in this case. If we do it in this case we must take a great number of military posts in different parts of the country that have been abandoned and turn them over to the local authorities. Unless Congress is prepared to enter upon that sort of a system there can be no special reason why in this case the property should be donated to the people of the city of Tampa.

I think the committee were unanimous in rejecting the present suggestion, although one member of the committee, I believe, was in favor of donating the proceeds of the land to the public schools of the State, or the city, or county, I do not remember which; but nobody was in favor of the proposition as now made.

Besides, from all the evidence the committee could get, the people of the town of Tampa are entirely satisfied with the proposition contained in the bill. This property has been lying there unoccupied for many years. The reservation of the park is a very valuable provision for the city. It is a very delightful portion of the reservation and the most valuable part of it. While this is not an absolute donation to the city, yet practically that is what it amounts to. It will probably never be resumed by the Government for any purpose of the Government, and it is a very valuable donation.

In addition to that, we have set apart other ground for public buildings, which if the Government should ever build on would furnish an additional park, because the grounds reserved are much larger than the public buildings will ever occupy or require. If the Government does not use that part of the reservation it will inure to the benefit of the city. So, on the whole, it is a very liberal donation to the city of Tampa.

I repeat that I was satisfied myself that the city of Tampa is anxious to have this reservation disposed of in such a way that it may be occupied. The portion of it that will be sold as a park might be put in proper order to make the place attractive.

I believe I do not misstate the fact when I say that the people of Tampa are interested in this bill in the shape it now stands, and it is much more likely to become a law if it passes in the shape that we have reported it than if it should be amended in the way the Senator from Florida suggests. I do not believe it is in the interest of the people of Florida to put on the amendment he suggests.

I should like to say further that the State of Florida has no right to complain of the munificence of the Government with respect to the public lands. They got their sixteenth section of school lands; they got their agricultural college lands; they got their internal improvement lands, and they got the general amount of lands, a large amount, that the Government donated to the new States. Indeed, they got nearly the entire State; and I have thought when I have listened to the Senator from Florida on various occasions that they had got all the State. They certainly got all the swamp land there was in the State. On various occasions the Senator has told us that under the pretense of getting swamp land the State had gobbled up, using a Western phrase, all the dry land besides. So if that is true, putting the two together, they have got all the land in the State. They ought to be satisfied to let the Government retain this small reservation, having got a very large donation in every way for schools, for colleges, and as swamp lands, and everything else, and now a very handsome donation is made in this bill itself. While it is not an absolute gift, I repeat, it is practically a donation. It looks to me as rather being a little bit avaricious for the Senator to claim any more.

I am willing to deal liberally with them, and the committee thought we had dealt very liberally when we selected 30 acres of the finest land on that whole reservation, which is worth several thousand dollars an acre at least, as a practical donation to the city. I think the Senator ought to be content with that.

Mr. CALL rose.

ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY.

Mr. EDMUNDS. I move that when the Senate adjourn to-day it be to meet on Monday next.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. BLAIR. I ask unanimous consent to say a word before that motion is put. This session is not too active for the business of the country. There are a great many bills that require action; there is a great deal of talk to be made before the discussion of the tariff bill can be properly in order. I hope the Senate will not consume the slight intervening time that there is before that debate is expected to commence by this thoughtless adjournment. There is a good deal to be done upon the Calendar. I hope the Senate will remain in session and devote itself to the public business to-morrow at least, if not on Saturday.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Vermont. [Putting the question.] The ayes appear to have it. The ayes have it, and the motion is agreed to.

Mr. CULLOM. I ask leave to submit a conference report.

Mr. BLAIR. I call for a division on the motion of the Senator from Vermont.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The Senator from New Hampshire asks for a division. Senators in favor of the motion will rise and stand until counted.

The Senate proceeded to divide; and the ayes were 20.

Mr. HARRIS. The Senator from New Hampshire, I trust, will not demand a further count. Twenty have voted in the affirmative.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. More than a majority of a quorum have voted in the affirmative.

Mr. BLAIR. There are several bills upon the Calendar that ought to be acted upon. There are several that I have been waiting months to ask the attention of the Senate to, and, like the man at the pool of Bethesda, just as I thought I was ready to get cured, somebody else who was not half so badly off, who did not need the public attention to anything the extent those bills did, got in with comparatively unimportant matters, and received attention from the Senate, and those bills were passed.

It has come to be that there are some three or four bills which ought to be acted upon before the final adjournment of the session that I fear will receive no attention unless they can receive it between now and next Monday, when, I understand, the tariff discussion is likely to be up. It is with that view, not because I am not as desirous of rest or of relief from these daily sessions as anybody else, that I oppose this motion. I hope the Senator from Vermont will not press it.

One Senator has given notice, I observe, of a desire to address the Senate upon some question to-morrow, Friday, and unless we are to have some system invented and inaugurated by which the whole Senate can talk through a single wire, like the modern duplex telegraph wire, we are not going to have time to relieve ourselves from the public business that is pending and pressing. To adjourn over and spoil the next two days is, I think, entirely wrong and trifling with the public interests. Therefore I hope the Senator will not press the motion. If he does, I shall feel under the necessity of appealing to the yeas and nays.

Mr. CULLOM. Will the Senator yield to me to submit a conference report?

Mr. HARRIS. Before the conference report is submitted (and I wish to submit one immediately afterwards) I desire to suggest to the Senator from New Hampshire that a demand for a further division or a further count may result in our inability to proceed with any business whatever; and if he presses it I for one promise him that it will require a voting quorum to pass any bill or do any other business in this body.

Mr. BLAIR. We shall have to deal with difficulties of that kind when we come to them. If Senators choose to take the responsibility of obstructing business that they otherwise would not, because some members of the Senate feel it to be their duty to go along as far as they can in the ordinary and usual method of procedure, the responsibility will be with those Senators and not with others who, like myself, desire to go on until we come to obstacles.

Mr. HARRIS. I beg to suggest to the Senator, if he will allow me, that it has come to the exact point now where the question referred to by him arises.

Mr. BLAIR. I do not think it has come to the exact point.

Mr. DAWES rose.

Mr. BLAIR. I am proceeding by unanimous consent.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The Senator will pause one moment. Is there objection to the Senator from New Hampshire proceeding? ["No objection."]

Mr. BLAIR. The question pending has not been decided, and unanimous consent has been given to debate. It is not apparent that I represent a minority of Senators upon the floor, and therefore the Senator from Tennessee is premature in his assumption of fact. I am urging reasons why there is, as I think there should be, a majority opposed to this motion, and I am serious in regard to it. As I said, if we must find out at some time whether we can do business here, I shall endeavor to secure a record by the yeas and nays upon the motion if it becomes necessary.

Mr. DAWES. Mr. President——

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. Is there objection to the Senator from Massachusetts proceeding? The Chair hears none.

Mr. DAWES. I simply want to make an inquiry of the Senator from Tennessee. I understand him to say that unless we can adjourn over to-morrow we shall not do any more business. Is that the threat the Senator announces?

Mr. HARRIS. The statement of the Senator from Tennessee was that if the Senator from New Hampshire pressed a further count and developed the want of a quorum, the Senator from Tennessee would be here to see that no business should be done without a quorum. That was the statement of the Senator from Tennessee, and the Senator from Massachusetts can draw whatever inferences or deductions (in which he is immensely fertile) that he chooses.

Mr. DAWES. So I understand the Senator from Tennessee announced that unless he can have his way and adjourn the Senate over to-morrow, he will see to it that no business is done hereafter until a quorum is brought back here.

Mr. CALL. I appeal to the Senator from Vermont to withdraw his motion at present. It has intervened in the midst of the consideration of the bill which has been under discussion, and if pressed now it may defeat the further consideration of the bill.

Mr. CULLOM. Is it in order to submit a conference report?

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. Twenty Senators have voted in the affirmative on the motion of the Senator from Vermont that when the Senate adjourn to-day it be to meet on Monday next.

Mr. EDMUNDS. I ask unanimous consent to say a word.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. Is there objection? The Chair hears none. The Senator from Vermont will proceed.

Mr. EDMUNDS. I wish to appeal to the Senator from New Hampshire, in the interest of getting on with a few little things this afternoon, to withdraw his insisting upon a division. At the present moment undoubtedly a quorum of the Senate is within reach, for we ought not to do any business at all without a quorum. The Constitution requires the presence of a quorum.

What the Senator from Tennessee has said ought to be said every day by everybody. If I did not suppose that at this moment a quorum was within reach, could be got within half an hour, and is therefore practically here, I should object to any business being done. The Constitution expressly requires that the number of members of this body who are entitled to do business is a majority of Senators elected, and any less number is not entitled to do business according to the Constitution that we have all pledged ourselves to sustain.

I have stood on that proposition ever since I have been a member of this body, and think it to be a duty to do so. Whether at this moment there may or may not be within this Chamber the requisite thirty-nine Senators, I do not know; and therefore, inasmuch as what would be a majority of thirty-nine have voted in favor of adjourning over, I thought it not unfair to appeal to the Senator from New Hampshire to let the business go on in that way. I did not intend to interfere with the bill that has been under consideration.

Mr. BLAIR. I understand the Senator's point is this, that no business should be done without a quorum.

Mr. EDMUNDS. No business ought to be done without a quorum.

Mr. BLAIR. I propose to see that we do not adjourn over until Monday without a quorum; that is all.

Mr. EDMUNDS. That is right.

Mr. HARRIS. I beg permission to say a single word.

Mr. BLAIR. I ask the Senator from Vermont, however, to withdraw his motion. I do not wish to have it pressed to an issue at this time.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. If there be no objection, the Senator from Tennessee will proceed.

Mr. HARRIS. The motion that when the Senate adjourn to-day it be to meet on Monday next was, as the RECORD will show, not my motion. If the want of a quorum shall be developed at this time, then no business can be done. I know that there are certain matters of public interest and of public business that ought to be done to-day, and I am anxious that they shall be done to-day. Therefore, if the Senator from New Hampshire chooses to develop a condition of things that may prevent our looking after and performing those duties that devolve upon us to-day, I give notice, and I shall stand by it, that I shall insist upon the presence of a quorum.

Mr. EDMUNDS. There is a quorum here now, I am satisfied.

Mr. BLAIR. Before the matter is decided I wish to protest against being made the poor dog Tray of this business. I have been standing upon the conceded right to find out whether this motion commands a majority of the Senate, which it should require, as both the Senator from Vermont and the Senator from Tennessee say, being out of the usual order of adjournment, a majority in order that it may be carried. I was trying to find out whether there was a majority of a quorum in favor of an adjournment over to Monday, and thus losing a day beyond our usual custom. I suggest to the Senator from Vermont that he withdraw his motion for the present. No doubt there will be unanimous consent given for that purpose.

Mr. EDMUNDS. I am satisfied there is a quorum here, and it is a good time to determine the question now that we have a quorum. As it is no party question, everybody is permitted to vote.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. Twenty Senators have voted in the affirmative. The noes will rise. [A pause.] Twelve Senators have voted in the negative.

Mr. EDMUNDS. Let us have the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered; and the Secretary proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. TELLER (when his name was called). I am paired with the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. GIBSON]. I do not know how he would vote, and therefore I refrain from voting.

The roll-call was concluded.

Mr. CULLOM. The Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. CHACE] is paired with the Senator from Georgia [Mr. COLQUITT].

Mr. BLAIR (after having voted in the negative). I desire to change my vote. I vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 35, nays 9; as follows:

YEAS—35.

Aldrich,	Coke,	Harris,	Platt,
Allison,	Cullom,	Hawley,	Pugh,
Bate,	Davis,	Ingalls,	Saulsbury,
Berry,	Dolph,	Jones of Arkansas,	Spooner,
Blair,	Edmunds,	Manderson,	Vest,
Bowen,	Eustis,	Morgan,	Walthall,
Butler,	Farwell,	Paddock,	Wilson of Iowa,
Cameron,	Gray,	Pasco,	Wilson of Md,
Cockrell,	Hampton,	Payne,	

NAYS—9.

Call,	Hoar,	Sawyer,	Vance,
Chandler,	Mitchell,	Stockbridge,	Voorhees.
Dawes,			

ABSENT—32.

Beck,	Faulkner,	Jones of Nevada,	Reagan,
Blackburn,	Frye,	Kenna,	Riddleberger,
Blodgett,	George,	McPherson,	Sabin,
Brown,	Gibson,	Morrill,	Sherman,
Chace,	Gorman,	Palmer,	Stanford,
Colquitt,	Hale,	Plumb,	Stewart,
Daniel,	Hearst,	Quay,	Teller,
Evarts,	Hiscock,	Ransom,	Turpie.

So the motion was agreed to.

Mr. BLAIR. I move to reconsider the vote just taken, and I do so with the design of withdrawing the motion to reconsider in a moment. Now, sir——

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The motion is not debatable.

Mr. HARRIS. I object to any debate on the question.

Mr. CALL. Mr. President——

Mr. CULLOM. I rise to submit a conference report which I have been trying to get in for some time.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The conference report can not be received at this time.

Mr. BLAIR. I withdraw the motion to reconsider, and will say what I have to say upon some other occasion.

LIFE-SAVING STATION.

Mr. CULLOM. I rise to submit a conference report.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. Is there objection?

Mr. CALL. That is not in order. The bill which was under consideration by the Senate must be proceeded with.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The Chair understands that the conference report would be in order except when some Senator was upon the floor.

Mr. CULLOM. I was on the floor myself.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The Chair understands that the

Senator from Florida [Mr. CALL] had the floor upon the bill that was pending when the motion to adjourn over was entered.

Mr. CULLOM. Can a Senator hold the floor while the yeas and nays are taken on another question?

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. Certainly.

Mr. HOAR. I desire to submit respectfully to the Chair, in order that the observation of the Chair may not go as a precedent, that I understand a conference report can be submitted when a Senator is speaking, taking him off his feet.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. That question does not arise now, but if it were up the Chair would decide against the suggestion made.

Mr. CULLOM. I believe the Senator from Florida yields. There will be no controversy over the report.

Mr. HARRIS. The Senator from Florida yields to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. CALL. Yes, I yield.

Mr. CULLOM submitted the following report:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 1856) to establish a life-saving station on the Atlantic coast between Indian River Inlet, Delaware, and Ocean City, Md., having met, after full and free conference have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its amendment.

JNO. P. JONES,
WM. P. FRYE,
Managers on the part of the Senate.

TH. H. BAYLY BROWNE,
T. E. TARSNEY,
Managers on the part of the House.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The report requires no action on the part of the Senate.

BRIGHTWOOD RAILWAY COMPANY.

Mr. HARRIS. The Senator from Florida kindly consents to yield to me that I may submit a conference report.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The report will be received.

Mr. HARRIS submitted the following report:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 2742) to incorporate the Brightwood Railway Company of the District of Columbia, having met, after full and free conference have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment numbered 1, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: After the words "single or," in line 8, insert "with the approval of the commissioners of the District, a;" so as to read: "And by that name may sue and be sued, implead and be impleaded, with authority to construct and lay down a single or, with the approval of the commissioners of the District, a double track, etc."

That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House numbered 2, inserting, after the word "cents," in line 12, page 2, the words "*Provided*, If electric wires or cables are used, the same shall be placed underground;" and agree to the same.

That the Senate insist on its disagreement to the amendment of the House numbered 3, and the House recede from the same, the amendment being to insert, after the word "jurisdiction," in line 7, page 6, the words "*Provided*, That the full amount of the capital stock subscribed shall be paid in full in cash before said company shall operate the said road."

That the House recede from its amendment numbered 4, inserting, after the word "construction," in line 16, page 9, the words "*Provided*, That it shall exercise no powers not herein expressly granted."

ISHAM G. HARRIS,
C. B. FARWELL,
JOHN C. SPOONER,
Conferees on the part of the Senate.

BARNES COMPTON,
JOHN T. HEARD,
M. S. BREWER,
Conferees on the part of the House of Representatives.

ADDITIONAL REPORTS OF COMMITTEES.

Mr. SAWYER. I ask the Senator from Florida to yield to me that I may make a report from the Committee on Pensions.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The report will be received if there be no objection.

Mr. SAWYER, from the Committee on Pensions, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 2499) increasing the pension of Miss Sarah Mary Carroll, reported it without amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

Mr. VEST, from the Committee on Commerce, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 11139) to authorize the building of a bridge or bridges across the Mississippi River at La Crosse, Wis., reported it with amendments.

He also, from the same committee, to whom was referred the bill (S. 3606) to authorize the building of a bridge or bridges across the Mississippi River at La Crosse, Wis., reported adversely thereon, and the bill was postponed indefinitely.

Mr. HAMPTON, from the Committee on Military Affairs, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 2267) to pay Thompson McKinley $375 for service voucher issued to him during the late war by Capt. George W. Harrison, assistant quartermaster United States Army, submitted an adverse report thereon, which was agreed to; and the bill was postponed indefinitely.

BILLS INTRODUCED.

Mr. COCKRELL introduced a bill (S. 3615) for the relief of the St. Louis and Mississippi Valley Transportation Company; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. COCKRELL. I present the petition of the president, Henry C. Haarstick, of that company, and ask that it be received and referred to the Committee on Claims to accompany the bill.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The petition will be received and referred to the Committee on Claims.

FORT BROOKE MILITARY RESERVATION.

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 3340) for the donation of Fort Brooke military reservation at Tampa, Fla., for free schools and other purposes, the pending question being on the amendment proposed by Mr. CALL.

Mr. CALL. Mr. President, I hope the Senator from Vermont [Mr. EDMUNDS] will withdraw his opposition to this amendment. I had counted with some degree of certainty upon those Senators who had been in favor of the appropriation of the public lands in large quantities for the cause of education, and expected that they would support this amendment to the bill. The circumstances of the case are precisely those of the Fort Smith reservation in Arkansas. I am somewhat astonished that the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. BERRY] should make an objection to the amendment. The quantity of public lands that the State of Florida has received has nothing to do with the matter.

If it is possible, I shall be in favor of reclaiming every acre of the public lands that any State has unlawfully obtained, giving them, as the law has given them, to the settler and not respecting any decisions of the Department which, in violation of law, have given away the lands which were donated to the people for homesteads. In all cases any disposition of the public land by the Interior Department to any other purpose than as homes for the people has been unlawful and is absolutely void. The law has been notice to every one, and no executive officer could by any act not authorized by law give any kind of a right or title to it any more than I could give a title to any one of this Capitol by executing a deed purporting to convey it. We all know that this is the law, and we know but for the poverty of the people and their inability to pay the expenses of a lawsuit it would be so decided without any further legislation.

Therefore it is no objection, so far as I am concerned, that the State of Florida or any other State has obtained in violation of law public lands which should belong to the people for homestead settlement and given them to corporations. Wherever the law has been violated I am in favor of the lands being reclaimed and restored to the people. Unless we follow this rule, we shall find some day that the Capitol has been given away by the Interior Department, and no doubt some kind of law will be claimed to justify it.

But, Mr. President, I shall not delay the Senate further. There is no better use that could be made of the proceeds of this reservation than to educate the people who are local to the place; that is, of the city, county, or district. If there be a reservation at Leavenworth or in Oregon or anywhere else in the United States, not too large in proportions, my vote shall always be given for the appropriation of that reservation and its proceeds to the benefit of the people in that locality; that is, for education and public buildings. I should be very willing to vote such proceeds for the benefit of the cause of education in the State of Vermont if the Senator from Vermont should want it done.

I see nothing in the proposition that the locality may not be benefited by the proceeds of the sale of the land in proper and reasonable quantities applied to the education of the people there. The question of what the State of Florida has received, or rather what individuals or corporations have received in the name of the State, has nothing to do with it. I am looking to the interest of the people of Tampa and South Florida, and to the education of the boys and girls in all useful knowledge.

There are many reasons why this should be done. The agricultural school fund of the State of Florida was in a large measure destroyed by the mismanagement of certain individuals; and I shall not make any partisan or political allusion here. The people there are now paying out of their labor for that misappropriation.

As respects this little piece of land at Tampa, it has been made valuable altogether by the settlement and residence of the people there, and it would furnish a fund that would largely advance the educational interest and the interest of industrial education, which I particularly regard more than all other education.

The interest upon this little fund which the amendment provides would be used not as the Senator from Arkansas says, without limitation, but subject to the direction of the Secretary of the Interior, and it would do a great benefit, more than the money could do under any other possible circumstances.

Mr. BLAIR. Mr. President, I was the member of the Committee on Public Lands alluded to as having favored the substance of this amendment in the committee. I favored the appropriation of the proceeds of this piece of land to the support of the common schools of the city of Tampa. It seemed to me that the appropriation of this money to an industrial school at that place would be somewhat experimental in its nature. The industrial school system is now being established at suitable and favorable points in the older and more generally settled and wealthier portions of the country; and it seemed to me that at that point was hardly to be found a good place to make the experiment. But the appropriation of the money for the support of the common

schools of that city would be sure to be a judicious appropriation, it seemed to me, if the common schools are worthy of support anywhere. There is a great necessity for an increased efficiency on the part of the schools at that place, and they are without the money, whether they ought to be or ought not to be, and they are likely to remain so.

I do not suppose there is a place in the State of Florida or in any State where an efficient system of common schools is more to be desired or of more imperative need of aid coming from abroad to establish and sustain the system than in Tampa or in the vicinity of Tampa.

As the value of this land is not the work of the United States, whose Treasury would be benefited if we pass the slight amount to be received for it into the Treasury, but the result of the settlement, the industry, the exertion of the community where the soil is, it seems to me that what it sells for ought to go to the people who have given it value. They found that a wilderness, or worse than a wilderness. They have given this land value by the improvements with which they have surrounded it. The United States has no longer use for the land, and is to dispose of it in some way. If it sells for $50,000 instead of 50 cents at the present time, it is not by reason of what the United States has done, but by reason of what that community has done to give that land larger value, a salable value, when it is no longer needed for Government uses.

In that view it seemed to me that the precedent established in the Fort Smith case ought to be applied in this instance. That matter came up on the application of the predecessor, I think the direct predecessor of the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. BERRY], involving the appropriation of proceeds from the military reservation at Fort Smith for the common schools of that city, and it met with universal favor in the Senate. It met with the favor of the Senator from Vermont. I am confident that the Senator from Vermont voted for or favored that appropriation, and so did Senators generally. I do not remember that there was scarcely any division or opposition on the final vote to the passage of that bill, and the reasons were precisely the same as in this instance.

A city had been established at Fort Smith. The land had been made valuable by the work of the community surrounding it. They needed the money. And when the Government no longer needed the land for military or other uses, it was sold, and the proceeds appropriated to the benefit of the common-school system of that city with very favorable results. I think the Senator from Arkansas will testify, as other prominent citizens of that State have said to me, that the schools of Fort Smith have received a very great impetus from the appropriation of the proceeds of that military reservation.

Tampa is a needy point. It is the extreme south of the country. Good schools there will clean up the city and help to cure the yellow fever, and help to fill that part of the country with the sort of population that will have the intellectual and physical vigor to retain such a knowledge of sanitary and other conditions as will enable them to make their peninsula a healthy locality, and it will be for the common defense, to put intelligence into the southern part of the State of Florida to a greater extent than it now exists. The masses of the people there need the school; they need it for a thousand reasons, and we need that they should have it.

If the Senator from Florida would be willing to modify his amendment so that this money, if the Senate should see fit to appropriate it, might go to the general good, instead of testing an experiment which in any event would only reach a portion of the people, I should be very glad indeed to support his amendment, and I should hope that the Senate would do the same, as they have done formerly.

Mr. BERRY. Mr. President, I was not a member of the Senate at the time the bill passed granting the Fort Smith reservation to the city of Fort Smith for the benefit of common schools, as stated by the Senator from New Hampshire. I stated before the committee, and I state here, that the reservation was sold in the most fortunate way, so as to yield a large amount of money. I say furthermore, as I stated there, that the effect has been to give an impetus to common schools at Fort Smith that they did not have before. It has builded up a fine school system in the city of Fort Smith.

That the citizens of the city of Fort Smith were very much in favor of that bill there can be no question. It has been a matter that has been discussed since that time in the State. A great deal of opposition was developed outside, in Sebastian County, some claiming that the money should have gone to the entire school district of the locality, or the township; others that it should have gone to the county; others to the Congressional district, or to the State.

The objection urged to this character of appropriations is that it is land which belongs to the entire people, that it is taken and given to the citizens of a particular locality, thereby making others contribute to the education of children in that particular locality when they receive none of the benefits of it. But, as I said, I do not care to discuss that point, because the Fort Smith matter was determined before I came here and is a matter with which I had nothing to do. But if this reservation is to be given to the city of Tampa then every other reservation that has been turned over as a part of the public domain should be given to the city or town nearest to which it is located.

Mr. BLAIR. May I ask the Senator a question?

Mr. BERRY. Certainly.

Mr. BLAIR. What is the objection to doing that? We have military reservations. They will not amount to much. The money will go to the community that by its personal work has made the land valuable. Can there be any objection to it?

Mr. BERRY. I will state to the Senator that the objection I have to it is the same objection I have to every other species of class legislation, which takes part of that which belongs to the whole people to be used for the benefit of a specified few as against the many. That is the objection I have to it.

Mr. BLAIR. May I ask the Senator another question?

Mr. BERRY. Certainly.

Mr. BLAIR. Are we not doing that every day, taking the money that belongs to the whole people to erect public buildings in this, that, and the other locality, which are no sort of accommodation to one out of twenty of the population of the entire country? Who of the rural population ever has anything of the benefits of any of the numerous public buildings we are erecting, except in the indirect, emotional, fanciful, mental influence that they may exert by being visible to the eye once in a year, being visited on great occasions, it may be because of art or cultivation and the training of the taste? Who gets any real benefit from scarcely any of the individual appropriations that we are making for public buildings or for the improvement of our rivers and harbors, except in this indirect way? Is it not the fact, if you make Fort Smith a large, flourishing, and intelligent city, a center of intellectual life and moral influence, and if you make Tampa the same, in the ultimate result, you are accomplishing as much for the country at large as you could do by putting the money into the Treasury and expending it for other and far less worthy purposes?

Mr. BERRY. The Senator from New Hampshire asks if we are not every day legislating for classes. I answer him that, unfortunately, I think we are, but the instances that he gives are not the ones that I would give. In regard to the public buildings, they are buildings of the Government; they are owned by the Government; they are located at those places where they will most benefit the Government. They are not given to the town; they are not intended to be built for the town especially; but they are built for the accommodation of the courts, the custom-houses, and the post-offices, which belong to the Government. The illustration is not in point in any way that I can see.

Mr. BLAIR. May I ask the Senator a question? What are the post-offices in the various communities but for the benefit of those communities? Is the United States Government anything but a great intangible entity that uses no post-office at all? Is it not the people who use all these things?

Mr. BERRY. I do not propose this evening to go into a discussion of the general question suggested by the interrogatory of the Senator from New Hampshire. I will state, however, that the class legislation I had in my mind is that which the Senator has supported here on various occasions, for instance, taking generals in the Army who resigned and engaged in civil life and failed to succeed at that, and placing them upon the retired-list now for the sole purpose of allowing them to draw money from the Treasury of the United States.

Mr. BLAIR rose.

Mr. BERRY. Wait a minute. If the Senator is going to place men of that character on the retired-list, the private soldiers throughout the country ought to have an equal chance. That is what I call class legislation, and that is what I alluded to.

Mr. BLAIR. Mr. President——

Mr. BERRY. I do not propose to discuss that matter, and I do not wish to be interrupted right now either.

Mr. BLAIR. Does the Senator decline to be interrupted?

Mr. BERRY. Now.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The Senator from Arkansas declines to yield.

Mr. BLAIR. I was simply going to suggest whether the pension-list is not of the same kind.

Mr. BERRY. It does not seem to matter much to the Senator from New Hampshire whether I decline to yield or do not, so far as making a speech is concerned.

Mr. BLAIR. It does not injure the Senator's speech.

Mr. BERRY. As I stated in the beginning, I think that the gift of money to Fort Smith is a precedent for the giving of it to Tampa. For that reason and because it was within my own State I made no special objection to it, provided the money went to the common schools; but I was very much opposed to it in the loose way in which it was suggested by the Senator from Florida.

I stated the objections which were specially urged by the chairman of the Committee on Public Lands, and I confess, since the Senator from New Hampshire has pressed me, those objections have great weight with me. The objection was that this Government property, which belonged to the people of the entire country, should be taken and sold and the money appropriated for the particular benefit of the school children who happen to live within the limits of that city, while the children of the poor men who live just beyond that limit get no benefit from it, and yet those children have the same interest in the matter as the children who live in the city of Tampa.

In addition to that there is the fact that there are other reservations all over the country, and this would serve as a precedent, and very soon throughout the United States where there is a reservation located the people of that community would come and ask Congress to give them the proceeds of the reservation, and thereby build up the schools of the town, leaving the children who live outside of those places unprovided for.

These are my objections to the amendment, and they are the objections urged by the committee. The committee in addition to that thought they were dealing liberally with Tampa. They gave in the bill over 25 acres for a park. They agreed to sell the land on long credit, giving every man an opportunity to bid at the sale. They adopted every suggestion that was made, I believe, by the Senator from Florida save and except in regard to the proceeds. I believe it is a precedent that ought not to be followed, and that the Government property and the Government money should be used for the good of the whole people of the country, and not for select individuals to be selected by the Member of Congress or the Senator who introduces the bill.

Mr. BLAIR. Unless this money can be reasonably concentrated, its dissipation will be as useless as the mist. For that reason, if it is to be appropriated at all, I think it should go to the city of Tampa, the support of whose schools will absorb the whole of it if they be made reasonably efficient. It will be impossible to distribute the interest upon this money as it accrues from year to year throughout the county or throughout the State, for its effect would be inappreciable.

With reference to class legislation, the Senator's case is hardly opportune so far as regards myself personally. Though I would be in favor of placing such men as General Frémont upon the retired-list, and while in very exceptional cases where very great public service has been rendered by a military officer who had failed to preserve his connection with the roster, I might be induced to place him on the retired-list, I have no recollection of having done so at any time except in the case of General Frémont, when, no doubt, I was justified in so doing.

I said nothing of class legislation. If there is any legislation whatever that is not class legislation, it is that which goes for the support and maintenance of a school system in which and by which every child of the United States born, as all children are, illiterate, can be qualified for the proper discharge of the duties of citizenship. The instances the Senator seems to have in his mind are certainly very far-fetched. They do not apply to the appropriations for the support of common schools.

As I said before, the people there seem to need these common schools. They need just such a light set on the shore, just such a beacon light at Tampa as this money would help to establish. It would be of infinitely more use to the American people than any other conceivable appropriation that could be made here, it seems to me.

As I said before, this particular community, having given all of the value there is to this particular land, it does seem to me like a species of robbery (which we have a right to do because we have the power and can enact the law) to take it from that locality and pour it into the general Treasury and appropriate it in a way that the community which made the value will get next to nothing from it.

I hope the Senator from Florida will modify his amendment. I understand the Senator from Arkansas is not especially opposed to the amendment in the form I suggest.

Mr. CALL. I will very cheerfully modify my amendment, if the Senator from New Hampshire desires it. I only wish to say one word in regard to it, and I intend to say but one.

I wish to say that the people of Tampa are, many of them, the most excellent people in the United States. They are gathered from all parts of the country. They are a very enterprising people, and they have progressed in every way and have developed a large and beautiful city there.

There is also the class of people there of whom I have spoken, men who came into the country from Cuba and the West Indies, engaged in all kinds of occupations, largely devoted to gaining a living from the waters of the ocean, from sponges, coral, fish, and oysters.

Those people have had very little opportunity for education; their time is occupied with severe labor, and they are a poor class of people. In addition to that there are the roaming Indians.

There being separate schools, which is an indispensable thing in that community, between the white and colored races, I am willing for every child everywhere in the State to go there who is willing to go. Of course there will be very few from outside, and none but the local people will attend; but it will do away with the idea of the Senator from Arkansas about class legislation.

I only wish to say that if the Senator from Arkansas is consistent he will never give a vote in this body of any kind whatever, for he will never vote for anything that will embrace every man, woman, and child in the United States. There can not be such an appropriation made except in its incidental effects, and all this idea of class legislation as applied to this kind of an appropriation is utterly unfounded in reason.

The general benefits of all legislation are those which embrace in some of their consequences, direct or indirect, the whole country and all the people in it. That is the only definition you can give it. There never was and there never will be a law passed which embraces every person and affects each one exactly in the same way. The education of each boy and girl in Tampa in some respects benefits all the people of the United States.

If the Senate is willing to pass this amendment in any form for the common schools, as much as I prefer industrial education, believing, as I said, that it is the only education that is advantageous to the great mass of the people, and with which all education will come, I shall gladly accept the modification proposed by the Senator from New Hampshire and agree to any amendment he or any Senator may suggest to carry out that object.

Mr. DOLPH. Mr. President, I am opposed to this amendment. This matter was fully discussed in the Committee on Public Lands, and the committee determined to report the bill without the amendment desired by the Senator from Florida. I believe there are about 37,000,000 acres of land in the State of Florida. Of this quantity over 20,000,000 acres have been selected by the State and claimed by the State as granted to it by the act of 1850, known as the swamp-land grant. Something over 15,000,000 acres, or nearly half the area of the State have been patented to the State as swamp land. Considerable grants of land have been made to the State in addition to aid in the construction of railroads.

Mr. CALL. Will the Senator allow me to interrupt him?

Mr. DOLPH. Certainly.

Mr. CALL. I ask the Senator if I have not been urging him and the Committee on Public Lands to reclaim every acre of that land which was improperly selected, and if I have not asked that a special committee be appointed for the purpose of examining that very subject?

Mr. DOLPH. I was not speaking of what was improperly selected. The Senator from Florida has been urging some impracticable thing. The Committee on Public Lands has had his resolution before it and has made a report which is in print. Any Senator can obtain full information in regard to the condition of the swamp lands in Florida from that report.

I repeat what I have said before, that out of 37,000,000 acres over 20,000,000 acres have been selected and claimed by the State of Florida as swamp land under the act of 1850, and over 15,000,000 acres have been patented to that State. In addition to that there have been considerable quantities of land granted to the State to aid in the construction of railroads. I understand the State of Florida has also received in addition every sixteenth section of public land in each township for public schools, and other grants, for an agricultural college and for university purposes, have been made.

Mr. EDMUNDS. And her share of the proceeds of the sales of all the public lands within her limits.

Mr. DOLPH. And her share of the proceeds of the sales of public lands, in the division that was made by Congress, I think, in 1841—probably in 1841 and 1843. This would appear to be a pretty good showing for the State of Florida in regard to the public lands.

I wholly disagree with the Senator from New Hampshire in his proposition that the lands reserved for this military reservation were made valuable by the acts of the citizens of Florida. I think very likely the land adjacent to this reservation and even the town of Tampa was largely built up by the fact that this was a military reservation and was occupied by the United States forces which had to be supplied at that point; and I know of no reason why, after there has been a reservation of public lands belonging to the United States, and they have been improved by lapse of time and by the general improvement of the country, the Government should not have the benefit of the improved value of the lands. Therefore I see no special or particular claim of the town of Tampa to the proceeds of these lands.

Again, I agree with the Senator from Arkansas, that if we establish precedents of this kind, they must be followed, and every town will claim the proceeds of the sale of the reservation which has been located near it whenever it is offered for sale.

Besides, after the matter has been fully investigated by a committee of the Senate and, as the Senator from New Hampshire knows, carefully and thoroughly, and the committee has made a report, I think that report ought to be acted upon and adopted by the Senate. I hope the amendment will not prevail.

Mr. BLAIR. Mr. President, I never was a believer in the sanctity of committee reports. A committee report is entitled to that consideration in open Senate to which the reasons on which it is based may be entitled; and if this report of the Committee on Public Lands is sustained by the better reason the report should be sustained. I do not think the Senator from Oregon probably means to claim for it any greater degree of sanctity than that which I have indicated.

Mr. DOLPH. The Senator from New Hampshire will permit me——

Mr. BLAIR. We are now acting as a Committee of the Whole and not the Committee on Public Lands, and I suppose the work of the Committee of the Whole should be as free from embarrassment as possible and that we should consider nothing but the reasons bearing upon the merits of the case. To be sure, the opinion of the Committee on

Public Lands is entitled to consideration, and the opinion of the majority of the committee was against the appropriation of this money to an industrial school. That was the decision of the committee.

In regard to the Senator's reply to the suggestion I made that the value of this land is owing to the exertion of the war power by the Government, I have to say that he gets the vehicle before the horse. The Government is the creature of the people; the war power is the creature of the people; and the war power was exerted in Florida because there was a people in Florida, the people of the United States, a portion of them, were there, and they were entitled to have the war power exerted in their defense. The people of the United States as a unity acquired that territory and the people as a whole defended that territory, as they have every inch of our frontier and a great deal of our interior, indeed all of our interior from time to time as it was our frontier.

So now these people in Tampa, the portion of the American people settled in Tampa and who conquered the difficulties of nature and made that soil, that locality prosperous and productive and a suitable home for a portion of this nation as a peaceful people and not as a portion of the war power, are entitled to the pecuniary value which they have given to the soil whereon they live. And now that the United States has no longer as a whole nation to discharge that portion of its duty in the exertion of the war power at that particular locality, needs it no longer, it belongs to the people of that locality, and the cultivation which surrounds this particular tract, being the work of the local community, it is only by reason of what they have done that it is longer desirable at all or has any salable value. It is now desirable for places of residences and in small tracts for building lots. Would it be so but for this city, which these people have established and built up there? Certainly not. Therefore it is, I submit, that unless the war powers of the Government are to be looked upon as the creators rather than the instrumentalities of the nation, the value was given to this particular locality by the people and not by the exertion of the war power under the Constitution.

Now, when this tract comes to be sold and we need it no longer for the purposes of war, and it comes to be appropriated for the purposes of peace and sold by the Government, I think that the community which has given the land value ought to have the value to themselves.

Mr. DOLPH. Mr. President, the same argument advanced by the Senator from New Hampshire in regard to the military reservation near the town of Tampa could be applied in the case of the removal of the capital of the United States to St. Louis or Chicago or San Francisco, and the Government reservations and lots upon which the public buildings stand in the city of Washington should be no longer needed for Government purposes and were to be disposed of by sale by the Government. It seems to me with just as much force the Senator could contend that the value of this property had been given to it by the people of the city of Washington, and therefore all the proceeds of the property should go to the support of schools or for some other public purpose in the city of Washington.

I think the fallacy of that sort of argument will be apparent at once. This city has become what it is, not so much by the efforts of the inhabitants of the city as from the fact that the capital of the United States is here, and that the United States has expended millions of money in erecting public buildings, and in opening streets, and in beautifying the streets, and in the payment of the employés of the Government located here, which money is expended in the community and which has built up the city. I say that upon the same principle undoubtedly the military reservation near the town of Tampa, if there were troops stationed there year after year, officers and men, who had to depend upon the surrounding country for subsistence, the very fact that they were stationed there tended to build up the town of Tampa and make the property of the citizens valuable, and it is not the action of the citizens that has made the military reservation valuable.

I do not see force in the expression of the Senator from New Hampshire to the effect that the citizens of the town of Tampa have either any legal or equitable interest in this property. It is a strange argument to me that people can acquire an interest in property the title of which they do not own simply by the improvement of their own property. I can not understand what either the legal or equitable claim of the people of Tampa is to this property. I think, as was said by the Senator from Arkansas, it is the property of all the people, and no such special showing has been made in regard to the wants of the community there as to justify the diversion of the proceeds of this land, which belong to the Government, from the Treasury of the United States to their benefit.

If it was a case where there were some special wants to be supplied, which it was proper for the General Government to supply, then that would be another question and the propriety of the appropriation would depend entirely on the propriety of supplying that want of the people of Tampa. But when the Senator undertakes to show that there is some sort of claim on the part of the people of Tampa to the proceeds of this property, it seems to me that his argument, if it is worth anything, would go to the extent of showing that the people of Washington would have an equitable right to the proceeds of all the public property in this city should the capital at any time be transferred or removed and the property sold.

Mr. BLAIR. Mr. President, I will put this question to the Senator from Oregon: Suppose there were not a human being living in the city of Tampa, it was just as necessary that there should have been this military occupation at that point on our coast as now, or as at any previous time whatever. That was a point which it was necessary to occupy for the general defense of the United States as well as the people who might settle in that particular locality. The Senator will not dispute that. In a general sense that is true at least.

Now, suppose that no human being lived there and there is no longer occasion for this military occupation and the United States should offer the land for sale, what would they get for it? It would not sell for 50 cents an acre. Its value is entirely owing to the fact that human beings, a portion of this nation, who with the rest of the United States were entitled to defense at that point because it was an accessible point on our coast where an invading enemy might land and so endanger the whole country—but for the fact, I say, that those people went there and established homes, this land would not be worth anything, would not be worth the time we are spending over it in debate, as the Senator well knows; and if when we withdraw our forces and the forts are dismantled we offer it for sale we get nothing for it, but on the contrary, offering it for sale, as we do now, it being no longer necessary for the general defense to occupy it, it sells for fifty or one hundred thousand dollars, it is not so much what that local community have done, but the fact that they are there and will remain there that gives value to that soil.

I am not talking about—and it is not the proposition before the Senate—disposing of the barracks and personal property that may be on this reservation for the benefit of the people there. There would be some little ground for the Senator's argument, though not much, then; but it is the soil, it is the reservation of land that we are talking about, something that the Government can not carry away. No purchaser can be found for it unless the soil be inhabitable, and it is valuable just in proportion as it is desirable as a place of habitation, and the people there have made it that and given it all of its value. I insist that my argument is a sound one.

Now, take the Senator's illustration as to the city of Washington. To be sure, the Government has given some value, great value, to the city of Washington. People have come here and have settled in consequence of the advantages which the Government has given to this locality. If it should be necessary for the general good to take these public buildings away and establish the capital elsewhere, I admit that the Government would have a right and ought to dispose of these public buildings to the best advantage it could; but could it sell them for anything unless it could remove them? Could it sell these buildings for anything unless somebody lived here or it could be made a good place of habitation? These public buildings are wholly inappropriate for any private use.

The result would be that, if the Government should change from the occupation of its property here, now so valuable, it would be the loser of its substantial value and could not sell it at all, while down at Tampa that piece of land which has been occupied for military purposes can be sold for a large amount of money that can be put into the Treasury. It could sell the soil where the Capitol and the other public buildings stand for something, but it could sell this soil for nothing unless by reason of the fact that somebody would remain and live here.

Everybody would be damaged, of course. The surrounding community by an act of that kind would be robbed of three-fourths of its property undoubtedly, by the fact that the Government chose to get up and locate itself somewhere else. They would suffer largely and the Government would be a total loser of everything, unless some portion of the American people chose to remain here and give value to the locality which we should abandon by reason of its being made appropriate for private and personal use.

So I insist upon it that it is not the Government that does this business for the country, which gives value to these things. The Government exercises its function for only general purposes. The war power is exerted for the general good, and it is specifically put forth where the enemy is likely to be found; but it is put forth not for the special defense of that people, though they are included, of course, in the people at large, but for the defense of the whole country; and when, as down there, we no longer need to meet an enemy at that point and the land is to be given to a private corporation, and we are dependent upon private purchasers for whatever we get for it, I say the people who are there and who have given it its purchasable value are entitled to the proceeds for their own use. We have a right to direct it to a public purpose which may be for the general benefit, as in the case of common schools, or at least we may undertake to exercise that right.

And so generally wherever the local community gives all the value that there is to property which the Government is abandoning—I mean property which can not be removed, like real estate—I say there is an equitable claim that in that locality, for such general public uses as may be needed, we should give them the benefit of the proceeds if there be need, especially as in this case. Surely you can imagine no stronger

case than this. We ought to give this money to Tampa whether there is any public reservation there or not.

Mr. DOLPH. Why?

Mr. BLAIR. Because they need it. On the same principle we passed the common-school bill, and divided the fund it appropriated where the illiteracy is prevalent, in proportion to illiteracy. Did the Senator vote for the school bill? I remember that he did so.

Mr. DOLPH. I did, but I did not vote for a bill for the benefit of one single town or one single community.

Mr. BLAIR. But you voted for the benefit of every town where illiteracy prevailed, and gave in proportion to the prevalence of illiteracy. I do not know any way that the people of Tampa can go to work and recover this money. I do not know any way that anybody can get money out of the Treasury but by act of Congress, unless he has the physical force to do it.

But it seems to me there is no argument which has been offered here, which is not very easily exploded, why this money should not be given to the people of Tampa under the circumstances of this case. They need it. Put it upon the ground of an act of benevolence and charity, and why should they not have it? What location in the United States is so needy as the southern extremity of Florida? Consider the class of population that is there. But few of the more intelligent people of the country are located there. You find descendants of Indians, half-breeds, and foreigners, and all of them educated in the general principles of yellow fever rather than of ordinary intelligence and of the capacity of American citizenship; and if we can put a common school there by expending $50,000 or $100,000 we are doing a great thing for the United States at large.

I wish the Senator from Florida would modify his amendment. I do not propose to go into that part of the question. I will vote for it; but if he would say "common school" instead of "industrial school" I should prefer it.

Mr. CALL. Mr. President, I shall feel under the necessity, after the suggestion of Senators, in order to pass the bill, to withdraw the amendment I offered. Before doing so, however, I desire to say just a word.

The people of Tampa are not such as my friend from New Hampshire, with the best motives, has described them. There are not many half-breeds there or any kind of mixture of races. They are a very enterprising and very intelligent and very moral and industrious people, perhaps equal to any to be found anywhere in the world; but there is a considerable mixture of Cubans there and of men who have followed the sea for a living, and they have but small accumulations. Therefore it would be very desirable that the public-school education, either common-school or industrial, should be largely aided.

I understand the Senator from Oregon to oppose this amendment on the principle that he will vote against all bills to appropriate the reservations in Oregon for the benefit of the people of Oregon in those particular localities where they may be found, and as this is a matter of principle, I withdraw the amendment and ask for a vote on the bill.

["Vote!" "Vote!"]

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill for the disposition of Fort Brooke military reservation at Tampa, Fla., and for other purposes."

THE LOUISIANA ELECTION.

Mr. CHANDLER. I move to proceed to the consideration of the resolution to investigate the Louisiana election.

The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The question recurs on agreeing to the resolution.

Mr. EUSTIS. I call for the yeas and nays on the passage of the resolution.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. BLAIR. Mr. President, at the close of the debate the other day I desired to say a few words upon this resolution, but failing the opportunity, I will briefly state now what I desired then to submit.

The resolution is one for investigation and against which, it seems to me, no Senator can well cast his vote. The one great function certainly of legislative power is to investigate, and to limit the power of investigation or to pursue a policy which limits that power or looks to its limitation, even where there be no certainty of the discovery of important matter, is to pursue a policy which will be likely to result in imperfect, ill-founded action, or the neglect of legislative duty; and for that reason, if for no other, I should support the resolution as I would a resolution to investigate grave charges of this or any other kind against the Commonwealth or conduct of citizenship in the Commonwealth where I reside. On former occasions the Democracy of the Senate have not hesitated to support like resolutions. I remember serving upon a committee when I first had the honor to become a member of the Senate which made like inquiries and investigations in the States of Pennsylvania, New York, Massachusetts, and Rhode Island, and possibly in other of the Northern States; and the charges against the conduct of citizens in those States were of as grave a character as those embraced in the present resolution.

The development of the existence of public evils must certainly be encouraged, for nothing is gained by their suppression. The evil is not lessened by its invisibility. It becomes greater if it remains unexposed within the system, poisoning the blood of the body-politic, and inevitably a catastrophe comes sooner or later, and all the sooner from the failure to investigate, to expose, and so open the way to remedy, to cure.

I anticipate as a result of this investigation, should it be ordered, that substantially everything that is alleged in the resolution of inquiry will be proven. Like investigations on former occasions have had that result, and I have little doubt that it is the general conviction of the country that most of these things asserted have come to be the existing status of several of the States of the United States, or a status has come to be out of which things of this kind inevitably grow, and therefore it is that as the results of these investigations there has come to be comparatively so little demonstration of popular interest.

It seems to be understood that here is this great trouble which should be remedied; but after we discover the disease we do not know how to cure it. Nothing has as yet been done except in so far as the forces of popular general opinion of mankind at large can affect to change or modify the conditions in which our friends in the South have found themselves involved.

I desire, the investigation being made, that the primary object should be to find the remedy, and have therefore for some time, against the patience of the Senate it may be, but I think not against the patience of the American people, certainly not against a great public necessity, urged that we pursue a course of legislation which is substantially and affirmatively remedial in its nature; and there is no way, in my opinion, in which we can reach this Southern difficulty so as to give a permanent cure, and there is no way in which we can prevent the like difficulties coming to every State of this Union but by making it an indestructible principle of action on the part of the nation at large that every human being born on our soil shall either by the parent or by the State or by the nation become fully qualified for the discharge of the duties of American citizenship, to which end the common education of the people is the first step.

And so it is that bearing upon this resolution and with something of the feeling that the old Roman senator is said to have had when he closed what little he had to say on any occasion, and I presume commenced also, with the asseveration that Carthage must be destroyed, I insist upon it that illiteracy in this country must be destroyed; and upon this resolution I have just a word to say in that direction, especially appropriate to the State of Louisiana.

It has been demonstrated by the proceedings and records relating to the very election which is proposed to be investigated that the illiteracy and consequent incompetency of the voting population of that great State is upon the increase. It is now greater than it was in the year 1880. The illiteracy of the white voters is in a rapid state of increase in the State of Louisiana. This is not an evil which is confined to the negro population; it is not an evil which is increasing only with the negro population; but it is increasing with the whole voting population of the State of Louisiana. As long as this condition of things exists and becomes deeper and denser, and larger and higher, and more and more formidable, the evils of which we complain in that State, and which are not absent in other States, will be upon the increase also; and to investigate without a view to the application of some remedy—and this is the only remedy that seems to be within our reach—is the idlest thing in the world.

My colleague has done well to introduce this resolution; but if, as a result of the investigation, nothing should be done save only the development of a difficulty, it will be time wasted and the efforts of the nation thrown away.

Now, Mr. President, I proceed to the establishment of the fact which I have alleged in reference to the condition of intelligence among the voting population of the State of Louisiana.

I will state that I myself wrote to the secretary of state of Louisiana some little time since, and have from him a communication establishing all that I have asserted; and I shall be glad, if I have not mislaid the figures which he gave me, to present them. But his communication showed this in substance, that the increase of illiteracy among the white voters of that State, was some 7 per cent. since the year 1880. The per cent. was larger of the colored voting population.

Still more recently, I wrote to the editor of the New Orleans Times-Democrat, a good paper, a strong and influential paper, Democratic, of course, politically, but a paper of character and position, not inferior, probably, to any other in the country in the regards of which I now speak, and I received in return this communication:

THE TIMES-DEMOCRAT, 58 CAMP STREET,
New Orleans, July 13, 1888.

DEAR SIR: Your letter of July 10th to the editors of The Times-Democrat, of whom I am one, was handed me to-day. The article to which you allude, on "the increase of illiteracy in Louisiana," was not published in the The Times-Democrat, but originally in the New York Sun, of which paper I am correspondent here. I wrote the article and sent it to the Sun early in May, but unfortunately—

And I hope some one will find that article, for it is a very telling article—

but unfortunately gave away the only copy of the paper containing it. I inclose, however, some statistics from it which I have saved. They are official,

from the reports of the several supervisors of registration, made to the late secretary of state, Mr. Oscar Arroyo, and are, of course, beyond question. I will be glad to furnish you more data on the subject, if you wish it, showing the steady increase in illiteracy in certain of the parishes (counties), and the fact that in many of them this illiteracy is not confined to the negroes, a large majority of the whites also being unable to read and write. I have interested myself greatly in education here, and have struggled to secure some improvement in our school facilities with but little success. I will, therefore, gladly co-operate with you and assist you in any way I can in this matter. The friends of education in the North can help us materially here by pointing out the condition of affairs shown by such statistics as I send you, as this may help to shame some of our people into making a better provision for public education.

There are a number of facts in regard to education in Louisiana that I would like to call your attention to if you think you can use them.

Yours, respectfully,

NORMAN WALKER.

Hon. H. W. BLAIR.

He incloses these statistics, and I will read them with some care and ask the attention of the Senate to their significance:

Illiteracy in Louisiana.

	White voters.		Colored voters.	
	Literate.	Illiterate.	Literate.	Illiterate.
1888*	99,945	23,986	23,010	102,942
1886†	89,856	20,464	16,570	91,987
1880‡	92,443	16,377	21,422	86,555

This shows an increase of illiterate white voters from 1880 to 1886 of 4,000 and over, and from 1886 to 1888 of 3,000 and over, nearly three and a half thousand, and the increase of illiteracy among colored voters from 1880 to 1886 is about 5,500, and from 1886 to 1888 there are about 11,000, from 91,987 to 102,942 during the last two years.

Now come the total voters of both colors consolidated and the percentages:

	Total voters.		Percentages.	
	Literate.	Illiterate.	Literate.	Illiterate.
1888*	122,955	126,938	49.2	50.8
1886†	106,426	112,452	48.7	51.3
1880‡	113,865	102,932	52.3	47.7

What I call special attention to is the increase in the percentage of illiteracy during this period of time. Illiteracy has increased; the intelligence of voters has decreased from 52.3 to 49.2 per cent.; the ignorance or illiteracy has increased from 47.7 to 50.8 per cent.

Then follow the percentages of white voters and colored voters, dealt with in separate columns.

Percentages.

	White voters.		Colored voters.	
	Literate.	Illiterate.	Literate.	Illiterate.
1888*	80.7	19.3	15.1	84.9
1886†	81.7	18.3	15.4	84.6
1880‡	84.9	15.1	18.0	82.0

As will be observed, there is a steady increase of illiteracy among the white voters, as shown by the percentages, and the literate colored vote has decreased from 18 per cent. down to 15 per cent. during the last eight years.

At the end of the statistics which I have just read Mr. Walker says:

Notice that in 1880 a majority of voters were literate. It has changed since. Notice also that in the new voters, or rather the increase in voters, there were added in eight years:

Whites who can read and write	7,502
Negroes who can read and write	1,588
Total literate	9,090
Whites unable to read, etc	7,609
Negroes unable to read, etc	16,387
Total illiterate	23,996

Of the new white voters a majority were illiterate; of the new negro voters ten out of eleven were illiterate.

Now, Mr. President, there is nothing so significant, so terrible that is developed in the existing data relating to the status of things in this country, as these figures bearing upon illiteracy; and the nation seems to be utterly stunned by their abundance and universal prevalence over vast portions of our country, geographically considered, and among vast masses of our population.

Mr. President, it is not a pleasant thing to be continually harping upon this subject of illiteracy. I am not anxious to do it, but I feel that it is a duty that I must perform.

This matter comes perhaps more naturally to my observation than that of many other Senators, and I feel bound to lay these figures before the Senate and before the country, and to insist upon it that our republican institutions are rapidly becoming neither more nor less than a humbug, and they may as well so be considered when the intelligence of the voter is eliminated from American citizenship. We know that elimination to be increasing everywhere, and the callousness of the public mind on the subject is increasing rather than decreasing. Unlike the continual dropping of water which ordinarily wears away the stone, it seems to me that the obduracy of the public conscience, of the public sensibility, is rather increasing than otherwise. This may continue for a time.

This country and its institutions may be perishing of dry-rot without our observation; but, all the same, the process is going on and the living members of this generation are not to retire to the last receptacle of all flesh, and sleep quietly in the soil of America, without seeing demonstrations of disorder, insurrection, turbulence, bloodshed, and destruction, of which hitherto we have not even dreamed, unless the American people pay attention to this subject and to the fact that the citizenship of this country is becoming incompetent to perform its functions.

I have nothing more to say, except to end as I began, with the asseveration that illiteracy must be destroyed or illiteracy will destroy the country.

THE REVENUE LAWS.

Mr. ALDRICH. I ask leave out of order to make a report.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The report will be received, if there be no objection.

Mr. ALDRICH. I present the report of the Committee on Finance upon the bill (H. R. 9051) to reduce taxation and simplify the laws in relation to the collection of the revenue.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The Senator from Rhode Island from the Committee on Finance submits a report to accompany House bill 9051, which will be printed.

Mr. ALDRICH. I ask that the report and the views of the minority, which will be presented by the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. HARRIS], may be printed in the RECORD, and I ask that an order be made that they may be printed in brevier type for the convenience of Senators.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. It will be so ordered if there be no objection. The Chair hears none.

Mr. HARRIS. I present the views of the minority of the Committee on Finance upon the same bill.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. They will be received and printed in the RECORD with the report of the committee in the type indicated by the Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. President, in behalf of the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BECK], who is absent on account of sickness, I present the paper which I send to the desk as his views, he being of the minority.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. They will be received and printed in the same way.

Mr. HARRIS. Printed in connection with the other reports?

The PRESIDETT *pro tempore*. In the RECORD?

Mr. HARRIS. In the RECORD and in document form.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. They will be printed in the RECORD and as a document in connection with the report of the majority and views of the minority of the committee.

Mr. HARRIS. The majority and minority reports and views of the minority of the minority.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. So the Chair understands.

Mr. ALDRICH, from the Committee on Finance, submitted the following report (to accompany bill H. R. 9051):

The Committee on Finance, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 9051) to reduce taxation and simplify the laws in relation to the collection of the revenue, respectfully report:

The demand for a careful and thorough revision of our revenue laws is imperative. This revision is necessary:

1. To reduce the national revenues, which are now excessive.

No valid reason can be given why we should, under existing circumstances, continue to collect annually a sum approximating $60,000,000 in excess of the amount required to administer the Government economically and to keep the pledges of public faith.

2. To protect honest importers and domestic producers from the disastrous consequences resulting from fraudulent undervaluations of imported merchandise on which ad valorem rates of duty are levied.

The alarming extent of this dishonest practice and its demoralizing and destructive effect upon public and private interests and the necessity for prompt adoption of remedial legislation have been repeatedly brought to the attention of Congress by successive Secretaries of the

* Report secretary of state. Full registration; State election.
† Report of secretary of state. Small registration; election only for members of Congress.
‡ United States census. Males over twenty-one.

Treasury. The enormous increase from year to year in the quantity of importations of manufactured and other articles of merchandise which are subject to ad valorem duties is largely attributable to this cause. Duties which are nominally protective to American industries, and which would be actually so if honestly collected, prove both delusive and destructive when, through defective laws and negligent or corrupt administration, but a fraction of the amounts lawfully due are levied and collected.

3. To remedy the defects, anomalies, and incongruities which have been from time to time discovered in the tariff schedules, or which have been created by erroneous decisions of the Treasury Department.

The interpretation given to the seventh section of the act of March 3, 1883, by which the cost of coverings and charges of all kinds is excluded from consideration in the assessment of dutiable values, has had the effect, without changing nominal rates, to reduce largely, but in an irregular and unequal manner, the amount of duties collected on imports.

4. To secure the proper readjustment and equalization of tariff rates rendered necessary by modified business conditions, improvements in methods of production, radical changes in prices, or by new elements or sources of competition.

5. To give relief and protection to many industries which are now suffering on account of the inadequate rates levied on competing products.

The public demand for a reduction of revenue is more urgent on account of the inexcusable retention in the national Treasury or on deposit in national banks of vast sums of money in excess of the amount required to pay the current demands upon the Treasury and to meet the maturing obligations of the Government. This sum, with the additions which will accrue within the next four months and before any legislative action reducing the revenues can be effective, will be sufficient to pay in full the outstanding 4½ per cent. bonds due in 1891, $221,000,000.

The existence of this immense surplus furnishes occasion for constant anxiety and apprehension of possible financial disaster. The failure to prevent this dangerous accumulation, inciting, as it does, extravagant expenditures, and constituting an ever-present menace to the prosperity and enterprise of all our people, can not be too severely condemned; but it is a failure for which the executive department of the Government is alone responsible.

This accumulation could and should have been profitably avoided, and the possibility of business disaster averted, by a prompt return of the money collected from the people to the channels of trade through the purchase of United States bonds that could at all times have been obtained for prices which, to the Government, would have been equal to an investment, of otherwise unprofitable funds, at a rate of interest of not less than 2 per cent. per annum.

It is probably true that the $60,000,000 deposited in national banks can not now be withdrawn without peril to the business interests of the respective communities where the banks are located, and that this sum must remain, for an indefinite period, a permanent loan to favored institutions without interest. This unfortunate situation, however, must have been foreseen when the deposits were made, and it should not be aggravated by further deposits, nor should it furnish an excuse for the failure to promptly dispose of the much larger sum remaining in the Treasury in the manner indicated.

To amend the provisions of law which enforce the collection of excessive revenue, and to remedy the defects which we have enumerated, are within the scope of legislative relief, and Congress may properly be held responsible for any evils resulting from a continuance of existing conditions. It may, however, be fairly said that responsibility for delay in the adoption of legislative remedies rests upon the party in control of the House of Representatives, which by the Constitution has sole power to originate revenue bills. The participation of the Senate in any effort to cure existing evils by proper legislation has not been possible, from the fact that the bill under consideration is the first that has reached the Senate in more than five years giving them jurisdiction over the subject.

In view of the universal demand for relief from the unsatisfactory condition in which we find ourselves the inaction of those whose anxiety for reform has been manifested by repeated declarations is remarkable. It would have been easy at any time when Congress has been in session since the 3d of March, 1885—and its sessions have covered at least twenty months of that period—to have secured the concurrence of the two Houses upon a measure which would have reduced the revenue and amended the administrative features of our customs laws in a satisfactory manner.

The refusal to adopt or even to consider a measure of this kind has been publicly declared by a leading member of the House of Representatives (Hon. SAMUEL J. RANDALL) to have been "owing to the fact that a majority of the Committee on Ways and Means seem to have determined that unless their own peculiar views can be incorporated into law in regard to customs taxation and the continuance of the internal-revenue system without reduction or modification they will prevent any reform in this direction."

It has been the evident purpose of those who have controlled the policy of the party in power to delay action, to magnify causes for uneasiness, and to multiply and intensify evils until the people of the country should imperatively demand relief, and then to assume that the evils and embarrassments from which we are suffering are the necessary incidents of the protective system, and that relief can only be found in the emasculation or destruction of that system.

The known attachment of the great mass of the wage-earners of the country to a system which has been productive to them of unexampled prosperity prevented the adoption of a policy of open attack, and made it necessary that some plausible reason should be found for the stealthy accomplishment of their destructive designs.

Your committee, after a thorough examination of the provisions of the bill (H. R. 9051) referred to them by the Senate, have become convinced of its inadequacy as a remedial measure in view of the condition which confronts us.

1. Its adoption would probably result in an increase instead of a reduction of the revenue from customs.

It is claimed by the friends of the bill that the reduction of revenue from this source would amount to $49,486,240.75; but we are confident that the large reduction in rates proposed would result in greatly increased importations. When American producers supply a considerable portion of our market with articles in general use, and the rates on these are reduced below the protective point, both importations and revenue must increase.

By the acts of July 14, 1870, May 1 and June 6, 1872, important reductions in tariff rates were made and the free-list greatly enlarged. It was officially estimated at the time of the passage of the various acts that these changes would result in a reduction of the revenue from customs of $57,227,510. The revenue from this source in 1869 was $176,114,904, and in 1873 it was $184,929,542, or an increase of $8,814,138, instead of a reduction of $57,227,510. This increase took place notwithstanding the fact that free importations increased in value $157,707,264 between 1869 and 1873. Similar results may be reasonably expected should the House bill become a law.

If foreign manufacturers should, through the changes made in the cotton and woolen schedules, secure a quarter of the market now held by our cotton and woolen manufacturers—and this is certainly a very conservative estimate—the additional amount of duty collected from increased importations would amount to at least $60,000,000 annually. The expansion of imports which would surely follow the reduction of rates on china, porcelain, common window-glass, manufactures of iron and steel, flax, jute, hemp, and a large number of minor manufactures, would greatly augment the revenue.

2. It provides no remedy for undervaluations, but, on the contrary, it invites and gives immunity to unlimited fraud by the substitution of ad valorem for specific duties.

3. It does not remedy any of the inequalities or anomalies, or cure any of the defects of existing law. While it perpetuates existing infirmities, it creates, by its obscurities of purpose and phraseology, and by its faulty construction, doubts and ambiguities which must multiply indefinitely the confusion now existing. The bill does not preserve the classification of dutiable articles in schedules, and it is impossible to say in many instances to what clause of existing law the amendments proposed by the bill were intended to apply, or what their effect would be. Although the different paragraphs in the various schedules have been numbered for reference at the Treasury Department, they have never received any such legal designation as would permit accurate description or identification for purposes of amendment or repeal, and the difficulties which would certainly arise in the interpretation of various provisions of the bill would unavoidably lead to endless litigation and serious loss to the Treasury. Some of the defective provisions now in force have caused great injury to important industries. For instance, the paragraph fixing rates on hat materials reads as follows:

Hats, and so forth, materials for: Braids, plaits, flats, laces, trimmings, tissues, willow sheets and squares, used for making or ornamenting hats, bonnets, and hoods, composed of straw, chip, grass, palm leaf, willow, hair, whalebone, or any other substance or material, not specially enumerated or provided for in this act, 20 per cent. ad valorem.

This has been construed by the Treasury Department and the courts to admit silks, satins, laces, and a large variety of other expensive articles as "materials for hats," which are really used for other purposes, at the low rate of duty of 20 per cent. ad valorem, when for other uses the same articles are dutiable at 40 to 50 per cent. ad valorem. The clause in the bill under consideration which provides for the duty on hat materials reads as follows:

Hats, materials for: Braids, plaits, flats, willow sheets and squares, fit only for use in making or ornamenting hats, bonnets, and hoods, composed of straw, chip, grass, palm leaf, willow, hair, whalebone, or any vegetable material, not specially enumerated or provided for, 20 per cent. ad valorem.

It was probably the intention of the framers of the bill to remedy the defects alluded to, but it is clear from a comparison of the two paragraphs that the provisions of existing law in regard to materials for hats, composed of "any other substance or material" than straw, chip, etc., would still remain in force and unrepealed, and the practice of importing silks, laces, etc., as hat materials, at 20 per cent. ad valorem would continue. Similar failures of amendments to amend are

found in all parts of the bill. To illustrate cases of this kind we have appended to our report (Appendix F) a list of paragraphs of doubtful meaning, together with some of those where any probable interpretation would increase existing confusion.

The results, however, which would flow from the failures of the bill as a corrective measure would be much less disastrous to the material interests of the country than those which must surely follow the adoption of its vicious affirmative propositions.

AD VALOREM DUTIES.

The feature of the bill which most clearly indicates its purpose is the proposed substitution of ad valorem for specific duties. This substitution could have no other result than to change rates now protective for others which would not protect. The promoters of this bill must have been familiar with the testimony submitted to Congress by Secretary Manning disclosing enormous frauds upon the revenue and honest merchants through the use of ad valorem rates. The frequency and notoriety of these frauds and the widespread demoralization resulting from them should have prevented any attempts to extend the system.

The use of ad valorem rates has been condemned by the experience of every commercial nation in the world, by the judgment of those who have been intrusted with the responsibility of customs administration, and by honest importers and merchants, as well as by intelligent political economists and legislators of every shade of economic belief. The reasons for this general and sweeping condemnation are obvious; ad valorem rates are equally unsatisfactory and uncertain whether levied for revenue or for protective purposes; duties based on foreign market value are, even under the most favorable circumstances, with honesty of purpose on the part of the importer and the highest degree of knowledge and unquestioned integrity on the part of the appraising officers, necessarily uncertain and unequal; but when, as now, many foreign importers deem the successful evasion of our revenue laws by unscrupulous methods the highest evidence of business capacity, ad valorem rates fail lamentably of their purpose. They greatly exaggerate variations in foreign prices. When business is depressed and foreign prices are abnormally low, when foreign competition is most to be dreaded, and when a defensive barrier is most needed by domestic producers, then ad valorem rates are lowest, protection is reduced, and depression is intensified. On the other hand, when foreign values are highest, rates are highest, and restriction enlarges into prohibition.

If it is desirable that a sliding scale of duties should be adopted, rates should increase as foreign prices diminish. Ad valorem rates afford facilities for the grossest frauds upon the revenue; through undervaluations they invite evasions of the law and reward dishonest importers, while they destroy the business alike of honest importers and of domestic manufacturers. The foreign manufacturer practically fixes the duty which he is willing to pay, and in many cases the only limitation upon the amount of foreign importations is the extent to which the fear of detection influences the persons who make the invoices. The evils which flow from ad valorem rates are so great and so manifest that this plan of collecting duties has no advocates but professional and political revenue reformers and dishonest consignors.

In illustration of the effect of the House bill to increase importations and break down domestic producers, we cite the application of ad valorem rates to the manufacture of fine cotton cloths. The specific rates now levied upon cotton cloths furnish no reasonable grounds for adverse criticism, either by the producers or consumers of cotton manufactures. The inevitable effect of the substitution would be to largely increase the importation of all the finer and more expensive classes of these goods, and to produce disorganization and depression in this important industry. The uniform rate of 40 per cent. proposed, bears very unevenly upon the various grades of goods. It would be if collected upon an honest valuation protective upon the coarser and commoner kinds which are largely consumed by all classes of our people, but it would encourage the importation without restraint of those fine fabrics which may be properly designated as luxuries.

The leading cotton manufacturers of the country joined in an emphatic protest to the framers of the bill against the adoption of ad valorem rates, and submitted the following strong statement of their objections to the system:

> While the ad valorem method seems to theoretically have the merits of simplicity and equity, it is in practice found to be unreliable, a prolific source of undervaluation, false invoicing, and false oaths, and a premium upon commercial dishonesty, and to tend toward a transfer of legitimate business from honorable importers to the most irresponsible and unscrupulous class of foreign traders. A reference to the records of revenue from the customs department and the United States courts, or inquiry among importing houses, will convince you, it is believed, of the truth of the foregoing assertion, and that the gravity of the danger inherent from the ad valorem system is not exaggerated.
>
> It is therefore thought to be proper to call your attention to this proposition of the adoption of ad valorem rates pure and simple, and to urge in the strongest manner that no such backward step be taken, however enticing it may appear theoretically, but that the ad valorem rates be used only where the specific form is inapplicable, or to supplement the latter in order to better equalize rates, as it is wisely applied in the present tariff.
>
> While no classification of cotton cloths can be equitable, and discrepancies will from time to time appear and disappear, consequent on changes in processes and the fickleness of fashion, these inequalities are found in practice under the specific form to be so inconsiderable in amount as to have but an insignificant bearing upon the principle and a trifling effect upon the revenue or volume of business, and any objection based upon such inequalities would be found to be imaginary rather than real.

The proposal to apply this principle to all manufactures of wool would be equally unsatisfactory and destructive. The rate proposed in the woolen schedule would prevent importation of the low grades of flannels, blankets, and hats of wool, and all low and medium grades of cassimeres and other cloths which enter into the clothing of the great mass of our people, but would be insufficient upon all the finer classes of dress goods and cloths for men's wear. All the articles in both these schedules which could be classed as necessaries of life, and which are worn by our working men and women, would be protected by the rates proposed to the extent of exclusion of the foreign article, while upon all the finer and more expensive products, which are in the nature of luxuries and purchased largely by the rich, the rates would place no restraint upon importations, and would furnish no protection to the American producer.

Specific duties have been advocated by all our Secretaries of the Treasury, with one notable exception, Mr. Robert J. Walker, from Hamilton, to the present incumbent of the office. The opinions of these officers are given in Appendix A. All the leading statesmen and financiers of Europe, and all acknowledged authorities on taxation on either side of the Atlantic, have advocated specific duties. They have been commended by all the principal administrative officers of customs, by the leading merchants, and by the chambers of commerce, in all of our large cities, for their simplicity and certainty in execution. No expert knowledge is required for their enforcement by customs officials, as the articles upon which they are levied have only to be counted, weighed, or measured. While specific duties are less liable to evasion and are certain and uniform in their operations, giving greater stability to the revenues, they also have the beneficial tendency to exclude from the country inferior, adulterated, and worthless goods.

INJURIOUS REDUCTIONS IN RATES MADE BY THE HOUSE BILL.

That the Senate may be fully advised of the injurious character of the radical reductions in rates which are proposed by the House bill, a table is appended to this report (Appendix G) which shows in parallel columns existing rates, the rates proposed, and the percentage of reduction in each case.

The rates proposed in the schedules imposing duties on silks, wines, liquors, and tobacco are not changed by the terms of the House bill, and but slight reduction is made in the rate of duty on sugar.

With the exceptions named, every tariff schedule is invaded by alterations made with the hostile spirit which pervades the bill, and nearly all of our industries would feel the blighting effect of changes which are either inconsiderate or purposely destructive. The following list contains a statement of some of the manufactures which would be seriously injured by these reductions:

Articles on the dutiable-list injuriously affected by the Mills bill.

Manufactures of cotton.
All manufactures of wool.
All manufactures of hemp, flax, and jute.
Paper envelopes and other manufactures of paper.
Steel railway bars.
Manufactures, articles, and wares of iron, steel, and other metals.
All manufactures of manila, sisal grass, and other vegetable fibers.
China, porcelain, Parian, and other wares.
Common window-glass and the manufactures of glass.
Lead products.
Paints and colors.
Iron and steel rivets, bolts, etc.
Wrought-iron and steel spikes, etc.
Horse, mule, and ox shoes, etc.
Cut tacks, brads, and sprigs.
Horseshoe, hob, and wire nails, etc.
Boiler and other tubes.
Chains of all kinds.
Files, file blanks, rasps, etc.
Iron and steel beams, etc.
Lead in ore and in pigs.
Needles.
Metallic pens.
Type-metal.
Blacking of all kinds.
Manufactures of gutta-percha, hard rubber, etc.
Manufactures of hair.
Ink of all kinds.
Brushes of all kinds.
Marble sawed and dressed, and manufactures of marble.
Manufactures of papier-maché.
Philosophical instruments and apparatus.
Webbing composed of cotton, flax, and other materials.
Zinc, dry and ground in oil.
Confectionery of all kinds.

The committee estimate the value of the annual product of these industries to be at least $2,000,000,000, and that in their prosecution employment is given to not less than 1,250,000 persons, while at least 5,650,000 are directly dependent for support on their continued existence and prosperity.

The testimony taken by your committee and herewith submitted to the Senate contains abundant evidence in detail from manufacturers and workmen alike of the destructive results sure to follow the adoption of the House bill.

From the representatives of imperiled industries a voice of universal protest has been raised and the action of the Senate has been earnestly invoked to preserve great enterprises from ruthless and unnecessary ruin.

For weeks we have patiently listened to persons employed in the various pursuits and from every section, and with doors open to all, we have received the advice and counsel of the men whose labor, enterprise, and skill have made the United States the foremost industrial country of the world, and not one person has appeared to approve or to advocate the bill under consideration.

The free-trade tendencies which are partly concealed in these propositions to cripple or destroy numerous industries are clearly brought into view by an examination of the list of articles which the bill proposes to place upon the free-list. Of the one hundred and four times

from which the duties are removed, nearly one-half, forty-eight in number, are manufactured articles, sixteen are agricultural products, eleven are articles which are now free of duty or without commercial importance, and twenty-one are articles which now pay a small revenue duty, but which are of such a character that removal of duties is unobjectionable.

The following is a list of the manufactured articles from which the duties are removed:

Timber, hewn, sawed, or used for spars or wharves.
Timber, squared or sided.
Sawed boards, planks, deals, and all other sawed lumber.
Hubs for wheels, posts, and all kinds of blocks, rough-hewn or sawed.
Staves of wood.
Machinery for the manufacture of cotton bagging.
Iron or steel sheets coated with tin or lead, known as tin-plates, terne-plates, or taggers' tin.
Glycerine.
Phosphorus.
Soap, hard or soft.
Extracts for tanning.
Indigo, extracts of and carmined.
Iodine, resublimed.
Oil:
Croton.
Hempseed and Rapeseed.
Oils:
Olive oil.
Cotton-seed oil.
Salad oil.
Neat's-foot oil.
Whale oil.
Seal oil.
Barks, beans, berries, etc., advanced by refining or grinding.
Cotton ties or hoops for baling or other purposes.
Needles.
Pickets and palings.
Laths.
Shingles.
Clapboards, pine or spruce.
Salt in packages or in bulk.
Burlaps, not exceeding 60 inches in width.
Bags of jute for grain.
Alumina, alum, etc.
Borax and boracic acid.
Copper, sulphate of, or blue vitriol.
Iron, sulphate, or copperas.
Soda:
Sulphate of, or niter cake.
Sulphate of, or Glauber's-salt.
Sulphur, refined, in rolls.
Coal-tar products.
Coal-tars, not colors or dyes.
Logwood and other dye-woods, extracts of.
Quicksilver.
Brick.
German looking-glass plates.
Chickory, roasted and ground.
Cocoa and chocolate, prepared.
Grindstones, finished.
Ocher and ochery earths, etc., dry and ground in oil.
Acorns and substitutes for coffee, prepared.
Osier and willow, prepared, for basket-makers' use.
Curled hair for beds and mattresses.
Manufactures from non-dutiable crude minerals, not otherwise provided for.
Finishing powder.
Rattans and reeds, manufactured.

This is free trade in the concrete, and the list furnishes conclusive evidence of the intent of the House bill, which can not be neutralized by the eleventh-hour disclaimers of its supporters.

Upon investigation it will be found that, with the exception of tin-plates, the supply of the above articles for home consumption is now furnished to a great extent by domestic producers, whose business would be in most instances at once destroyed by the adoption of this bill.

The committee have not been able to secure accurate statistics of the aggregate value of these manufactures or of the number of persons employed in their production. It is evident, however, from an examination of the list and of the testimony taken by your committee and the reported value of the products of 1880 that at least $500,000,000 of capital and 300,000 workingmen are now so employed. These items seem to have been taken indiscriminately from the present dutiable-list, and there is no reason for the removal of duties upon them which would not apply with equal force to hundreds of other manufactures which are now dutiable. They owe the distinction of having been designated for the first sacrifice on the free-trade altar to the fact that neither the interests of a section nor the political control of a district demanded their preservation.

In many cases where the manufactured article is placed on the free-list a duty is retained on the materials from which it is manufactured. It is needless to say that this discrimination would act as a prohibition upon production in this country.

Soap is placed on the free-list, while duties are retained upon caustic soda and essential oils and a tax is retained upon alcohol. This would undoubtedly result in the destruction of a large industry which gives employment to nearly twenty-five thousand persons.

German looking-glass plates are placed on the free-list, while a duty is maintained on polished cylinder and plate glass, not silvered, or from 2.5 to 45 cents per square foot, equal in some cases to 152 per cent. ad valorem. A duty is also retained on nitrate of silver and tin-foil used in the silvering process.

Tin-plates, or iron and steel sheets coated with tin or lead, are placed on the free-list; while iron ore and pig-iron, as well as the iron bars or steel billets and slabs from which these sheets must be rolled, are dutiable at from 45 to 60 per cent. ad valorem. A duty is also placed by the bill on common black sheet-iron of from 1 to 1.4 cents a pound, and iron and steel sheets, when galvanized with zinc or coated with any other metal except tin or lead, are required to pay an additional duty of from one-fourth to three-fourths of a cent a pound above these rates. There is also a duty levied of 1¼ cents a pound upon pig-lead.

Iron and steel cotton-ties and hoops for baling or other purposes, not thinner than No. 20 wire gauge, are made free; while other hoop, band, or scroll iron is dutiable at rates varying from 1 to 1.3 cents a pound, and an additional rate of one-fourth of a cent a pound is levied on articles wholly or partially manufactured from hoop-iron. The iron bars or steel slabs from which cotton-ties or hoops must be manufactured are dutiable at from 45 to 60 per cent.

Needles are placed upon the free-list, while the duties on steel remain unchanged at not less than 45 per cent. ad valorem.

The duty is removed from ocher and ochery earths, and umber and umbery earths, dry and ground in oil, while a duty of 15 cents per gallon is retained on linseed-oil.

In the manufacture of the chemical and other products which are placed on the free-list the use of expensive apparatus and machinery is required, and these remain dutiable. Alcohol, upon which a tax of nearly 400 per cent. ad valorem is retained, is largely used in some of the products on which the duties are removed or greatly reduced.

In a considerable number of cases the admission of important manufactured products free of duty while a duty is retained on materials would not only extinguish the industry directly affected, but would effectually destroy important collateral industries.

The free admission of iron or steel sheets of all thicknesses coated with tin or lead would not only prevent the production of tin-plates in this country, but it would cause a substitution of imported tin-plates or sheets in most cases for roofing, and other building purposes, and for domestic uses, where galvanized or other sheet iron or steel is now used, and thus large and important American industries, now fully established, would be annihilated.

The provision to admit German looking-glass plates free of duty would not only destroy the business of silvering plates in this country, but the much larger and more important industry of manufacturing plate or other polished glass for all purposes. As the glass referred to is of the finest quality and highly polished, it would not only take the place of plate or other polished glass for looking-glasses, but of glass for other purposes, as it could be cheaply silvered and the silver removed at an expense which would be insignificant compared with the duty on foreign glass. This provision also contains, we believe, the first attempt which has been made in an American tariff to discriminate between the productions of various foreign states, and it can be safely assumed that the producers of France, Belgium, and England would not consent to this discrimination in favor of German manufacturers.

Placing curled hair upon the free-list would ruin a useful trade, and it would also deprive the farmers of the United States of a profitable market for millions of pounds of hair.

In many cases the duty is removed not only from materials, but also from the manufactured product in various stages as well. Raw wool is free of duty, and no duty is levied on washed or scoured wool, or on wool tops or other manufactures of wool less advanced in condition than yarns.

Jute is put upon the free-list, and the duties are also removed from burlaps and bags of jute for grain.

If Canada consents, round and square timber and sawed boards are all free from duty, while the duty on planed lumber is left an uncertain quantity.

Several important crude minerals, like copper, quicksilver, and antimony, are placed on the free-list, and the duty is also removed from the unenumerated manufactured products of these and of the crude minerals, gold, silver, aluminum, bromine, bismuth, and many others of importance which are now free. It is impossible to say what the effect of this sweeping provision would be; it certainly would admit free of duty a large number of valuable manufactured articles which are now dutiable.

Crude and refined borax and boracic acid, coal-tar, and coal-tar products, and grindstones, finished and unfinished, are placed on the free-list.

It is evident that in these, and in many similar cases, free raw materials would not benefit the domestic manufacturers.

In several cases articles are free under one description and dutiable under another.

For example, iron hoops for other purposes than baling are free, while iron hoops for all purposes except cotton-ties, which are specially provided for, are dutiable at from 1 to 1.3 cents a pound. All vegetable fibers, including flax, are free, while hackled flax is also dutiable at $10 per ton. All earths and clays unwrought are free, while china clay, or kaolin, unwrought, is dutiable. All unmanufactured or undressed monumental or building stone, including marble, is free, while undressed marble is also dutiable at 40 cents per cubic foot. Cocoa prepared and manufactured is free, while chocolate, a preparation of cocoa, is dutiable at 2 cents a pound.

In a great number of instances materials used by the manufacturer are dutiable at one rate, while the finished product is dutiable at a lower rate. This want of relation in rates, which extends to every schedule in which changes are made, will affect injuriously all of our important industries.

For instance, white lead when dry, ground, or mixed in oil is dutiable at 2 cents a pound, while orange mineral, a manufactured product of white lead, is dutiable at 1½ cents a pound; the rate on red lead and litharge, two other lead products, is but one-fourth of a cent above the duty on pig-lead; while the rates on brown and white acetates of lead are so low that production would cease in the United States if this bill should become a law. The rates on structural iron and steel are reduced to six-tenths of a cent a pound, while the duty of 1 cent a pound is retained on bar-iron, from which iron beams must be manufactured.

The duty on sugar above No. 20 Dutch standard in color is fixed by the bill at 2.8 cents a pound, which is equivalent to nearly 85 per cent.

ad valorem. The duty on colored and other confectionery is 40 per cent. ad valorem. Refined sugar could be manufactured into confectionery by machinery at an additional cost of one-half cent a pound, and imported at a rate of duty which would be about one-half of that imposed on the sugar before it was manufactured. Prepared and manufactured cocoa, which contains 75 per cent. of pure sugar, is admitted free, and under this description chocolate confectionery would also be admitted free. We should have then under the House bill refined sugar dutiable at 2.8 cents a pound as sugar, dutiable at half this amount as confectionery, and free as manufactured cocoa. The effect of these provisions upon the manufacturers of confectionery, cocoa, and chocolate, and upon the business of refining sugar in this country can be readily understood. The value of the domestic manufactures of these articles by the census of 1880 was $182,424,602.

Several important manufactures of iron and steel, including files and file-blanks, cut tacks and brads, and steel pens, which now have a specific rate, are given an ad valorem rate of 35 per cent., while the steel from which they are made is dutiable at not less than 45 per cent. ad valorem.

Type-metal is dutiable at 15 per cent. ad valorem, while the lead of which it is largely composed is dutiable at 1¼ cents a pound, or 50 per cent. ad valorem. Lead imported as type-metal would pay a duty of three-eighths of a cent per pound, instead of 1¼ cents if imported as pig-lead. The lead could be recovered by the sweating process at a cost of about one-half of a cent per pound, and still a saving of three-eighths of a cent per pound could be made in duties.

Machinery, hardware, and other articles and wares composed wholly or in part of copper, are dutiable by the bill under consideration at 35 per cent. ad valorem, while machinery, hardware, and other manufactures of iron, steel, or other metals, or of which these metals are the component material of chief value, are dutiable at 40 per cent. ad valorem. Very much the larger portion of all the machinery and hardware now manufactured is composed in part of copper or brass, and if this bill should become a law all machinery and hardware would contain copper or brass, and in this way the duty on all such manufactures would be reduced from 45 per cent. ad valorem, the present rate, to 35 per cent. The effect of this large reduction on the finest manufactured products of iron and steel and other metals, while the duty on the materials of which they are composed remains practically unchanged at much higher rates, would certainly be disastrous to many very important American industries. Machinery is still further discriminated against in the section authorizing the collection of a duty upon packages.

A duty of 25 per cent. ad valorem is placed on paper, while the duty on paper envelopes, the raw material of which is paper, is reduced to 20 per cent., and the duty on the various manufactures of paper not otherwise provided for is fixed at 15 per cent.

Buttons, braids, fringes, and trimmings of all kinds, of wool or silk, are dutiable at 50 per cent. ad valorem, while cloaks and other garments for ladies' and children's wear, made up, are dutiable at 45 per cent. ad valorem.

Ground rice and rice meal are dutiable at 15 per cent. ad valorem, while paddy, or rice with the outer hull on, is dutiable at 1 cent a pound, or 100 per cent. ad valorem. Rice starch, an advanced manufacture of rice, is also dutiable at 1 cent a pound, while by a change in classification the rate on uncleaned rice is advanced one-half a cent per pound beyond existing rates.

Oil-cloths are dutiable at 25 per cent.; oil-cloth foundations bear the same rate, while linseed-oil and many other materials used in the production of oil-cloth are dutiable at a higher rate.

The inconsistencies of the bill are numberless.

Cotton bagging is dutiable at three-eighths of a cent a pound, while a portion of the machinery for manufacturing cotton bagging is admitted free. Jute bags and burlaps which can be used for covering cotton are free, while the machinery for the manufacture of burlaps or jute bags is dutiable at 35 or 40 per cent. ad valorem. Bags of jute for grain are free, while bags of jute for flour, fruit, vegetables, or other purposes are dutiable at three-eighths of a cent a pound. Burlaps not exceeding 60 inches in width are free, while burlaps exceeding 60 inches in width are dutiable at 25 per cent. ad valorem.

Bibles and other books in foreign languages, printed for gratuitous distribution, are free, while Bibles and other books in foreign languages, if printed for sale, are dutiable at 25 per cent. ad valorem.

Needles and looking-glass plates are free, while protective duties are levied on iron-ore and soda-ash.

Extract of hemlock bark is free, and extract of sumac is dutiable.

Beans and pease are free, while rice is dutiable at $1.28 per bushel.

Wool and salt are free, while sugar and coal are given high duties.

Copper-ore is free, and nickel and zinc ores are protected.

One clause of the bill fixes the duties on screens, covers, and a large number of other articles of silk, jute, or vegetable material, at 40 per cent. ad valorem, while other provisions of the bill fix rates on the same articles at from 15 to 50 per cent.

We have enumerated but a few of the many defects and incongruities of the House bill, as every correct principle of tariff construction has been violated in selecting articles for the free-list and those upon which large reductions in rates are made.

FREE RAW MATERIALS.

We have shown the deceptive character of the claim that the proposition of the House bill to place certain materials on the free-list would stimulate manufactures.

All protectionists agree that crude materials used in manufactures, or articles of any description which can not be produced to any considerable extent in this country, or which from climatic or other causes (not depending upon the cost of labor), can not be produced here under as favorable conditions as elsewhere, should be placed on the free-list. With few unimportant exceptions, all the materials which may be fairly said to be included in this description are now free. Those upon which a revenue duty is now retained are transferred to the free-list in the substitute to the House bill proposed by your committee. The great number of articles which have been added to the free-list since 1870 in pursuance of this policy is elsewhere alluded to. The percentage of importations of free and dutiable articles under the various tariffs which have been in existence from 1846, inclusive, is shown by the following table:

Period.	Dutiable.	Free.
	Per cent.	*Per Cent.*
1847 to 1857	88	12
1858 to 1861	78	22
1879 to 1883	70	30
1884 to 1887	66	34

It will be seen that with protective legislation we have had a much larger and constantly increasing amount of free importations. The protective policy contemplates the free admission of all non-competing articles and of all those in the production of which the benefactions of nature have given other countries permanent advantages over our own.

The doctrine of free raw materials, as advocated by tariff reformers, is a difficult one to enforce in legislation. In the usual division of labor the finished product of one man becomes the raw material of his industrial successor. If each man in this series becomes a tariff reformer, and insists that every article which he buys shall be considered a raw material and placed on the free-list, and that every article which he sells shall be deemed a manufactured product and protected, a practical solution of the problem of tariff construction is impossible.

As we have already shown, but very few of the articles placed on the free-list by the House bill can possibly be classed as raw materials

In the small number of cases where duties have been properly removed from crude materials such a reduction has been made on the manufactured product that the change would prove an injury rather than a benefit to the manufacturer.

It is claimed that the bill seeks to reduce the duties on the necessaries of life, but the fact is, that of the long list of articles put upon the free-list salt is the only one which could be called a necessary of life, and of the changes made in the dutiable-list the insignificant reductions on sugar and rice are the only ones which could be credited to this purpose. In marked contrast with these trivial reductions is the action taken in reducing rates of duty on luxuries, as shown by the following table:

Articles.	Existing duties.	Proposed duties.
Artificial feathers, flowers, and millinery ornaments.	50 per cent.	30 per cent.
Dolls and toys	35 per cent.	Do.
Kid gloves	50 per cent.	40 per cent.
Cosmetics, pomades, and toilet powders.	do.	30 per cent.
Cut, engraved, and stained glass	45 per cent.	40 per cent.
Manufactures of rosewood, mahogany, and satinwood.	35 per cent.	30 per cent.
Proprietary preparations, pills, etc	50 per cent.	Do.
Olive, salad, and other oils	Various	Free.
Fine confectionery	10 cents per pound..	5 cents per pound.
	50 per cent.	40 per cent.
Prepared cocoa and chocolate	2 cents per pound	Free.
Manufactures of marble	50 per cent.	30 per cent.
Percussion caps	40 per cent.	Do.
Fine linen cloths of all kinds	35 per cent.	25 per cent.

FREE WOOL.

We have been recently advised by the President of the United States that in any tariff revision "such reliance upon present revenue arrangements as has been invited or encouraged should be fairly and justly regarded," and assured that in the reforms inaugurated by his party friends "abrupt and radical changes which might endanger such enterprises and injuriously affect the interests of labor dependent upon their success and continuance are not contemplated or intended."

There can be no better test of the sincerity of these sounding declarations than the proposition to put wool on the free-list. Wool has been dutiable since 1816, and through all the tariff mutations which have taken place since no suggestion has been made by any political party, up to the inauguration of the present Administration, for the removal of duties. The wool-growers of the country produce annually 300,000,000 pounds of wool, valued at $100,000,000. They sup-

ply nine-tenths of the clothing wool used by American manufacturers, and they have raised the United States to the first rank among the wool-producing countries of the world.

Those who have by their patient labor and intelligent efforts built up this great industry, relying for security upon the protection of "present revenue arrangements," are certainly entitled to fair treatment and reasonable consideration. They are refused either by this proposal. It is neither fair nor reasonable to suddenly force this large portion of our people into unequal and ruinous competition with the underpaid or semi barbaric labor of other wool-producing countries. It will afford no consolation to the numerous wool-growers of the country to tell them that their ruin may benefit the woolen manufacturers, or that we must have free wool because England, Germany, and France, under circumstances and conditions entirely different from ours, have removed the duties. If we are to look to the interests of the people of the United States alone, and to have in view the development of our own great natural resources, the adequate protection and care of wool producing must continue a feature of our American policy. Even the government of the Southern Confederacy, with a provision in its constitution which forbade the imposition of protective duties, recognized the importance of encouraging wool production, and levied a duty on raw wool.

Scarcely any other branch of American industry is more important to the American people or more necessary to their industrial prosperity and independence than wool-growing and wool-manufacturing. Scarcely any other branch has so fully vindicated the policy of protective duties by remarkable growth since the enactment of the protective tariff of 1861. In selecting these branches of industry for the radical changes which free-trade theories enforce, the President and his party have made it perfectly understood, in this country and abroad, that their acceptance of these theories is complete, and that they intend to put the ax to the root of the protective system.

The only reason given for advocating a repeal of the duties on wool, which have so greatly benefited agriculture, is that cheaper raw materials would help the manufacturer and benefit the consumer. In the same breath it is asserted that the prices of wool have been lower with protective duties than with revenue duties. The attempt to make the wool-grower believe that free trade will raise the price of wool, and at the same time make the manufacturer believe that the same change will render his materials cheaper, can not be said to have been entirely successful. In a large portion of our country wool-growing is co-extensive with farming, and the incidental benefits to the farmer, in many thousands of cases, make agriculture profitable where it would otherwise be profitless. It is by no means to the farmer who devotes his attention exclusively or mainly to the culture of sheep that the duties on wool are of the greatest importance. A far greater number of farmers now make farming pay with the aid of wool-growing who could not do so if they were obliged to compete with the flock-masters and ranges of Australasia or South America.

The contention that wool-growing in this country has not been aided or encouraged by protective duties is sufficiently answered by the following statement of the annual production and production per capita from 1840 to 1885:

Amount of wool produced in the United States.

Year.	Production.	Per capita.	Year.	Production.	Per capita.
	Pounds.	*Pounds.*		*Pounds.*	*Pounds.*
1840	35,802,114	2.5	1879	232,530,000	4.6
1850	52,516,960	2.7	1880	240,000,000	4.7
1860	60,264,913	1.7	1882	290,000,000	5.3
1869	162,000,000	4.2	1884	308,000,000	5.4
1874	181,000,000	4.2	1886	285,000,000	4.7

It will be noticed that in 1860, after fourteen years of revenue tariff, the total production of domestic wool was 60,264,913 pounds, or 1.7 pounds per capita, while in 1884, after twenty-four years of protection, the total production had increased to 308,000,000 pounds, or 5.4 pounds per capita. This increase justifies the policy of affording this important agricultural product adequate protection.

MANUFACTURES OF WOOL.

The following table shows the advance which has been made in woolen manufactures. It contains a statement of the value of manufactures of wool in each of the census years from 1820 to 1880, and the per capita value for each of those years:

Value of manufactures of wool in each of the census years from 1820 to 1880, and the per capita value.

Year.	Value.	Value per capita.	Year.	Value.	Value per capita.
1820	$4,413,068	$0.46	1860	$65,596,364	$2.09
1830	14,528,165	.88	1870	177,495,689	4.60
1840	20,696,999	.82	1880	267,252,913	5.34
1850	43,207,545	1.86			

The average annual quantity of wool consumed by our manufacturers from 1840 to 1887 was as follows:

Amount of wool consumed by American manufacturers by decades—average per annum.

Periods.	Products.	Imports.	Total consumption.	Per capita.
	Pounds.	*Pounds.*	*Pounds.*	*Pds.*
1841–'50	46,000,000	13,976,459	59,976,459	3.0
1851–'60	66,000,000	23,010,629	89,010,629	3.3
1861–'70	150,000,000	50,161,113	200,161,113	5.4
1871–'80	192,225,000	64,091,664	256,316,664	5.8
1881–'87	289,428,571	79,205,585	368,634,156	6.6

These tables, taken together, show that harmonious development of interests which it is the aim of the American policy of protection to secure.

It is often stated that the heavy duty on wool has prevented the normal growth of woolen manufactures. For the purpose of making a comparison between this and an industry which has free raw material, we insert the following statement, showing the total value and the value per capita of the cotton and woolen manufactures of the United States for each of the census years from 1820 to 1880:

Comparative statement of the values of manufactures of cotton and wool in each of the census years from 1820 to 1880, and the per capita value of each manufacture.

Year.	Manufactures of cotton.		Manufactures of wool.	
	Value.	Value per capita.	Value.	Value per capita.
1820			$4,413,068	
1830	$32,000,000	$2.49	14,528,166	$0.88
1840	46,350,458	2.71	20,696,999	.82
1850	65,501,687	2.82	43,207,545	1.86
1860	115,681,774	3.68	65,596,364	2.09
1870	177,489,739	4.60	174,495,689	4.60
1880	192,030,110	3.83	267,252,913	5.34

It will be noticed that the relative increase in the value of woolen manufactures has been much greater than in cotton. In 1870 the production of cotton and wool per capita was the same ($4.60 in each case), while in 1880, with a heavy duty upon wool, woolen manufactures had increased to $5.34, and cotton manufactures, with free cotton, had fallen to $3.83 per capita.

It may be valuable in this connection to make a comparison of the changes which have taken place in the consumption of wool in the countries which are the principal competitors of the United States in woolen manufactures.

Germany has increased its consumption of wool in manufactures about 40 per cent. in twenty years. France consumed in 1866 about 310,000,000 pounds of wool—190,000,000 foreign and 120,000,000 home grown; and in 1886 about 446,000,000 pounds—366,000,000 foreign and 80,000,000 domestic; an increase of barely 44 per cent. in twenty years. Great Britain consumed 238,000,000 pounds in 1859, when the United States consumed 86,000,000 pounds. In 1885 Great Britain consumed 366,000,000 pounds, when the United States consumed 400,000,000 pounds. This startling change in the industrial relations of the two countries may afford some explanation of the anxiety in Great Britain for the destruction of the protective policy of this country.

The development of woolen manufactures in the United States has been arrested by the inadequate duties that were imposed upon manufactures of wool by the act of March 3, 1883, which, taken together with the erroneous classification of manufactures of worsted, have led to greatly increased importations from England, Germany, France, and Belgium. The rapidity with which these importations have increased the past year threatens, unless some remedy shall be promptly adopted, to destroy the woolen manufacturing industry of the United States. The following table shows the importation of worsted coatings, etc., from the consular district of Bradford, a single manufacturing district of Great Britain, for the past six months and for a corresponding period in 1887:

Exports from the consular district of Bradford, England, to the United States of certain woolen and worsted fabrics during the first six months of the years 1887 and 1888.

Articles.	1887.	1888.	Increase.
Stuffs	$3,199,760	$3,383,605	$183,845
Worsted coatings	1,534,235	2,689,387	1,155,152
Woolen goods	197,560	274,255	76,695
Silk seals, plushes, etc	719,595	1,407,705	688,110
Worsted yarns	302,702	346,330	43,628
Total	5,953,852	8,081,282	2,147,430

Similar statistics in regard to importations from other districts and countries are not available, but they would undoubtedly show a like increase of importations.

The average annual importation of all manufactures of wool except carpets for the years 1868 to 1883, under the tariff of 1867, was $34,129,676.21. The average annual value of the same importations under act of March 3, 1883, in the years 1884–'87 was $39,232,500.25. The value of these importations in 1887 was $42,752,588.12, and in 1888 was $46,352,063.

The value of the importations of all manufactures of wool for the month of July, 1888, was $1,265,992 greater than the importations for the corresponding month in 1887. If this rate of increase continues the total imports for the present fiscal year will be about $63,000,000.

To form an approximate estimate of the rapidity with which the quantity of imported woolen manufactures is increasing we should consider the great decline which has taken place in the price of woolen and worsted goods. The average value of the importations of manufactures of worsteds, etc., for the four years prior to 1883 was $1.33 per pound, while in 1887 the average had fallen to 79 cents per pound.

The people of the United States consume nearly one-third of all the wool produced on the globe, the consumption per capita being very much greater than that of any other country. In 1860 the American producers supplied 68 per cent. of the amount of woolens required for domestic consumption; in 1880 they supplied 87 per cent.; while in 1884 the amount of woolen goods imported was probably less than 10 per cent. of the value of the total consumption. Since the reduction in rates made in 1883, however, with the increase in the value of our imports of woolens, domestic production has relatively declined.

The following table shows the comparative value of domestic and imported manufactures of wool, value per capita, and proportion of the American market held by American and foreign manufacturers in each of the census years from 1820 to 1880:

Year.	Domestic manufactures.			Importations.		
	Value	Value per capita.	Percentage of total consumption.	Value.	Value per capita.	Percentage of total consumption.
1820	$4,413,068	$0.46	38	$7,238,954	$0.75	62
1830	14,528,166	.88	64	8,290,062	.75	36
1840	20,696,999	.82	60	13,950,772	.94	40
1850	43,207,545	1.86	77	13,005,852	.65	23
1860	65,596,364	2.09	68	31,333,273	1.16	32
1870	177,495,689	4.60	85	33,046,521	.94	15
1880	267,252,913	5.34	87	39,537,694	.90	13

One of the principal arguments used by the advocates of free wool is that if the duty should be removed the woolen manufacturers of the United States would be able to compete successfully for the markets of the world, and that by retaining the duty upon wool we are deliberately excluding them from profitable employment. There is, we believe, much popular misapprehension as to the extent of the markets of the world in woolen goods. The total amount of the net importations of woolen goods by all the countries of the world, excluding the United States, probably does not exceed $90,000,000 per annum. We ourselves imported last year, 1888, nearly $49,000,000 in foreign value of woolen goods, or more than $80,000,000 in duty-paid value.

It is thus demonstrated that we have within our own reach a market which is almost equal in importance to all the other available markets of the world, and it would seem to be the paramount duty of Congress to secure to American producers by wise legislation this important portion of the world's market. It can be easily shown that if we had free wool we could not compete on equal terms for the neutral markets of the world. We could not compete because the cost of production of all manufactures of wool aside from the cost of wool is much greater in the United States than in competing countries. We have equal advantages in machinery, capital, the enterprise of our people, but the much greater wages paid to operatives and the greater earnings in this country of all the people who contribute to the production of our woolen manufactures prevent successful competition in neutral markets, unless wages should be reduced to the foreign scale.

It is only by the maintenance of the American system that the operatives in American woolen mills can hope to retain the immense advantages in respect to wages which they have over the workingmen of England, Germany, and France. The protection of the allied industries of wool and woolens has not, however, been beneficial alone to the persons employed in woolen mills. It has at the same time helped to increase the wages and rewards of farm labor; it has enabled us to raise and sell 300,000,000 pounds of wool where 60,000,000 pounds were raised, and to employ operatives in working up 400,000,000 pounds where but 86,000,000 pounds were manufactured. Coincident with this constant advance in wages and enlarged employment there has been a great reduction in the cost of woolen goods to American consumers. Free trade in wool and a bare revenue duty for woolens would compel the farmers to raise other crops, of which the supply is already greater than the demand, and it would close factories in which many millions of capital are invested, rob an army of operatives of employment, and force down the wages of all other labor.

All the sacrifice and suffering, this arrest of harmonious progress, and this disorganization of labor, we are asked to face in the hope that with one-sixth of the world's supply of wool cut off, we may thereby get cheaper wool and woolens. If this hope were rational, the loss would far outweigh the gain. It is better to maintain the wages of our workers and to develop our own resources than to abandon our fields, stop our mills, and look to Europe for the supply of our manufactured products.

A SECTIONAL BILL.

The removal of the duties from cotton-ties, burlaps to be used as cotton bagging, machinery for making cotton bagging, jute bags, etc., the retention of high duties on certain plantation products, such as sugar at 68 per cent. and rice at 100 per cent., the imposition of duties which would be protective on the coarser kinds of cotton and woolen fabrics manufactured in this section, all point to an attempt, by the terms of the House bill, to discriminate in favor of the planters of the cotton-growing States, an attempt made with the vain hope that it may be found possible to achieve the permanent prosperity of one section at the expense of another.

The industries of this section are not disturbed. It is well known that a considerable number of interests in other sections are suffering from insufficient protection, and yet it is significant that the only article upon which the rate of duty is increased in the entire bill is uncleaned rice, which by a change in classification is advanced from 70 to 100 per cent. ad valorem. We submit herewith (Appendix E) a suggestive table taken from the census reports, which shows the relative proportion of the various manufactured products upon which rates are removed or largely reduced by the House bill that were produced in 1880 in the eleven cotton States and in the other States. This table discloses the fact that the section which furnishes the bill and two-thirds of its effective supporters supplies but 2½ per cent. of the industries to be crippled or destroyed.

A BILL TO FAVOR CANADA.

The discrimination is not less marked in favor of the people of Canada and against the farmers and lumbermen living along our northern border from Maine to Oregon. The following table contains a comparison of the rates which are imposed by the Canadian tariff upon certain articles placed upon the free-list by the House bill under consideration:

Comparative statement of Canadian and United States tariffs on certain articles affected by the House bill H. R. 9051.

Articles.	Present law.	H. R. 9051.	Canadian.
Oils, animal and fish	25 per cent.	Free	20 per cent.
Oil, coal	10 per cent.	Free	7½ cts. per gallon.
Meats	1 cent per pound.	Free	1 cent per pound.
Shoulders and other meats	2 cents per pound.	Free	2 cents per pound.
Vegetables	10 per cent.	Free	10 per cent.
Pease	10 or 20 per cent.	Free	10 cts. per bushel.
Beans	10 or 20 per cent.	Free	15 cts. per bushel.
Brick	20 per cent.	Free	20 per cent.
Shingles	35 cents per M	Free	20 per cent.
Hubs, spokes, etc	20 per cent.	Free	15 per cent.
Lumber and timber, n. o. p. f.	20 per cent.	Free	20 per cent.

Under our existing tariff the Canadians send to our markets annually many millions of dollars in value of their products, which, after paying duties not greater than those levied by the Canadian tariff, are sold in competition with our domestic producers. The advantages which would accrue to the people of Canada by this removal of duties are manifest.

The effect which the placing of lumber on the free-list would have upon the Canadian interests is shown by the following extract from the report of Consul Hotchkiss to the Department of State, under date of February 2, 1888:

I have been thus explicit in describing the systems of the two countries, for, to my mind, they are the key by which the situation and effect may be safely prejudged in case free lumber becomes a reality.

There is no dispute that the American manufacturer controls the making of prices. In doing this, he is not influenced by the Canadian supply in any degree. If the duty of $2 is removed it will not affect the American price, because it has never been a factor and will still be unfelt. No lower price will prevail in the United States than heretofore, and no different net results will be experienced by the manufacturer.

The Canadian, on the contrary, will lay his lumber down in the American market at $2 less per thousand, and will obtain for it the same as the American does, so that the net result to the Canadian manufacturer will be a clear gain of the $2 which the American Government has remitted. This additional net result to the Canadian manufacturer will, however, be of very brief duration.

Having shown how the governments in Canada continue their control of the timber land and their disposition to tax them to the utmost, I am confident that not a May pay day will pass before a public notice will issue in effect that a further increase in annual and timber dues has been made an order in council, in sums sufficient to absorb the $2 per thousand into the provincial treasuries.

That Canada will do this we have reason to believe, not only from the foregoing statement but from the fact that when in 1870 we placed logs on the free-list, which prior to that time bore a duty of $1 per

thousand, Canada in 1872 responded by placing an export duty on logs of $2, which duty is retained to this day.

HOME MARKET FOR FARM PRODUCTS.

The comparative treatment which is indicated by a contrast between the duties on rice and sugar and the placing of beans, peas, meats, vegetables, and other Northern agricultural products on the free-list does not deter the supporters of this bill from making earnest appeals to farmers as a class for support. This appeal is based upon the theory that a protective tariff can not aid the farmer in securing better prices or a wider market for his products, but that it does impose a higher cost upon every protected manufactured article which he buys. It might be an advantage to an individual farmer if he were able to buy the protected manufactured products which he consumes at the prices they could be purchased for in England or Germany; but if all the farmers should purchase their supplies of these articles at the lower foreign price relative conditions would change at once.

If these goods were all purchased abroad, the destruction of a large portion of the domestic demand for farm products created by the artisans and mechanics employed in manufacturing industries would follow, and a very large number of persons now engaged in other pursuits would be obliged to seek employment in agriculture. If, on the other hand, these manufactures should be purchased of domestic producers at the lower foreign price, this would involve, as we have shown, a reduction of the earnings of operatives and mechanics to the foreign level, and the consequent reduction of their ability to purchase farm products from the domestic supply.

An addition of 5 cents per day to the wages of the workingmen of the country would furnish a market within our own territory equal in extent to the value of the surplus agricultural products now annually exported. If the earnings of all persons engaged in useful occupations in the United States should be reduced to the level of the earnings of the same classes in Great Britain, the purchasing power of our people would be reduced more than $3,000,000,000 per annum, or by a sum equal to the value of all our agricultural products in 1880.

No class of people in the United States have an equal interest with the farmer in the diversification of our industries and in the development of manufactures, for proximity to profitable markets gives increased value to labor and to land and its products.

We append to this report Exhibit D, a statement showing the production, consumption, and exportation of cereals from 1840 to 1887, for the purpose of indicating the relative value to farmers of the foreign and home markets. From this table it will be seen that our total annual exports of all cereals would barely supply domestic consumption for three weeks. If the per capita consumption by our people had not been greater in 1887 than it was in 1860, our surplus for exportation would have been at least five hundred million bushels greater than it was. This increase of consumption per capita is owing to the increased earnings of the masses of our people. If the acreage and production of cereals should remain stationary for a year and a half we should then have no surplus for exportation.

The competition in wheat-growing which has been developed in India, South America, Australia, and in the British possessions in North America, is likely to make unprofitable the production of this cereal for exportation by our people, and to cause the wheat-grower of the Northwest to look to an enlargement of the certain and remunerative home market. This enlarged and profitable market can only be secured by increasing the number of people engaged in other than agricultural pursuits, and by furnishing to all increased employment without diminution of wages. To cripple our manufacturing interests and reduce the purchasing power of our working men will result in augmenting the number of competitors in the field of agricultural production, and the increased supply could, in that event only, find a market in Europe by enforced competition with India at ruinous prices. Wheat can now be laid down in Liverpool from the central provinces of India at as low a cost for transportation as from Chicago, and Indian wheat can be delivered in New York at less cost for transportation than from the wheat-fields of Dakota.

It is for the highest interests of the American farmer that the number of our food consumers rather than of food producers should be increased, and that the general prosperity of all should be secured. It is true that the decline in prices of agricultural products has been very great, but the value of these when measured by the value of clothing, farming utensils, or other necessities of a farmer's life, is much greater now than in any of the years preceding 1860.

REDUCTIONS MADE BY THE HOUSE BILL, AS SHOWN BY THE AVERAGE AD VALOREM RATE.

After months spent in violent attacks upon the protective system, and when, fortunately, the people of the country have become thoroughly aroused to impending danger, the friends of the House bill suddenly discover that it is not a free-trade measure, and that it would not injuriously affect the vital interests of any of the large number of persons employed in American industries. In proof of this it is said that the bill proposes an average reduction of only $4.32 on every $100 of dutiable merchandise imported. The average ad valorem rate assessed on all dutiable goods in 1887 was 47.10 per cent., and it is assumed that the average rate under the terms of the House bill would be 42.78 per cent., and that therefore the percentage of reduction of rates is not more than 9.2 per cent.

It is claimed that this small percentage of reduction of rates proves conclusively that the bill is conservative in its character, that it would not injure any established industry, and that it is not open to the severe criticism to which it has been subjected. It is assumed that the retention of an average ad valorem rate of 42.78 per cent. on dutiable merchandise is conclusive evidence that the bill has no free-trade tendencies.

These statements in regard to the average ad valorem rate imposed by the bill, and the percentage of reductions made by it, are misleading and deceptive. The average percentage of reduction made by the House bill in tariff rates can be estimated by a comparison of the amount which was collected with existing rates upon the importations of the articles named in its various sections, in any given year, with the amount which would have been collected on the same importations if the rates proposed had been operative. The rates imposed by three schedules of the existing tariff, namely, F, H, and L (tobacco, wines and liquors, and silks), are not reduced or changed in any manner by the terms of the bill. In the other schedules the duties on a large number of articles are left unchanged, and these, together with the schedules referred to, should not, of course be taken into consideration in estimating the percentage of reduction of duties or rates.

The value of all the articles upon which the rates of duty are changed by the bill, and which are alone affected by its provisions, imported in 1887, according to the statement furnished by the Committee of Ways and Means and printed in connection with the bill, was $249,806,796.20. Upon these articles there was imposed a duty in 1887 of $136,087,147,77, equivalent to 54.48 per cent. ad valorem. The same articles, if imported under the provisions of the proposed bill, would have paid, according to the same statement, duties to the amount of $86,600,907.62, or an ad valorem rate of 34.67 per cent. The resulting reduction in the amount of duties collected under the House bill on the importations of 1887 would be $49,406,240.15, or a percentage of reduction of 36.36 per cent., instead of 9.2 per cent., as claimed by the friends of the bill.

To ascertain, however, the effect which the bill would have upon protected industries, we should eliminate from this computation the amount collected from the revenue duty imposed upon sugar. If we deduct the value of the importations and amount of duty collected from sugar in 1887, we should then have the value of all imported articles referred to in the bill $175,571,927.80, upon which the duties collected in 1887 amounted to $78,074,855.50. The duties which would have been collected upon these articles under the proposed bill would have amounted to $39,525,789.49, showing a percentage of reduction of duties and rates upon all articles named in the bill, exclusive of sugar, of 49.37 per cent. These articles paid an average ad valorem rate in 1887 under the present law of 44.46 per cent., and would have paid, under the provisions of the House bill, 22.51 per cent. Instead, then, of retaining an average ad valorem rate upon all articles enumerated in the bill of 42.78 per cent., it would actually retain but 22.51 per cent.

The statement of reductions furnished by the House committee does not embrace the reduction which would be produced by putting German looking-glass plates, bags of jute, jute machinery, and several other articles of less importance upon the free-list, nor does it include the reduction which would be made by an important change of classification in Schedule B, reducing the duties on several kinds of china, porcelain ware, etc., from 60 to 35 per cent. If these reductions are taken into consideration it is apparent that the measure reduces the rates of duty more than one-half upon all articles affected by it except sugar.

The average reduction in rates can be estimated by another method, namely, by a direct comparison of every item of existing and proposed rates and finding the percentage of reduction in each case (as shown in Appendix G), and averaging the resulting percentages without regard to the relative importance of the articles or the amount of importations. This method would show an average reduction of 53 per cent.

The alleged conservative character of the bill disappears under this examination, and we find that the average reductions it would produce are more than twice as great as any which have heretofore been proposed by the most courageous revenue reformer.

Many illustrations might be given to show the absurdity of attempting to establish the protective character of a revenue measure by the average ad valorem rate which it imposes upon dutiable articles. It is the distribution and relation of rates, and not the average rate imposed on all articles, which determine the character of a tariff. For instance, the average ad valorem rate imposed upon all dutiable articles by the British tariff in 1887 was 70.07 per cent., and yet it will hardly be claimed that the British tariff is protective in its character.

If all of the articles in our tariff schedules upon which protective duties are levied should be placed upon the free-list and all our protected industries destroyed, and duties should be maintained at present rates upon tobacco, silks, wines and liquors, and sugar, the average ad valorem rate imposed upon dutiable importations would be 71.92 per cent. instead of 47.10, and by this wonderful mathematical process

of ascertaining the extent of protection by the average ad valorem rate, we should find that the nearer we approached to free trade the greater would be the degree of protection afforded our industries. The assurance that after all a high average ad valorem rate was preserved would afford no compensation to the manufacturers or workingmen whose industries were destroyed by the removal of duties. The average rate upon all the schedules, excluding silks, wines, liquors, tobacco, and sugar in 1887, was 37.65 per cent.

The effect of placing articles on the free-list which bear lower rates of duty than the average is obviously to increase the average rates on the remaining dutiable articles. The high average ad valorem rate resulting from our present tariff is owing to the unexampled low prices current for a number of years, and to the high rates of duties levied on tobacco, silks, wines, liquors, and sugar.

The tariff of 1846 is constantly referred to by tariff reformers as a model enactment, and yet if the articles in the four schedules named had been dutiable at the same rates in 1887 which were imposed upon them in 1846 (wines, 40 per cent.; sugar, 30 per cent.; tobacco, 40 per cent.; silks, 30 per cent.), the average ad valorem rates upon all imported merchandise in 1887 would have been 23.69 per cent., or a less rate than was imposed upon all imported merchandise under the act of 1846.

FREE TRADE.

In consequence of the extreme sensitiveness manifested by the authors and supporters of the bill under consideration to the suggestion that they are free-traders, or that the measure which they have proposed looks in the direction of free trade, it may be well to consider what is understood by free trade when the term is used to describe the economic policy of the nation.

It is true there is but one country to which we can look for an illustration, as, with the conspicuous exception of Great Britain, all other commercial nations have rejected the teachings of that school of political economists who dream of universal serenity and prosperity to be accomplished through the adoption of free-trade theories. Free trade, then, judged by the example of Great Britain, does not mean the abolition of custom-houses nor the collection of all revenues by direct taxation. There is annually paid by the people of Great Britain under the provisions of the British tariff an equal sum per capita for duties on imports to that which would be paid by the people of the United States under the provisions of the House bill or of the substitute proposed by your committee.

A free-trade country may be properly described as one which does not impose protective duties upon importations. Lord Salisbury lately defined a free-trader as one who is opposed to protection. Mr. David A. Wells recently said, "Free trade, as an economic principle or politico-commercial system, is the direct opposite to the so-called principle or system of protection." If these definitions are correct the promoters of this bill are self-confessed free-traders, and the denial that they are engaged in a "crusade of free trade" comes too late, for the American people are not likely to forget the lessons of 1844 and the political rallying cry of "Polk, Dallas, and the tariff of '42."

American free-traders, or revenue reformers, as they now choose to call themselves, are hopelessly divided in opinion as to the proper manner of raising the revenue necessary for the support of the Government; many of the more conspicuous are in favor of a single tax upon land; others prefer the direct tax contemplated by our Constitution; some favor the collection of revenue by customs duties upon articles not produced in this country, after the manner of the British tariff; much the larger number, however, are in favor of a general tariff for revenue only, but all oppose with equal ardor the imposition of protective duties, which they declare to be "vicious" and "iniquitous," resulting in "spoliation" and "robbery."

These gentlemen have also differed at times as to the best method of securing the abolition of protective duties and the destruction of the system. They are, however, in substantial agreement that the long line of our industrial defenses can only be carried by concentrating their forces upon that which seems from time to time to be the weakest point. After each repulse or defeat some new point has been selected for the assault. The warfare has usually been directed against the manufacturers of the country, who were declared to be odious monopolists, whose exactions wrung from an unwilling people by the machinery of a protective tariff could be no longer tolerated. The present movement is disguised under the pretense of a purpose to assist and emancipate our overburdened manufacturers.

Great ingenuity has been shown in the construction of the varied and various reform measures which have been introduced in Congress from year to year, but in all the common purpose of destroying the protective system has never been lost sight of. The free-trade programme embodied in the bill now under consideration was adopted in 1885, after the defeat of the so-called Morrison horizontal reduction bill of 1884.

In November, 1885, the free-traders and revenue reformers of the country met in national conference at Chicago, under the auspices of the American Free Trade League, to decide upon a plan for renewing the attack upon the common enemy. This important conference, after prolonged discussion, determined to urge upon their friends in Congress the adoption of the policy outlined in the following resolutions:

We therefore urge upon Congress for action at the ensuing session—

1. That, under no pretense, shall any countenance be given to attempts to increase protective duties.

2. That articles which are at the foundation of great industries should, in the interest of labor and commerce, be freed from duty, whether they be crude materials (as lumber, salt, coal, ore, wool, etc.) or partly manufactured (as chemicals, dye-stuffs, tin-plate, wood-pulp, etc.).

3. That on products from such articles duties should be at least correspondingly reduced, so that protection, real or nominal, to manufacturers shall not be increased and that the consumer shall have the immediate benefit of the reduction.

We urge that any steps in tariff reform should simplify the present complicated classification, and should do away with mixed duties, replacing them by ad valorem rates, instead of specific duties, which are most burdensome on low-priced goods consumed by the great body of the people.

These resolutions were prefaced by a long preamble, declaring, among other things, that "every protective feature must at the earliest day be eradicated from our revenue system."

A careful comparison of the provisions of the House bill now under consideration with the detailed suggestions contained in the resolutions will show with what fidelity the programme of the free-trade conference has been followed in every essential particular.

At the conference a suggestion was made that it might be advisable to memorialize the President on this subject, but the presiding officer, Mr. David A. Wells, responded:

We can trust the President of the United States.

This confident and significant assertion was publicly made a year before the President sent the annual message to Congress in which he enunciated the policy of the Administration and of his party upon the lines laid down by the free-trade conference, and in which he sought to enforce the soundness of the position they had taken by the use of arguments which had become familiar through constant reiteration for half a century by free-traders on both sides of the Atlantic.

The controversy, however, between the opponents and the friends of the bill under consideration is not one over names or phrases; it is a contest between those who support and those who oppose the American system of defensive duties; and this conflict is as irrepressible as that which was waged between the respective friends of freedom and slavery. There is, moreover, the same irreconcilable antagonism between a protective tariff and a tariff for revenue as that which exists between protection and absolute free trade. The definition of revenue duties given by Secretary Walker, their most distinguished advocate, and one which has been generally accepted by his followers, carefully and effectually excludes all idea of protection.

A duty, whether high or low, which does not equal the difference in cost of production in this and in any competing country of the article upon which it is levied is not protective.

If a duty is protective it matters not to the labor employed in an industry whether it is so accidentally, incidentally, or whether it is levied with full knowledge and intent of the result which is to follow. If the rate is below the protective line it has no defensive virtue and confers no benefits upon domestic manufactures. The debate is between those who believe that protective duties may be levied in pursuance of a wise public policy and those who believe that all protective duties are indefensible; and in this discussion the advocates of the House bill necessarily take their places among the opponents of the protective system.

LABOR COST OF PRODUCTION.

It is asserted that the rates of duty retained by the House bill must be sufficiently protective to the labor employed in our various manufacturing industries, as these rates on all manufactured articles are greater than the entire sum paid in each case for labor in producing the article. For illustration, it is claimed that, as the average rate proposed by the bill on manufactures of cotton is 39.07 per cent., and as the assumed average labor cost in these manufactures is but 21.06 per cent., it may be said (even though competing nations should reduce the wages of labor in this industry to the lowest possible minimum) that the duties retained would much more than equalize the larger sum paid by the American producer for labor. The census of 1880 and the first annual report of the Commissioner of Labor are quoted in corroboration of these and similar statements in regard to other industries. The labor cost of producing a ton of pig-iron in various parts of the United States is assumed to be from 8.55 to 16.71 per cent. of the total cost of production, and as the rate of duty proposed by the bill on pig-iron is $6 a ton, or nearly 55 cent. of the foreign prices, it is therefore said to be evident that this duty could be still further reduced more than one-half and yet be amply protective of the labor employed in this industry.

The extravagance of these statements and the falsity of the deduction made from them are apparent when we consider that the percentage of labor cost in each case is based upon the amount paid for labor at a single stage of the long process of manufacture.

In the ultimate analysis, the cost of production of manufactured articles is the cost of the labor or services of man. The cost of the original elements in their natural state, before they are advanced in value by labor, is insignificant. If, in computing the cost of production, we

should exclude the sums paid for taxes, insurance, interest, and retained for accruing profits, a large portion of which represents payments for labor and services, and which together would rarely amount to 10 per cent. of the entire cost, we should then find the labor cost in all cases to be at least 90 per cent. of the total expenditure.

Mr. Edward Atkinson, in a carefully prepared statement published in April, 1887, demonstrates that of the total cost of producing medium shirtings, worth 6¼ cents a yard, the proportion paid for labor at various stages (on the plantation, in transportation, in factories, etc.) was 92.12 per cent., the remaining portion, 7.88 per cent., being absorbed in interest, insurance, profits, etc. This estimate is confirmed in a striking manner by the following statement of Hon. A. S. Hewitt, made at a hearing before the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives, February 21, 1884, the subject under discussion being the percentage of labor cost in the manufacture of iron.

Mr. Hewitt said:

> The percentage of labor involved in the production of any give article depends upon where you begin to estimate the percentage. If you begin with a steel-rail mill, which uses pig-iron, the labor will be from 25 to 30 per cent. The actual wages paid by a wire mill will amount to about 29 per cent. of the cost. If you include labor in the blast-furnace that would make it 60 per cent. But if you go on back to the ore bed, and put in everything which was paid out from the ore bed, the percentage of labor would have been about 90 per cent. I say this because the gentleman (Mr. Thomas G. Shearman, of Brooklyn, N. Y.) proposes to overthrow facts within my knowledge, and for which I pay. I say the amount which I pay out for labor, when I include every particle of raw material beginning at the ground—and I am a miner both of ore and coal—I have never, with all my anxiety to get it down, got it below 90 per cent. on the value of the finished product.
>
> Mr. MILLS. What is the finished product?
>
> Mr. HEWITT. Any finished product. I make bar-iron.
>
> Mr. MILLS. Is pig-iron a finished product?
>
> Mr. HEWITT. The labor in pig-iron will be 90 per cent. of the cost. It actually takes 90 per cent. of the cost of the article for labor when you include everything, from the beginning to the end.

That which is shown to be true by the intelligent testimony of these two eminent tariff reformers in regard to the manufactures of cotton and iron is equally true in regard to every other manufactured product. The adequacy of a rate of duty for defensive purposes can not properly be determined by ascertaining the sum paid for labor in any one of the many operations necessary to transform natural elements into fully manufactured products. The larger earnings and greater cost of labor at every stage and in all contributory occupations should be taken into consideration, and the rates should always be equal to the resulting increased cost of production. As all of our people engaged in every occupation contribute to and share in the benefits of profitable production, so all are alike vitally interested in the maintenance of a policy which secures and enlarges the area of national industrial success.

The futility of attempting to adjust rates of duty, levied to equalize foreign and American prices, on the basis of the mathematical relation which these rates bear to that small portion of the labor cost of production which is included in the census tables, is demonstrated by the following illustration:

The labor cost of manufacturing worsted goods, according to the census reports, is 16.23 per cent. The actual relative cost of producing No. 36 worsted yarns in the United States and in England, as shown in detail by some tables submitted to the House of Representatives May 12, 1888, by Hon. WILLIAM L. SCOTT, of Pennsylvania, assuming wool to be free from duty in the United States and the cost of wool to be the same in both cases, is 59 cents per pound in England and 90 cents in the United States. It will be seen that to equalize the cost of production between the two countries in this case a duty of 52.54 per cent. must be imposed by our tariff. If a duty of 16.23 per cent. should be levied, the cost of English yarn laid down in New York, duty paid, would be, say, 69 cents per pound, as against 90 cents cost to the American manufacturer; and American production would cease unless wages of labor in this and all collateral industries were reduced to the English standard.

The same tables show the relative cost of manufacturing the same number of yarn from a different grade of wool to be 52 cents in England and 80 cents in the United States. In this case a defensive duty of 53.84 per cent. would be necessary. Mr. SCOTT'S tables also, it will be observed, prove conclusively the inadequacy of the rate of duty (40 per cent.) proposed by the House bill upon worsted manufactures.

We are further assured by our tariff-reform friends that the cost of production of many leading manufactures is not greater in the United States, and in some cases is even less, than in competing countries. The most casual examination of the comparisons upon which these assertions are founded will disclose their unreliable character, as in most instances they are based upon dissimilar articles, produced under entirely different conditions.

The general inaccuracy of the statement that manufactures of cotton, iron, wool, or steel can be produced in this country at an equal or lower cost per unit of quantity than in England, Germany, or France is known to every intelligent observer, and is clearly established by the fact that we import annually $175,000,000 in value of these manufactures that are successfully sold in competition with our domestic productions after the payment of duties which we are told are exorbitant. In all cases the greater cost of producing the manufactures to the American producer is due to the greater wages or larger earnings of the workingmen of this country. The fact that all persons employed in American production—and this includes all who are engaged in useful occupations—receive very much larger sums for their labor, whether the compensation is measured by money or by the necessaries and comforts of life, than those who are engaged in similar employment in any other country is now generally admitted.

While revenue reformers are forced to admit the truth of this statement, they claim that the better-paid labor in the United States gives to the American manufacturers lower cost of production on account of the greater activity and efficiency of American workingmen, and that this condition is the legitimate result of the general economic law that high wages are an unerring indication of low cost of product. To say that greater wages per hour or per day can be paid in America than in Europe for attending the same machinery, running at the same speed an equal number of hours, and turning out the same quantity and kinds of goods, and yet that the cost of production will be lower in America, is to state an absurdity; and yet these are the actual relative conditions which govern the production of a large portion of our manufactures. It is true that the cost of production does not in all cases depend solely upon the sum paid for the wages or earnings of employés. There may be climatic advantages, the more extensive or effective use of machinery, greater skill in superintendence or manipulation, more favorable situation in reference to markets, greater experience, intelligence, vigor, or artistic taste of workmen. When all or most of these advantages exist in a country or community the highest rate of wages is not inconsistent with relatively low cost of production.

In the manufacture of textile fabrics and many other branches of industry it can not be truthfully claimed that we have any considerable advantage in most of the respects named over England, Germany, France, or Belgium. In these days of fierce competition between all industrial communities the adoption of a new invention or an improvement in methods in one country becomes immediately known in all the others. Practically, the intelligent and successful manufacturers in all these countries use the same machinery and employ substantially the same methods in production. If we should consult English authorities, we would find a general agreement of opinion that English operatives are more efficient than those of any other nation in the world. On this point Mr. J. S. Jeans, in a recent publication, makes the following statement:

> On the contrary, there is abundant proof of the fact that in this respect England continues *facile princeps*. The efficiency of English factory labor continues to remain, as it has ever been, unsurpassed. This attribute is established by many conclusive evidences. * * * In the United States, which, after the United Kingdom, is now the greatest cotton-manufacturing country in the world, the increase in the number of spindles per operative has been practically the same in amount as in the United Kingdom; but the average productiveness of the cotton operatives of the United Kingdom, as expressed in the number of spindles used per employé, is 47 per cent. greater than the same class of workers in America. In factory operations, moreover, English operatives turn out more work per employé than those of any other country, whether measured by the number of spindles which they tend or by the quantity of yarn they spin.

This view of the relative efficiency of labor in the two countries is not shared by intelligent observers in the United States. It is undoubtedly true that American workingmen and mechanics have greater intelligence, activity, and enterprise, and that these qualities more than offset the advantages of association, surroundings, and the inherited skill of generations which the operatives of Great Britain possess. But it is also true, even with this superior activity and intelligence, and all the other industrial advantages which we may possess, that the cost to the American manufacturer of accomplishing certain equivalent results—say, of producing similar yards of cotton or woolen, or pounds of iron—is much greater than to his foreign competitor, owing to the much greater cost here of labor or services in production. The tables submitted by Mr. SCOTT, and elsewhere referred to, establish the truth of this statement with reference to one industry. We might multiply indefinitely examples in regard to others, showing the greater cost per unit of quantity of the similar articles to American manufacturers, thus enforcing the necessity of adequate protective duties to insure the continued industrial prosperity of the United States.

MANUFACTURERS' PROFITS.

It may perhaps be proper in this connection to make an allusion to another fiction extracted from the census reports, which has formed the basis of many tariff-reform arguments in and out of Congress. It has been assumed that the protective policy has enabled the manufacturers of the country to make enormous profits in the prosecution of their business, and that the extent of their net profits could be accurately ascertained from the census tables by deducting the sums reported as paid for materials and labor from the value of the gross product in each case. These net profits are said to vary from 25 to 67 per cent. per annum, and from this it is claimed that capital employed in manufactures is much better rewarded than that employed in agriculture or commerce.

When we consider that the sums returned to the census officials as having been paid for materials and labor do not include the cost of superintendence, administrative labor, insurance, taxes, depreciation of plant, interest, commissions, transportation, losses by bad debts, or

other inevitable elements of cost, the worthless character of these statements and any conclusions which may be based upon them is apparent. If the aggregate expenditures for these unenumerated elements of cost should also be deducted from the total value of products, the average net profits would be found but little, if any, above the average commercial rate of interest.

Experience in industrial communities has demonstrated the fact that whenever the profits in cotton, woolen, or other branches of manufacture much exceed the customary rate of interest, new establishments are erected, new competition is enlisted, and the normal rate of profit is soon restored.

The census tables contain no statistics which were intended to indicate, or which can possibly be made to show the net profits in any trade or business, and all conclusions based on figures obtained in the manner described are equally unreliable.

If any inference could be drawn from the census tables bearing upon the question whether the protective system has increased or diminished sums paid for labor or the earnings of capital, a comparison should be made between the census of 1880 and 1860. The census of 1860 would show a profit to the cotton manufacturers of 35.6 per cent. as against 23.5 per cent. in 1880; to the woolen manufacturers of 47.9 per cent. in 1860 instead of 28.5 in 1880; and in all the manufacture of iron 30.8 per cent. in 1860 instead of 21.1 per cent. in 1880. If any value whatever, therefore, could be accorded to this method of ascertaining profits, it would be shown that a revenue tariff such as existed in 1860 secured much greater profits to the manufacturer and much smaller remuneration to labor than a protective tariff. It may be safely assumed, however, that this class of statements is made for circulation in communities where there is little or no knowledge of industrial methods and results, and where their falsity and absurdity may not be understood.

WAR TARIFF.

The criticism of our tariff laws which is urged with most pertinacity is based upon the assumption that we are maintaining in time of profound peace a war tariff enacted to provide for the enormous expenditures incurred between 1861 and 1866. It is frequently claimed that the rates which are now imposed are greater even than those which were levied during the war. The chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means, in his opening speech upon the bill now under consideration, said:

> The duties on imports were raised from an average of 18.84 per cent. in 1861 to an average of 40.29 per cent. on dutiable goods during the five years from 1862 to 1866, inclusive. These war taxes still remain, and they are heavier to-day than they were on an average during the five years of the existence of hostilities.

This statement would lead to the inference that an increase of rates of duties upon imports had taken place since the close of the war. The assurance with which all opponents of the protective system join in a vigorous demand for the repeal of what they choose to call "war-tariff taxes" has created a popular misapprehension as to the nature of the changes which have taken place in our tariff since 1865. The best answer to this demand may be found in a simple recital of facts.

Three important revisions of the tariff have taken place since 1870, namely, by the acts of July 14, 1870, of June 6, 1872, and of March 3, 1883. Minor changes in rates have been made from time to time by other acts.

By the provisions of the act of July 14, 1870, 178 dutiable articles were placed on the free-list. These included many crude materials in use by our manufacturers, the produce of foreign countries, which did not come in competition with American products. The rates of duty were reduced upon 50 articles. By the act of June 6, 1872, 213 items were added to the free list, and duties were specifically reduced on 49 articles in addition to those upon which a uniform reduction of 10 per cent. was made.

By the act of March 3, 1883, 72 additional articles were placed upon the free-list, while the rates were reduced on 427 paragraphs, embracing every schedule and almost every article upon the dutiable list.

In view of the constant misrepresentations which have been made as to the character and extent of the reductions made by the act of March 3, 1883, we have had the following table prepared by a competent expert, showing the percentage of reduction made in rates by that act:

Statement of rates reduced by the act of March 3, 1883.

Number of items reduced.	Percentage of reduction.	Number of items reduced.	Percentage of reduction.
2	10	33	40 to 45
68	10 to 15	3	45 to 50
44	15 to 20	44	50 to 60
50	20 to 25	15	60 to 70
85	25 to 30	7	70 to 80
48	30 to 35	1	80 to 100
27	35 to 40	72	100

Estimated average reduction in rates, 38.5 per cent.

Those who were responsible for this act did not intend that rates should be reduced below the protective point in any case where protection was desirable. But experience has shown that in some cases they were mistaken in judgment. With changed conditions many of the low rates then adopted have proved inadequate.

The revision of March 3, 1883, left the rates upon nearly all articles mentioned in our tariff schedules greatly below those which had been levied prior to July 14, 1870. For instance, the rate on every item in the woolen schedule had been largely reduced. This is also true of every item in the cotton schedule except manufactures of cotton not otherwise provided for. All manufactures of iron and steel, with a few unimportant exceptions, had been changed. All but two of the rates in the earthenware schedule had been amended. The duties upon common window-glass had been largely reduced. The chemical schedule had been entirely recast, and great reductions in rates had taken place. The list of the articles which remain dutiable at rates which were imposed in 1870 includes the agricultural products, a few manufactured articles of minor importance with rates from 20 to 30 per cent., several fancy articles, like perfumery, cosmetics, and artificial flowers, upon which a revenue duty of 50 per cent. was laid, and the articles enumerated in the flax, hemp, and jute schedule, upon which the duties have never been protective. As to all the great protected industries, changes in phraseology and radical reductions in rates had been made.

The magnitude of these reductions is best shown by the statement that if the rates of duty imposed by our tariff laws prior to the act of July 14, 1870, had been applied to the importations in 1887 the amount of duties collected in the latter year would have been $359,629,117.15, or an excess of $139,596,693.25 above the amount which was actually collected under the provisions of existing law; in other words, if our revenue from customs in 1887 had been collected under the provisions of the war tariff, it would have been 65.65 per cent. greater than the amount which was collected. The average ad valorem rate upon all importations of merchandise in 1887, dutiable and free, was 31.13 per cent. If upon these importations war tariff rates had been levied the average ad valorem rate would have been 51.76 per cent.

These statements would seem to effectually dispose of the claim that our tariff rates are as high or higher now than they were during the war. It is true that the average ad valorem rate levied upon dutiable goods in 1887 was higher than the average ad valorem rate on dutiable goods in the years prior to 1870. This is owing to the unexampled decline in prices which has been going on with increasing rapidity for the past fifteen years. As an illustration of the effect which the lowering of prices has had upon average ad valorem rates when specific duties are levied, the following table is inserted:

Year.	Average ad valorem rate on dutiable imports.	Average rate on all dutiable imports, with sugar dutiable at 45 per cent. ad valorem.	Average ad valorem rate on sugar.
1884	41.61	39.87	53.95
1885	45.86	40.74	73.66
1886	45.55	41. 3	70.40
1887	47.10	38.67	82.04

The third column shows the average ad valorem rates on sugar for the years 1884–'87. During these years no change in rates on sugar took place, and yet we have an apparent increase in rates of 52 per cent. in four years. This change was due to the decline in the price of sugar from an average of 3.6 cents per pound in 1884 to 2.7 in 1885, 2.8 in 1886, and 2.5 in 1887. When the present rate of duty on sugar was fixed in 1883 it was equivalent to 45 per cent. ad valorem on the unit of value of importations of 1882, which was 4.4 cents per pound. If, instead of imposing an average specific duty of 2 cents a pound, the act of 1883 had imposed upon sugar an ad valorem rate of 45 per cent. and all other rates had remained as they are in the act the result would have been the steadily diminishing average ad valorem rates shown in the second column instead of the constantly increasing rates in the first column, which are based on actual importations and existing rates. It is evident that if the prices of merchandise current during the war, or in 1864, for example, had been maintained without diminution the average ad valorem rate on the importation of 1887 would have been greatly below the lowest average of any year of the war. The enormous decline in the prices of both domestic and foreign products, without any reduction in their relative cost of production, has had the effect to greatly diminish the protection afforded by an equal ad valorem rate of duty.

During the years from 1862 to 1878 the premium on gold in the United States had the effect of increasing the protective barrier. For the purpose of illustrating the rapidly-diminishing amount of protec-

tion afforded by a uniform rate of duty of 35 per cent. ad valorem, maintained from 1864 to 1886, we have prepared the following table:

Year.	Foreign prices of merchandise. As shown by the Economist's index number.	Foreign prices of merchandise. Equivalent in United States currency.	Protection afforded per unit of quantity in each year by an ad valorem duty of 35 per cent.	Ad valorem equivalent in each year of the specific amount of duty imposed in 1886.
				Per cent
1864	172	$3.49	$1.32	9
1865	162	2.59	.91	12
1866	161	2.27	.79	14
1867	137	1.89	.66	17
1868	122	1.71	.60	19
1869	121	1.61	.56	20
1870	122	1.40	.49	23
1871	118	1.32	.46	24
1872	129	1.44	.50	22
1873	134	1.53	.54	21
1874	131	1.45	.51	22
1875	126	1.45	.51	22
1876	123	1.37	.49	25
1877	124	1.30	.46	25
1878	115	1.16	.41	28
1879	100	1.00	.35	32
1880	115	1.15	.40	23
1881	108	1.08	.38	30
1882	111	1.11	.39	29
1883	107	1.07	.37	30
1884	101	1.01	.35	32
1885	95	.95	.33	35
1886	92	.92	.32	35

For a standard of foreign values and of the changes which have taken place from year to year in the foreign prices upon which ad valorem duties are levied we have taken the well-known index numbers of the London Economist. These tables, prepared for the purpose of showing the movement of English prices, are widely accepted as authority on this subject. They are based on the annual average of the wholesale prices in England of twenty-two articles of commercial importance. The average of prices for the years 1845–1850, represented by the number 100, is used as the standard in each case.

We have assumed for this comparison that the index number in the first column represents the value in dollars and cents of some unit of quantity of merchandise imported into the United States. The second column shows the equivalent value of the same unit in each year in United States currency. The third column shows the relative amount of protection on each unit of quantity which would have been afforded the American producer in each year by an uniform ad valorem rate of 35 per cent. The fourth column shows what the equivalent ad valorem would have been in each year if a specific duty had been levied during the whole period equal to the sum assessed in 1887. It will be noticed that an ad valorem rate of 35 per cent. in 1887 furnishes no greater measure of protection than 9 per cent. would have afforded in 1864.

There are a number of important changes in business conditions, aside from the decline in prices, which have had the effect to diminish the protection afforded by tariff rates. These are (1) the much greater extent to which undervaluation is now successfully carried on; (2) the much greater facilities afforded our merchants for making foreign purchases, and the much less time required for the delivery of the goods purchased; and (3) the greatly reduced cost of trans-Atlantic transportation. A striking example of the effects of cheapened transportation was furnished by the statement of a large manufacturer before your committee, that merchandise could now be transported and landed on the wharf in New York from Liverpool more cheaply than it could be carted to the same wharf from a factory in Brooklyn.

It is important to take into consideration in connection with the examination of the foregoing table that the relative cost of production in Great Britain and the United States in the years named has not materially changed. The increase of the earnings of labor and the resulting increase in the labor cost of production have been greater in the United States than in England since 1860, and the actual sum required in nearly all cases for the sufficient protection of American labor against foreign competition is greater now than in the past. The accuracy of the statement of the greater increase since 1860 in the earnings of labor in the United States than in Great Britain is shown by the following table, in which we have also included the relative cost of living in the two countries at the time the comparison of wages is made:

Comparison of earnings and cost of living of workingmen in Great Britain and United States in years named.

	Earnings per annum. 1860.	Earnings per annum. 1885-'86.	Increase, per cent.		Cost of living per annum. 1860.	Cost of living per annum. 1885-'86.	Increase, per cent.
Great Britain:							
*For each family..	$292	$389	33	*Great Britain, for each family	$308	$349	13
*For each person employed.....	184	206	12	United States, for each person.....	124	112	†11
United States, for each person employed:							
‡Class 1	735	1,242	69				
‡Class 2	468	720	54				
‡Class 3	399	540	35				
‡Class 4	303	420	39				

*Professor L. Levi, "Wages and earnings of working classes." For years 1857 and 1884.

†Decrease.

‡Mr. Edward Atkinson, The Forum, September, 1888, pages 26 to 27.

CLASS I. Specially skilled men, foremen, overseers, boss blacksmiths, carpenters, etc., customarily earning $3 to $5 per day at the present time.

CLASS II. Average mechanics, engineers, blacksmiths, carpenters, machinists, and painters, connected with establishments reported in volume XX of the Census, 1865 to 1880, inclusive.

CLASS III. All the operatives, except foremen and overseers, in 100 establishments, reporting the wages of their working people under more than 1,200 separate titles: bricks, marble, furniture, agricultural implements, tinware, stoves, boots, hats, cars, wagons, flour and saw mills, iron, paper, and textiles, employing men, women, and children, from 20 to 2,000 in each.

CLASS IV. Laborers computed separately, connected with above establishments.

It will be noticed that while the increase in average wages has been much greater in the United States than in Great Britain within the period named, the cost of living has increased in Great Britain and decreased in the United States. In view of these facts, it is not strange that the laborers employed in the production of articles subject to low ad valorem rates are vigorously demanding further protection, and it is remarkable that in such cases any successful competition is now possible.

These considerations establish the necessity for a frequent revision of tariff rates if an equal and just protection is to be afforded at all times. If all the rates imposed by our war tariff had been maintained without change, the specific rates would now have been excessive and the ad valorem rates would have been inadequate. As a matter of fact, the specific rates have all, we think, without an exception, been largely reduced, and the ad valorem rates have also in many cases been improvidently cut down.

The practical question which we have to solve is not the date when duties were established or the circumstances or promises under which they were levied, but, the desirability of protection being conceded, it is, what rates are proper and adequate under existing conditions.

INTERNAL-REVENUE TAX ON DISTILLED SPIRITS.

Sections 29 to 34, inclusive, and sections 36, 38, and 40 of the House bill, are intended to modify existing laws relating to the tax on distilled spirits. Your committee do not recommend their adoption.

The sections, when taken together, can not be construed by your committee as having any other effect than to open wide the door to fraud in the collection of taxes on distilled spirits. The cost of distilling spirits from grain, without the tax, is not more on an average than 20 to 25 cents per gallon, while the tax on each gallon is 90 cents, or nearly 400 per cent. upon the cost of the spirits. This great temptation to fraud led Congress many years ago to pass rigid statutes relating to taxes upon distilled spirits, which are chiefly embodied in chapter 4, Title XXXV, of the Revised Statutes. When enacted they were found absolutely necessary to make it possible to collect the bulk of the tax, as under the laws prior to their passage the frauds were so great as to almost entirely destroy the revenue from this source.

Experience has shown that with all these safeguards it has been exceedingly difficult in some sections of our country to enforce the law against illicit distillation. Notably has this been the case in several States south of the Ohio and Potomac Rivers, where large numbers of small distilleries were and still are located, about fourteen hundred in all. It is quite clear to your committee that the general result of the House provisions would be to make it impossible in the future to effectively collect the tax upon distilled spirits, as by these provisions all safeguards against illicit distilling and all the efficient machinery for the detection and punishment of fraud are removed.

It is estimated that with all existing safeguards there are annually produced about 6,000,000 to 8,000,000 gallons that do not pay the tax, and it is notably true that in some of the Southern markets spirits are sold at a price little above the amount of the tax. It would seem that if this tax is to be maintained, greater restrictions should be provided, rather than provisions looking to the relaxation of existing laws.

Section 36 of the House bill is the chief section, and the other sec-

tions are merely tributary or auxiliary; it amends section 3255 of the Revised Statutes by adding a provision which authorizes the Secretary of the Treasury to exempt distilleries mashing less than 25 bushels of grain per day from the operations of the provision of the law relating to the manufacture of spirits, and establishes an entirely new principle for the collection of taxes upon spirits produced by them.

The tax is now levied upon the spirits actually produced, whereas this new provision requires that upon the class of distilleries named the tax shall be levied and collected on the capacity of the distilleries, without reference to the amount of spirits actually produced. This is an entirely novel provision in our internal-revenue laws relating to spirits, as from the beginning the aim has been to collect the tax upon the spirits produced. All experience in this and other countries has shown that it is impossible to collect the tax simply upon the capacity of a distillery, as is here proposed. This has been tried in Germany and Austria, and both Governments were soon forced to abandon the system and annul all contracts with distillers, although these contracts in some cases run for a long period of years, and there, as here, the tax is now collected on the actual product. The tax has been collected on the product for a great number of years in Great Britain, as there, also, it has been found that this is the only safe mode of collecting the tax.

This amendment also provides that such distilleries may be run and operated without store-keepers or store-keepers and gaugers.

The presence of store-keepers or store-keepers and gaugers under existing law is found necessary to make sure that the entire product of the distillery pays the tax; if they are removed, the only knowledge the internal-revenue officers can have of the amount produced is the knowledge imparted by the distiller himself, whose interests would be to report the smallest possible production.

The effect of section 3255 thus amended would therefore be to remove from every such distillery all the restraints and safeguards now provided by law against illicit distillation, and this applies to every distillery which has a practical capacity of producing 100 gallons of distilled spirits per day, upon which the daily tax would be $90. It leaves the distiller without supervision in his work of distillation, with the expectation that he will make honest returns at the end of each month of the amount distilled.

A capacity tax must be based upon an estimate of the amount of spirits which can be obtained from each bushel of grain within a certain fixed time. In practical distillation the best results are secured by mashing each bushel of grain in not less than forty to forty-five gallons of water with a fermenting period of not less than seventy-two hours. But with half the quantity of water and the use of an extra quantity of yeast the grain can be fermented and distilled in twelve hours. The yield per bushel of grain in this case would be much less, but the aggregate quantity of spirits produced daily would greatly exceed that permitted by any reasonable official survey, and this increased amount would of course escape payment of the tax. But if the period should be extended from twelve to twenty-four or thirty-six hours, the capacity, as compared with the measure of the still, would then be largely increased, and the Government would depend entirely for the collection of its revenue upon the honesty of the distiller.

Each bushel of corn, it is estimated, produces from 3½ to 4 gallons of proof spirits with a fermenting period of seventy-two hours. With a fermenting period of half that time, the yield would probably be three-fourths of this amount. As grain is the chief material used, the small relative cost of which compared with the tax to be paid would enable the distillery to use the grain (which, for the purpose of feeding to stock, loses little of its value) in a wasteful way, so that the temptation to force the fermenting period into twelve or twenty-four or thirty-six hours, and thus double the product of the distillery, would be so great that in most cases its adoption by these small distillers would follow.

This section would afford the opportunity to establish any number of small distilleries of a much less capacity than 25 bushels per day in out-of-the-way places, in mountain regions, and in houses and cellars, where opportunity of detection would be small, and where, if detected, they would only be required to pay tax on the declared capacity of the distillery.

These small distilleries could be set up at a slight cost, would be portable, and could be removed from place to place easily without detection, and the product of a single week of any one of these small stills would more than pay for the original cost of the apparatus.

From the experience of the Internal Revenue Office for many years it is believed that the tax is now collected upon all spirits distilled in the large distilleries, as in them the safeguards of existing law have proved effectual, and the chief trouble in the administration of the law results from the difficulty of controlling small distilleries and suppressing illicit distilleries in mountain regions and in out-of-the-way places. But for the frauds in the States where these small distilleries most abound the system for the collection of tax on distilled spirits would be regarded as perfect as practicable. These frauds, however, do not probably exceed in the aggregate more than 10 per cent. of the entire amount of spirits distilled in the country. It is because of the safeguards alluded to that the tax has yielded so large a revenue.

If the percentage of fraudulent distillation should be measurably increased it would not be long before the large distilleries which now pay a tax upon all the spirits produced would be obliged to abandon the field in competition with small distilleries which would not be required to pay upon anything but the estimate of the amount produced—on the capacity of their stills.

The small distillers have no reason to ask for this legislation if engaged in the honest production of spirits. The cost to them of such production, so far as the Government is concerned, is no greater than to the distilleries of larger capacity, as the cost of supervision through the medium of gaugers, storekeepers, etc., is not paid by them, but out of the Treasury, and there is no reason why any honest distiller, whether his distillery be of large or small capacity, should complain of Government supervision, *i. e.*, if he means to pay the tax upon the actual amount of spirits produced.

Whatever may be the strength of public opinion in the States where these small distilleries are numerous, the Government can not afford to relax the efficient and necessary safeguards thrown around the production of spirits simply for the purpose of relieving these people from proper supervision which compels the payment of the tax. But the effect of section 36 would be not only to open the door for fraud where these small distilleries are now located, but with the temptation of a profit of 400 per cent. in favor of successful illicit distillation the small distilleries would soon be found in every State of the Union where either corn or molasses could be easily procured, and the distiller honestly paying his tax, whether small or large, would soon disappear.

It may be said that the section only authorizes the Secretary of the Treasury to exempt such distilleries from the restrictive provisions of the Revised Statutes and that he may refuse these exemptions. But this officer has no discretion; he must levy the tax upon the capacity of the distillery, and this mode of levy would be the primal source of fraud.

But if this section should become a law no Secretary of the Treasury would feel that he had any discretion respecting its other requirements, as they would be no more imperative upon the Secretary if the law should read "the Secretary of the Treasury shall exempt all distilleries," etc. The word "may," here used, is equivalent to a legislative direction to the Secretary of the Treasury as to what he shall do in the case described.

It is an expression of the legislative will that in cases of distilleries mashing less than 25 bushels of grain per day the existing law should not apply with its rigid requirements, but that in such cases the integrity of the distiller should be substituted for the restraints of law applied to distilleries having a larger capacity.

It is true that the elaborate provisions of our internal-revenue laws respecting the punishment for illicit distillation of spirits are rigorous and the fines and penalties in many cases severe, but they are absolutely essential to the enforcement of the law and to the collection of the revenue derived from the distillation of spirits. These laws are respected and obeyed without question by nine-tenths of our people, and in a large portion of our territory. The penalties, though severe, are only for wrong-doing, and it would be extremely unwise to remove the restrictions, which operate as a protection to all manufacturers of spirits who now honestly pay their taxes, for the purpose of placating individuals or localities which, it is well understood, hold all our revenue laws in contempt. If this source of revenue is to be abandoned, it should be done openly by a repeal of the statutes, rather than by their relaxation to an extent which would ultimately end in this result.

The Commissioner of Internal Revenue, with the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury, is authorized to make such rules and regulations as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of the section; thus substituting for provisions of the statute restrictive in their nature, which apply to all distillers, the rules and regulations which a Commissioner of Internal Revenue, with the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury, may choose to make respecting this class. But these rules and regulations must be in accord with the spirit of the section, which is that every restraint of law shall be removed from a distiller who mashes less than 25 bushels of grain per day, and must not be in contravention of the novel provision, hitherto unknown in our laws, of making two rules for the collection of the tax, namely: the capacity rule for one set of distillers, and the rule of the amount of spirits produced for another. The injustice of such legislative discrimination need only be stated to be condemned.

Section 36 is supplemented by other provisions intended to shield not only these small distillers, but all distillers from the rigorous provisions of existing law.

Section 30 is a complicated section, having the effect to impede any process looking toward the arrest or prosecution of offenders under the internal-revenue laws by providing that no warrant shall issue upon information and belief, except upon the affidavit of collector, or deputy collector, or internal-revenue agent, thus excluding all other revenue officers, such as store-keepers, gaugers, etc., who, by reason of their official positions, may have information and belief which would

justify them in making complaint and no private person can make complaint except the facts are within his own personal knowledge.

It provides, further, that no fee shall be paid to either marshals, clerks, or commissioners unless there be a conviction, or unless the prosecution has been approved, either before or after such arrest, by the attorney of the United States for the district where the offense is alleged to have been committed, or unless the prosecution was commenced by information or indictment. Thus, in cases of violations of the internal-revenue laws, it would be necessary for a complicated investigation to be gone through with before any such prosecution could be instituted.

It is impossible for internal-revenue agents to hear complaints and thus be able to make affidavit on information and belief, as there are only twenty of them in all, and they are occupied chiefly in the examination of accounts, giving information to officers as to their method of conducting business, etc. Collectors and deputy collectors are engaged in the detail work of their offices and may be at a great distance from the place where the fraud is being committed. The section would require preliminary trial by a collector or deputy collector before a prosecution could be instituted. The marshals, who under the law are required to execute any process pre-ented, are informed in advance that they shall have no pay unless there is a conviction, which necessarily implies that the marshal, before he serves process, must enter into an examination of the probability of a conviction or else discharge his duties without compensation.

Section 34 minimizes the penalty for intentional violation of the internal-revenue laws. This section is a substitute for section 3176 of the Revised Statutes, which provides that if any person refuses or neglects to make any return or list for taxation, as required by law, or who renders a false or fraudulent return or list, the Commissioner of Internal Revenue shall assess the tax, and in case of any return of a false or fraudulent list or valuation, the Commissioner shall add 100 per cent. to such tax. So that in case of actual fraud, under section 3176 of the Revised Statutes, the penalty is 100 per cent.; but in case of a refusal or neglect only, except in cases of sickness or absence, the added penalty is 50 per cent.; the penalty in both cases being assessed as a part of the tax.

Section 34 of the bill amends this section of the Revised Statutes by substituting a uniform penalty of 25 per cent., and interest at 10 per cent. from the time when such tax is due and payable; that is to say, if an illicit distiller is caught, or if a distiller makes a false and fraudulent return, instead of 100 per cent. penalty as now provided he is only required to pay a penalty of 25 per cent.

Section 3332 of the Revised Statutes provides that in case a registered distillery, having a producing capacity of less than 150 gallons a day, shall violate the law respecting such distillery, and having been declared forfeited by a judgment of the court for a violation of the internal revenue laws, such still, etc., shall be destroyed so as to prevent its use for the purpose of distilling. This section of the Revised Statutes is amended by section 38 of the bill so that in case of judgment of forfeiture the seizing officer shall remove such still, etc., to a place of safe storage, where it shall be sold, and that it shall be so removed without mutilation. The reason for the present law was that a distillery of the capacity described in this section, having been detected at one place, could, unless destroyed, be easily removed to another and again begin its operations, as had frequently been done prior to the passage of the law; and it was thought that the destruction of the still was an effectual method of preventing illicit distillation by means of these small distilleries. If the effect of a judgment of forfeiture shall only be to require the seizing officer to carefully preserve and store the still without mutilation, it will soon renew its work in some other convenient locality where the vigilance of revenue officers could, for a time at least, be eluded, as stills of this capacity are portable and easily transferred from one neighborhood to another.

In order that the Commissioner of Internal Revenue might have knowledge of every still manufactured in the country and its location, enabling him thereby to pursue the still from the time of its manufacture until it engaged in the production of spirits to be taxed, section 3244 of the Revised Statutes provides that a manufacturer of stills shall pay an annual tax of $50, and $20 for each still or worm for distilling made by him; and section 3265 of the Revised Statutes requires such manufacturer before the same is removed from the place of manufacture to notify the collector of the district in which such still, boiler, or other vessel is to be used or set up, by whom it is to be used, its capacity, and the time when the same is to be removed from the place of manufacture; and also provides that it shall not be set up without the permit of the collector in writing for that purpose. These wholesome provisions, taken together, were intended to prevent persons from manufacturing stills or procuring them from manufacturers without the knowledge of the proper revenue officers of the Government. But section 40 of the proposed bill repeals all laws which impose these special taxes, and thus stills would be manufactured without the knowledge of the office of the Commissioner of Internal Revenue and without opportunity of the revenue officers to know when, where, or how such stills were to be set up and used.

These sections constitute such a modification of our present revenue system, as respects the collection of taxes from distilled spirits, as will make it easy for those disposed to engage in illicit distilling to do so with impunity, and your committee can not but regard these provisions as seriously endangering the efficacy of our entire system of laws which provide for the collection of revenue from distilled spirits.

THE SUBSTITUTE PROPOSED BY THE FINANCE COMMITTEE.

The House bill (H. R. 9051) under consideration was received by your committee July 25, and was immediately referred to the following subcommittee: Messrs. ALLISON, of Iowa, chairman; ALDRICH, of Rhode Island; JONES, of Nevada; HISCOCK, of New York; BECK, of Kentucky; HARRIS, of Tennessee, and VOORHEES, of Indiana, who reported the same back, September 25, to the full committee, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute, which was adopted by the full committee and reported to the Senate this day by Mr. ALLISON.

In the preparation of the substitute submitted for the consideration of the Senate, it has been the purpose of your committee to present a measure which would, as far as possible, fulfill the important requirements of revenue revision which we have enumerated. The numerous failures and defects of the House bill rendered the task of amending that bill impossible, and made the preparation of a comprehensive and consistent measure of relief and revision necessary. We submit this substitute to the judgment of the Senate, and invite for it full and careful scrutiny. The time which has elapsed since the House bill reached the Senate has been diligently employed by your committee in a careful investigation of the diverse and important questions involved in a general tariff revision, and in hearing such representatives of the vast number of interests affected by changes in the tariff schedules as could be heard in the limited time at their disposal.

Other interested parties are desirous of being heard, and it is the intention of the committee, with the approval of the Senate, to give such time to further hearings as shall be possible during the period the bill may be under discussion, with a view of eliciting the fullest information, in order that the provisions of the substitute, and of such amendments as shall be suggested, may be acted upon with the greatest degree of intelligence.

The committee estimate that the annual revenues would be reduced by the provisions of the substitute as follows: By the reduction of the duty on sugar, $27,759,783.95; by adding to the free-list the forty-two items named in Appendix C, $6,428,095.56; by the abolition of the internal-revenue taxes on the production or sale of tobacco and the reduction of the tax on cigars, $24,371,460.98; and by the provisions which allow the use of alcohol in the industrial arts free from tax, $7,000,000, or a total reduction of $65,559,340.49.

An estimate has also been carefully prepared (Appendix B) of the effect which the other changes in the tariff schedules would have upon importations and the revenue. If this estimate should prove to be correct, the total reduction in revenue effected by the substitute would be $73,668,994.30.

In order to obtain the necessary reduction of revenue, the committee have selected such duties or taxes for reduction or repeal as would, while effecting that object, secure the most beneficial results to the masses of our people, and would not disturb or injure any industry or pursuit entitled to protection.

The excessive duty of from 2 to 3½ cents per pound now imposed upon sugar adds a considerable sum to the daily cost of living of every family in the United States, where in most cases the cost of sugar is greater than the cost of bread. The high rates of duty which have been levied upon this important article of food have not successfully developed the sugar-producing industry of the United States. The great natural advantages which the producers of cane sugars in the tropical islands have over those of the United States preclude domestic competition upon equal terms. If it were not for the fact that parties interested in the production of sugar from sorghum or beets are confident of the rapid development of these industries in the United States the committee would recommend a still greater reduction in the rate of duty upon sugar, as the advantages of this reduction would be felt through a larger circle than any other which could be made in our tariff schedules.

The articles which are placed on the free-list include jute, jute butts, sisal grass, manila, and other crude materials not produced in this country, whose free admission would benefit both the producers and consumers of manufactures from these materials.

The provisions of the substitute which allow the use of alcohol in the industrial arts free from taxation would prove of great benefit to a large number of important manufactures. Alcohol is used in the production of more than five hundred chemical and pharmaceutical preparations and in many of the mechanical and industrial arts, and its use in all these directions would be largely extended if the onerous tax should be abolished. The heavy tax upon alcohol unnecessarily increases the price of many manufactured products, with no corresponding benefit except the resulting revenue, which is not unnecessary.

Your committee have considered numerous suggestions for the repeal of all internal-revenue taxes and the abolition of the entire internal-revenue system, but they deem the adoption of this course at present both impracticable and unwise, not only because the repeal of these taxes would create a large annual deficit, but for the further reason

that the taxes levied on distilled spirits used as a beverage and on beer should be retained, and the legislation to protect American dairy products from fraudulent imitations should be enforced.

The proposition for a repeal of all internal-revenue taxes on tobacco is presented in compliance with a universal demand.

The provisions of the carefully prepared bill to prevent undervaluations, heretofore reported from the Committee on Finance and adopted by the Senate, are incorporated in the substitute.

We have inserted a provision intended to prevent the importation of all articles of foreign manufacture when marked or labeled in such a manner as to represent that they were manufactured in the United States.

Section 39 provides that upon the exportation of articles manufactured from dutiable imported materials the entire sum paid for duties on such materials shall be repaid in the form of a drawback.

In the revision of the dutiable schedules and the free-list submitted constant effort has been made to correct the inequalities and to eliminate the ambiguities of the existing tariff, and careful attention has been given to the recommendations of the executive officers and to the statements of merchants, manufacturers, and workmen whose business has suffered from admitted defects.

In pursuance of our general plan to lessen the evils of undervaluation, to secure more certainty, uniformity, and equality in the collection of duties as well as economy in administration, specific or compound rates have been substituted for ad valorem rates wherever practicable, or when the necessary data could be obtained. Whenever changes of this character have been made they have been adjusted upon information obtained from customs experts or from other reliable sources.

It will be observed that all of the tariff schedules have been thoroughly revised, rearranged, and greatly simplified. They have been divided into paragraphs and numbered consecutively, in order that in the future amendments may be made to a single paragraph or schedule without a general re-enactment of all the schedules, as is now necessary to prevent confusion. The number of paragraphs has been reduced from 495 in the tariff of 1883 to 440 in the substitute submitted.

To secure the proper relation between the rates imposed upon the numerous articles produced in our related and interdependent industries is the most difficult problem of tariff adjustment. The committee have endeavored, in the revision of rates proposed, to accomplish this necessary equalization. Reductions have been made whenever they have seemed desirable, and we have increased rates whenever it seemed necessary to preserve the workingmen engaged in any American industry requiring protection from ruinous or unequal competition.

The present anomalous and inadequate duties on tin and terne plates have received the attention of your committee, who believe that such a readjustment of these rates should be made as would encourage the manufacture of these articles in this country. We have not, however, up to this time, been able to obtain the definite information upon which to base a recommendation for an increase of rates upon the gauges which could now or might in the near future be produced in this country if protection were afforded; but as soon as the requisite information can be obtained we shall offer an amendment for this purpose.

We also, if found necessary after further examination, reserve the privilege of suggesting amendments to other paragraphs.

In all the numerous changes suggested your committee have had constantly in view the preparation of a consistent measure whose beneficent influences would be felt in every section and by every class of our people, which would give greater diversity to our industries, and by strengthening and invigorating the American system of protection secure the harmonious development and prosperity of agriculture, manufactures, and commerce.

The differences between the House bill and the substitute reported by your committee are fundamental. The House bill has been formulated on the theory that a diminution of revenues can only be secured by a reduction or repeal of protective duties, and that tariff revision means simply that indiscriminate cutting down of rates which encourages importations, benefits foreign manufacturers, and produces free trade.

The substitute proposes to reduce revenues and at the same time to preserve the American system. It is based upon the idea that tariff revision implies an equitable readjustment of duties in the interest and for the benefit of the people of the United States, and in the distribution of rates its framers have not hesitated to erect or to maintain defensive barriers which would carry confidence and comfort into American homes.

The committee express regret that through severe illness they have been deprived of the mature judgment and counsel of the chairman of the Finance Committee, JUSTIN S. MORRILL, of Vermont, the author of the tariff bill of 1862, which formed the basis of our present protective system.

APPENDICES.

APPENDIX A.—*Specific Duties.*

In 1795 Secretary Hamilton reports to the House of Representatives that, by existing laws, about one-third of the duties was derived from articles rated ad valorem, and adds:

"In other nations, where this branch of revenue, as with us, is of principal or very considerable consequence, and where no peculiarity of situation has tended to keep the duty low, experience has led to contract more and more the number of articles rated ad valorem, and, of course, to extend the number of those rated specifically, that is, according to weight, measure, or other rules of quantity. The reason of this is obvious; it is to guard against evasions, which infallibly happens in a greater or less degree when duties are high. * * * It is needless to repeat that this will contribute as much to the interest of the fair trader as to that of the revenue.

"It is believed that in our system the method of rating ad valorem could, with convenience, be brought within a much narrower compass, and it is evident that to do so will contribute materially to the security of the revenue." (American State Papers, Finance, volume 1, page 348.)

Secretary Gallatin, reporting to the Senate in 1801, said:

"In order to guard as far as possible against the value of goods being underrated in the invoices, it would be eligible to lay specific duties on all such articles now paying duties ad valorem as may be susceptible of that alteration." (American State Papers, Finance, volume 1, page 702.)

Secretary Dallas, reporting to the House of Representatives in 1816, says:

"Articles imported to a great amount should rather be charged with specific duties upon their weight and measure, in order to guard against evasions and frauds, than with ad valorem duties on their value." (American State Papers, Finance, volume 3, page 91.)

Secretary Crawford, in 1817, in the report concerning revision of the revenue laws already referred to, calls attention to the subject of frauds, particularly in the importation of articles upon consignment paying ad valorem duties, and recommends a series of remedial provisions, which are mainly applicable to importations subjected to ad valorem duty, to which he adds:

"Whatever may be the reliance which ought to be placed in the efficacy of the foregoing provisions, it is certainly prudent to diminish as far as practicable the list of articles paying ad valorem duties," and submits a list of one hundred and twenty-four enumerations to be transferred to the class of specifics. In 1819 he submitted a further list. (American State Papers, Finance, volume 3, pages 236, 415.)

Secretary Meredith, in his report of December 3, 1849, says:

"I propose a return to the system of specific duties on articles on which they can be conveniently laid. The effects of the present ad valorem system are twofold, namely, on the revenue and on our own productions. Experience has, I think, demonstrated that, looking exclusively to the revenue, a specific duty is more easily assessed, more favorable to commerce, more equal, and less exposed to frauds than any other system. Of course such a duty is not laid without reference to the average cost of the commodity. This system obviates the difficulties and controversies which attend an appraisement of the foreign market value of each invoice, and it imposes an equal duty on equal quantities of the same commodity. Under the ad valorem system goods of the same kind and quality, and between which there can not be a difference in value in the same market at any given time, nevertheless may often pay different amounts of duty. Thus the hazards of trade are unnecessarily increased."

"To levy an ad valorem duty on foreign valuation equably at the different ports is believed to be impossible. That the standard of value at any two ports is precisely the same at any given time is wholly improbable. The facilities afforded to frauds upon the revenue are very great, and it is apprehended that such frauds have been and are habitually and extensively practiced. The statements annexed (marked O), to which I invite special attention, exhibit in a strong light the dangers to which this system is necessarily exposed.

"As the standard of value at every port must at last depend upon the average of the invoices that are passed there, every successful attempt at undervaluation renders more easy all that follow it. The consequences are, not only that the revenue suffers, that a certain sum is in effect annually given by the public among dishonest importers as a premium for their dishonesty, but that fair American importers may be gradually driven out of the business and their places supplied by unknown and unscrupulous foreign adventurers."

The adoption of specific duties has been uniformly favored by the executive officer of the Government, and has been specially recommended by a number of the Secretaries of the Treasury in recent years.

Secretary Bristow, in his annual report for 1876, in commenting upon the administration of the customs revenue, said:

"Another remedy, and the most effective which could be adopted for correcting the evils of the appraisement system, is the substitution, so far as practicable, of specific for ad valorem duties. This change would work a great reduction in the amount of labor requiring the knowledge of experts. The entire process of ascertaining duties would be more simple, certain, and safe. Opportunities for collusive undervaluation would be greatly lessened, and if errors were committed they could not, as to specific rates and amounts, be accounted for except upon the supposition of culpable negligence or actual fraud; whereas, in respect to ad valorem duties, an error of judgment may readily be assigned as a sufficient explanation.

"Such change, either with or without a decrease in the number of dutiable articles, would insure a very considerable reduction of the force at the chief ports, with a consequent diminution of expenses."

Secretary Sherman, in his report to Congress for 1878, made the following suggestions with respect to specific duties:

"While not recommending a general revision of the tariff at the present time, it is deemed important that upon some articles the ad valorem duties now assessed should be converted into specific duties. As a rule, specific duties are to be preferred to either ad valorem or compound rates, and in any future revision of the tariff it is hoped that Congress will give preference to this system of imposing duties as far as practicable. The argument in favor of specific duties applies with great force to kid gloves, concerning the value of which, under the present ad valorem duties, serious differences of opinion have occurred between the importers and the Government during the past year, which have led to protracted delays in the ascertainment of the dutiable value, and consequent injury to the mercantile community."

In his report on the collection of duties for 1885 the late Secretary Manning said:

"In a system of ad valorem rates there are two critical points: One is dutiable value and the other is rate of duty. The present rate of duty on certain silk goods is 50 per cent. of the market value at the time of exportation in the principal markets of the country, or what is equivalent to one-half of the importation. If the law were so administered by the Treasury Department that on the importation of one importer 50 per cent. was levied, and on the importation of another importer, 40 per cent., and on that of another importer, 30 per cent., there would be a general outcry. So there would be if an importer at New York was required to pay only 30 per cent. and if of another at Buffalo was demanded 40 per cent. and of another at Chicago was required 50 per cent. But none the less illegal and intolerable result would follow if the dutiable value on one importation were fixed at $100, on another, by the same vessel, at $80, and on another, by the same vessel, at $60, the merchandise in all of the three being similar. If importers can illegally control dutiable values, they can control the amount of duties paid on the merchandise, although the ad valorem rate may be fixed and uniform for everybody and every port in the country.

* * * * * * *

"I do not make a recommendation to Congress for the restoration of the 'old moiety system' and the statutory inducement to informers, or the law concerning intent and burden of proof, which existed from 1799 to 1874. And I do not

so recommend for the reason that the purpose of the House and Senate, in respect to the simplification of the rates of duty and a prudent enlargement of the application of specific rates, is necessarily unknown. Should some such last-named change be not made, I have little faith that the existing power of the Executive and of the courts will be adequate to secure honest invoices and full appraisement."

* * * * * * *

"The following extracts from the report of Mr. Forward, made nearly half a century ago, are instructive now by way of showing his appreciation of the relation between ad valorem and specific rates, and the light in which foreign manufacturers sending their goods to this country on consignment were then regarded:

"'With a view to guard the revenue against fraudulent undervaluations which can not be entirely prevented by the existing scheme of ad valorem duties, specific duties are proposed in nearly all cases when practicable. The operation of the system of specific duties may not be perfectly equal in all cases in respect to the value of the articles included under it. But this inconvenience is more than compensated by the security of the revenue against evasions, and by the tendency of specific duties to exclude worthless and inferior articles, by which purchasers and consumers are often imposed on.'

* * * * * * *

"One advantage, and perhaps the chief advantage, of a specific over an ad valorem system is in the fact that under the former duties are levied by a positive test, which can be applied by our officers while the merchandise is in the possession of the Government, and according to a standard which is altogether national and domestic. That would be partially true of an ad valorem system levied upon 'home value,' but there are constitutional impediments in the way of such a system which appear to be insuperable. But under an ad valorem system the facts to which the ad valorem rate is to be applied must be gathered in places many thousand miles away and under circumstances most unfavorable to the administration of justice."

The present Secretary of the Treasury, in that portion of his last annual report relating to the administration of the customs laws, used the following language:

"Whatever the rates of customs taxation may be, the laws for the collection of the same should be made as efficient as possible. In this the bona fide importer, who wishes to gain only the legitimate profits of his business, the home manufacturer, and laborer are equally interested. They all have a right to demand that the laws be so administered as to give them every possible protection in their business. The high ad valorem tariff of the last quarter of a century has been the fruitful cause of devices to gain improper advantage at the custom-house. It is therefore desirable that in revising and reducing rates of duty they should be made specific instead of ad valorem so far as the nature of the merchandise will admit. Theoretically considered, ad valorem are preferable to specific duties; but in practice, under such rates as we have had and must continue to have for years to come, the former are the too-easy source of deception and inequality at the custom-house. Congress has it in its power to change, from time to time, as may be advisable, specific rates so as to meet any permanent changes in values."

APPENDIX B.—*Estimates of imports and duties by provisions of Senate substitute to H. R. 9051.*

	Importations, fiscal year 1887.		Estimated imports under the proposed bill.		Estimated decrease of duty by the proposed bill.	Average ad valorem rate of duty.	
	Values.	Duties.	Values.	Duties.		Present law.	Proposed bill.
A. Chemical products	$15,123,113.72	$4,655,375.27	$14,751,699.54	$4,383,074.79	$272,300.48	30.78	29.70
B. Earthenware and glassware	13,055,763.49	7,583,953.97	13,042,454.73	7,308,270.25	275,683.72	58.09	56.03
C. Metals	57,784,719.42	23,090,797.67	51,402,136.87	21,376,664.68	1,714,132.99	39.96	41.58
D. Wood and wooden ware	8,274,012.16	1,518,723.09	8,061,909.70	1,513,440.16	5,282.93	18.35	18.77
E. Sugar	68,956,335.07	56,530,360.14	68,924,968.35	28,770,576.19	27,759,783.95	83.43	41.02
F. Tobacco	10,955,125.03	9,127,738.26	10,739,454.24	6,856,875.68	2,270,882.58	83.82	63.85
G. Provisions, etc	42,593,244.97	11,048,754.66	33,596,588.35	9,040,908.68	2,007,845.98	25.94	26.91
H. Wines, liquors, etc	10,387,592.49	7,681,031.53	9,761,316.47	7,586,442.73	94,588.80	73.94	77.72
I. Cotton manufactures	30,207,908.83	12,081,263.06	29,664,007.64	12,049,295.48	31,967.55	40.00	40.59
J. Flax, hemp, and jute	24,791,662.08	7,868,605.78	24,030,013.17	7,682,125.73	186,480.05	31.74	31.97
K. Wool and manufactures of wool	60,586,613.61	35,629,534.13	53,658,583.84	34,642,732.88	986,801.25	58.81	64.56
L. Silk and silk goods	31,264,276.58	15,540,300.70	30,340,689.80	15,447,942.94	92,357.76	49.71	50.92
M. Books, papers, etc	5,212,152.54	1,154,619.13	4,751,274.82	1,113,825.58	40,793.55	22.15	23.44
N. Sundries	44,008,079.14	10,810,310.37	43,629,620.50	10,679,774.20	130,536.17	24.56	24.47
Articles, not enumerated—dutiable under section 2513 Revised Statutes:							
Unmanufactured	305,545.78	30,554.61	305,545.78	30,554.61		10.00	10.00
Manufactured	564,001.70	112,800.34	564,001.70	112,800.34		20.00	20.00
Packages, crates, boxes, etc., designed to evade duty	12,340.96	12,340.96	12,340.96	12,340.96		100.00	100.00
	424,082,487.48	204,477,083.64	397,236,606.46	168,607,645.88	35,869,437.76	48.21	42.45

APPENDIX C.—*Additions to free-list by proposed Senate substitute.*

Acorns, raw, dried or undried, but unground.
Baryta, sulphate of, or barytes, unmanufactured.
Bee's-wax.
Books and pamphlets printed exclusively in languages other than English.
Braids, plaits, flats, laces, etc., for ornamenting hats, etc.
Bristles, raw or unmanufactured.
Bulbs and bulbous roots, not edible.
Chicory root, raw, dried or undried, but unground.
Coal, slack or culm.
Coal-tar, crude.
Curling-stone handles.
Currants, Zante or other dried.
Dandelion roots, raw, dried, or undried, but unground.
Eggs' yolks.
Feathers and downs of all kinds, crude and unmanufactured.
Jute.
Jute butts.
Manila.
Ramie.
Sisal grass.
Sunn.
All other textile grasses or fibrous substances unmanufactured or undressed.
Floor matting, known as Chinese matting.
Grease and oils, such as are commonly used in soap making or wire drawing, etc.
Human hair, raw, uncleaned and not drawn.
Mineral waters, not specially enumerated.
Molasses, testing not above 56°.
Olive oil, for manufacturing or mechanical purposes.
Nut oil, or oil of nuts.
Opium, crude or unmanufactured.
Potash, crude carbonate.
Potash, caustic or hydrate.
Potash, nitrate of, or saltpeter.
Potash, sulphate of.
Potash, chlorate of.
Rags, all not enumerated.
Hemp seed.
Rape seed.
Sponges.
Sand.
Tar and pitch, of wood.
Turpentine, spirits of.

APPENDIX D.—*United States production and consumption of cereals.*

Year.	Production of cereals.		Area of cereal crops.	Products of cereals, per acre.	Home consumption of cereals.		Exports of cereals.	Exports (percentage of production).
	Bushels.	Per capita.			Bushels.	Per capita.		
		Bushels.	*Acres.*	*Bushels.*		*Bushels.*	*Bushels.*	
1840	615,525,302	36.0	(*)	(*)	602,326,353	35.3	.....	.....
1850	867,453,967	37.4	(*)	(*)	851,502,312	36.7	.....	.....
1860	1,239,039,945	39.4	(*)	(*)	1,216,084,810	38.7	.....	.....
1870	1,629,027,600	42.2	69,254,016	23.5	1,571,737,179	40.8	57,290,521	3.5
1871	1,528,776,100	38.5	65,061,951	23.5	1,464,956,527	36.9	63,819,573	4.2
1872	1,664,331,600	40.7	68,280,197	24.4	1,588,432,567	38.9	75,899,033	4.5
1873	1,538,892,891	36.6	74,112,137	20.7	1,444,923,359	34.3	93,968,932	6.1
1874	1,455,180,300	33.7	80,054,289	18.2	1,324,687,112	30.6	130,493,088	8.9
Average, 1870-1874	1,562,241,678	38.3	71,351,918	22.0	1,478,947,469	36.2	84,294,229	5.4
1875	2,032,235,300	45.9	86,863,178	23.4	1,928,444,494	43.6	103,790,806	5.1
1876	1,962,822,100	43.4	93,920,619	20.9	1,834,795,271	40.5	128,026,829	6.5
1877	2,178,934,646	47.0	93,150,286	23.4	2,042,970,575	44.1	135,964,071	6.2
1878	2,302,254,950	48.6	100,956,260	22.8	2,111,044,022	44.5	191,210,928	8.3
1879	2,437,482,300	50.2	102,260,950	23.8	2,199,870,793	45.1	246,611,507	10.1
Average, 1875-1879	2,182,745,859	47.0	95,430,259	22.9	2,021,625,031	43.6	161,120,936	7.3

*Estimated.

APPENDIX D.—*United States production and consumption of cereals*—Continued.

Year.	Production of cereals.		Area of cereal crops.	Products of cereals per acre.	Home consumption of cereals.		Exports of cereals.	Exports (percentage of production).
	Bushels.	Per capita.			Bushels.	Per capita.		
		Bushels.	*Acres.*	*Bushels.*		*Bushels.*	*Bushels.*	
1880	2,718,193,501	54.3	120,926,286	22.5	2,433,485,593	48.6	284,707,908	10.4
1881	2,066,029,570	39.8	123,388,070	16.7	1,782,843,127	34.4	283,186,443	13.7
1882	2,699,394,496	50.3	126,568,535	21.3	2,531,333,617	47.2	168,060,879	6.6
1883	2,629,319,089	47.6	130,633,556	20.1	2,440,920,948	44.1	188,398,141	7.2
1884	2,992,880,000	52.6	136,292,766	22.0	2,797,514,193	49.1	196,365,807	6.5
Average, 1880–1884	2,621,163,331	48.9	127,561,843	20.5	2,397,219,496	44.8	223,943,836	8.6
Average, 1870–1884	2,122,383,956	45.2	98,114,673	21.6	1,965,930,665	41.9	156,452,964	7.4
1885	3,015,439,000	51.4	135,876,080	22.2	2,848,172,006	48.6	167,266,994	5.5
1886	2,842,579,000	47.1	141,859,656	20.0	*2,933,617,186	48.5	194,131,382	6.8

APPENDIX E.

Comparative statement, by Census Report of 1880, of articles of domestic production, by sections, affected by tariff changes in the bill H. R. 9051 as it passed the House of Representatives.

Articles.	Cotton States.	Other States.
Jute manufactures	None.	$696,982
Dye-wood extracts	....do	5,253,038
Chocolate (cocoa)	....do	1,392,153
Grindstones	....do	184,555
Rattan and whalebone	....do	526,777
Glass manufactures	....do	21,154,571
Ink	....do	1,629,413
Oil-cloths	....do	5,844,587
Files	....do	2,486,533
Nails and spikes	....do	5,629,240
Needles and pins	....do	1,378,023
Steam fittings and heating apparatus	....do	5,127,840
Ivory and bone work	....do	1,454,901
Straw goods	....do	9,345,759
Toys and games	....do	1,502,513
Blacking	....do	1,491,474
Lead, bar, pipes, sheets, etc	....do	5,600,671
Slate mantels, marble mantels, etc	....do	1,030,660
Castor oil	....do	653,900
Scales and balances	....do	3,252,460
Sewing-machines and attachments	....do	13,863,188
Steel springs	....do	3,654,862
Stamped ware	....do	3,512,423
Bags	$91,300	9,635,300
Salt	213,538	4,616,028
Soap and candles	291,935	26,260,792
Stone and earthen ware	129,702	7,814,027
Confectionery	1,756,361	23,880,672
Brushes and brooms	288,328	10,272,527
Iron work, architectural	25,250	2,084,287
Foundry and machine-shop products	7,091,959	207,286,509
Manufactures of wool of all kinds	1,800,873	265,452,040
Planed lumber	2,09-,385	34,706,971
Brick and tile	2,644,595	30,188,992
Marble and stone work	803,310	30,611,840
Paints	19,330	23,371,337
Type founding	10,000	2,220,298
Starch	6,000	7,471,712
Cordage and twine	24,000	12,468,171
Paper manufactures	645,547	48,454,357
Hats and caps not wool	6,300	21,296,807
Instruments, professional and scientific	37,900	1,601,194
Wire and wire work	10,200	19,954,423
Tallow and grease	194,105	13,535,908
Beans	230,370	2,844,680
Baking and yeast powders	38,500	4,722,098
Book-binding and blank-book making	159,69	11,817,395
Boxes, fancy and paper	262,038	7,403,515
Brass castings	28,200	10,780,542
Carriages, wagons, etc	4,278,292	100,463,044
Coffee and spices, roasted and ground	451,201	22,473,693
Drugs and chemicals	599,607	38,374,051
Furniture	1,960,680	75,885,045
Hardware	8,900	22,644,793
Iron bolts, washers, nuts, etc	240,000	9,833,330
Kaolin and ground earth	69,795	1,385,962
Linseed oil	700	15,393,112
Neat's-foot oil	500	258,586
Patent medicines and compounds	409,932	14,273,562
Tin ware, copper ware, and sheet-iron ware	2,862,505	45,233,633
Tools, not cutlery	600	4,235,968
Wooden ware	338,350	4,897,124
Total	30,126,457	1,196,104,265
Cotton manufactures	15,938,712	176,151,398
Wool	15,786,767	139,894,984
Sawed lumber	30,018,858	203,249,871
Total	61,744,337	519,296,253
Grand total	91,870,794	1,715,400,518

APPENDIX F.—*Paragraphs of doubtful interpretation in House bill (H. R. 9051)*

[Compared with text of present law.]

PRESENT LAW.	H. R. 9051.
CHEMICALS.	CHEMICALS.
All preparations of coal-tar, not colors or dyes, not specially enumerated or provided for in this act, 20 per cent. ad valorem.	All preparations of coal-tar not colors or dyes, and not acids of colors and dyes. Free-list.
All coal-tar colors or dyes, by whatever name known and not specially enumerated or provided for in this act, 35 per cent. ad valorem.	Aniline oil and its homologues. Free.
All barks, beans, berries, balsams, buds, bulbs, and bulbous roots, and excrescences, such as nutgalls, fruits, flowers, dried fibers, grains, gums, and gum resins, herbs, leaves, lichens, mosses, nuts, roots and stems, spices, vegetables, seeds (aromatic, not garden seeds), and seeds of morbid growth, weeds, woods used expressly for dyeing, and dried insects, any of the foregoing of which are not edible, but which have been advanced in value or condition by refining, or grinding or by other process of manufacture, and not specially enumerated or provided for in this act, 10 per cent. ad valorem.	All barks, beans, berries, balsams, buds, bulbs, bulbous roots, and excrescences, such as nutgalls, fruits, flowers, dried fibers, grains, gums, and gum resins, herbs, leaves, lichens, mosses, nuts, roots and stems, vegetables, seeds, and seeds of morbid growth, weeds, woods used expressly for dyeing, and dried insects, any of the foregoing which are not edible and not specially enumerated or provided for. Free-list.
Opium, crude, containing 9 per cent. and over of morphia, $1 per pound. The importation of opium containing less than 9 per cent. morphia is hereby prohibited.	Opium, crude, and not adulterated, containing 9 per cent. and over of morphia, for medicinal purposes. Free-list.
EARTHENWARE AND GLASSWARE.	EARTHENWARE AND GLASSWARE.
Brown earthenware, common stoneware, gas-retorts, and stoneware not ornamented, 25 per cent. ad valorem.	Brown earthenware, common stoneware, gas-retorts, and roofing tiles, not specially enumerated or provided for, and not decorated in any manner, 20 per cent. ad valorem.
China, porcelain, parian, and bisque, earthen, stone, and crockery ware, including plaques, ornaments, charms, vases, and statuettes, painted, printed, or gilded, or otherwise decorated or ornamented in any manner, 60 per cent. ad valorem.	China, porcelain, parian, and bisque, earthen, stone, or crockery ware composed of earthy or mineral substance, including plaques, ornaments, charms, vases, and statuettes, painted, printed, enameled, or gilded, or otherwise decorated in any manner, 50 per cent. ad valorem.
China, porcelain, parian, and bisque ware, plain white, and not ornamented or decorated in any manner, 55 per cent. ad valorem.	China, porcelain, parian, and bisque ware not decorated in any manner, 40 per cent. ad valorem.
	White granite, common ware, plain white or cream-colored, lustered or printed under glaze in a single color; sponged, dipped, or edged ware, 35 per cent. ad valorem.
All other earthen, stone, and crockery ware, white, glazed, or edged, composed of earthy or mineral substances, not specially enumerated or provided for in this act, 55 per cent. ad valorem.	All other earthen, stone, and crockery ware, white, colored, or bisque, composed of earthy or mineral substances, not specially enumerated or provided for in this act, and not decorated in any manner, 35 per cent. ad valorem.
Encaustic tiles, 35 per cent. ad valorem.	Encaustic tiles, not glazed or enameled, 20 per cent. ad valorem.
	All glazed or enameled tiles, 45 per cent. ad valorem.
Brick, fire-brick, and roofing and paving tile, not specially enumerated or provided for in this act, 20 per cent. ad valorem.	Brick other than fire-brick. Free-list.
	Paving tiles, not encaustic, 20 per cent. ad valorem.
Green and colored glass bottles, vials, demijohns, and carboys (covered or uncovered), pickle or preserve jars, and other plain, molded, or pressed green and colored bottle glass, not cut, engraved, or painted, and not specially enumerated or provided for in this act, 1 cent per pound; if filled, and not otherwise in this act provided for, said articles shall pay 30 per cent. ad valorem in addition to the duty on the contents.	Green and colored glass bottles, vials, demijohns, and carboys (covered or uncovered), pickle or preserve jars, and other plain, molded, or pressed green and colored bottle glass, not cut, engraved, or painted, and not specially enumerated or provided for, 1 cent per pound; if filled, and not otherwise provided for, and the contents are subject to an ad valorem duty, or to a rate of duty based on their value, the value of such bottles, vials, or other vessels shall be added to the value of the contents for the ascertainment of the dutiable value of the latter; but if filled, and not otherwise provided for, and the contents are not subject to an ad valorem

PRESENT LAW.	H. R. 9051.
METALS.	METALS.
Provided further, That all iron bars, blooms, billets, or sizes or shapes of any kind, in the manufacture of which charcoal is used as fuel, shall be subject to a duty of $22 per ton.	*Provided further*, That all iron bars, blooms, billets, or sizes or shapes of any kind, in the manufacture of which charcoal is used as fuel, shall be subject to a duty of not less than $20 per ton.
Sheet-iron, common or black, thinner than 1¼ inch and not thinner than No. 20 wire gauge, 1.1 cents per pound.	Sheet-iron, common or black, thinner than 1 inch and not thinner than No. 20 wire gauge, 1 cent per pound.
Provided, That on all such iron and steel sheets or plates aforesaid, excepting on what are known commercially as tin-plates, terne-plates, and taggers' tin, and hereafter provided for, when galvanized or coated with zinc or spelter, or other metals, or any alloy of those metals, three-fourths of one cent per pound additional.	*Provided*, That on all such iron and steel sheets or plates aforesaid, excepting on what are known commercially as tin-plates, terne-plates, and taggers' tin, when galvanized or coated with zinc or spelter or other metals, or any alloy of those metals, one-fourth of 1 cent per pound additional when not thinner than No. 20 wire gauge; thinner than No. 20 wire gauge and not thinner than No. 25 wire gauge, one-half cent per pound additional, and when thinner than 25 wire gauge three-fourths of 1 cent per pound additional.
Iron or steel sheets, or plates, or taggers' iron coated with tin or lead, or with a mixture of which these metals is a component part, by the dipping or any other process, and commercially known as tin-plates, terne-plates, and taggers' tin, 1 cent per pound; corrugated or crimped sheet-iron or steel, 1.4 of 1 cent per pound.	Iron or steel sheets, or plates, or taggers' iron, coated with tin or lead, or with a mixture of which these metals is a component part, by the dipping or any other process, and commercially known as tin-plates, terne-plates, and taggers' tin. Free-list.
Iron and steel cotton-ties, or hoops for baling purposes, not thinner than No. 20, wire gauge, 35 per cent. ad valorem.	Iron and steel cotton-ties or hoops for bailing or other purposes, not thinner than No. 20, wire gauge. Free-list.
Boiler-tubes, or flues, or stays, of wrought-iron or steel, 3 cents per pound.	Boiler-tubes, or other tubes, or flues, or stays, of wrought-iron or steel, 1½ cents per pound.
Other wrought-iron or steel tubes or pipes, 2½ cents per pound.	
Provided, That iron or steel wire covered with cotton, silk, or other material, and wire commonly known as crinoline, corset, and hat wire, shall pay 4 cents per pound in addition to the foregoing rates: *And provided further*, That no article made from iron or steel wire, or of which iron or steel wire is a component part of chief value, shall pay a less rate of duty than the iron or steel wire from which it is made either wholly or in part: *And provided further*, That iron or steel wire cloths, and iron or steel wire nettings, made in meshes of any form, shall pay a duty equal in amount to that imposed on iron or steel wire of the same gauge, and 2 cents per pound in addition thereto. There shall be paid on galvanized iron or steel wire (except fence wire), one-half of 1 cent per pound in addition to the rate imposed on the wire of which it is made. On iron-wire rope and wire strand, 1 cent per pound in addition to the rates imposed on the wire of which it is made. On steel-wire rope and wire strand, 2 cents per pound in addition to the rates imposed on the wire of which it is made.	Iron and steel wire and iron and steel wire galvanized, and all manufactures of iron and steel wire and of iron and steel wire galvanized shall pay the duties now provided by law: *Provided*, That no such duty shall be in excess of 60 per cent. ad valorem.
All non-dutiable crude minerals, but which have been advanced in value or condition by refining or grinding, or by other process of manufacture, not specially enumerated or provided for.	
Clippings from new copper and all composition metal of which copper is a component material of chief value not specially enumerated or provided for in this act, 3 cents per pound; copper in plates, bars, ingots, Chili or other pigs, and in other forms, not manufactured, or enumerated in this act, 4 cents per pound; in rolled plates, called braziers' copper, sheets, rods, pipes, and copper bottoms, and all manufactures of copper or of which copper shall be a component of chief value, not specially enumerated or provided for in this act, 35 per cent. ad valorem.	Clippings from new copper fit only for remanufacture, 1 cent per pound. Copper, in plates, bars, ingots, Chili or other pigs, and in other forms, not manufactured, 2 cents per pound; in rolled plates, called braziers' copper, sheets, rods, pipes, and copper bottoms, 30 per cent. ad valorem.
Nickel, in ore, matte, or other crude form not ready for consumption in the arts, 15 cents per pound on the nickel contained therein.	Nickel, in ore or matte, 10 cents per pound on the nickel contained therein.
Nickel, nickel oxide, alloy of any kind in which nickel is the element of chief value, 15 cents per pound.	
Sheathing, or yellow metal, not wholly of copper, nor wholly nor in part of iron, ungalvanized, in sheets, 48 inches long and 14 inches wide, and weighing from 14 to 34 ounces per square foot, 35 per cent. ad valorem.	Sheathing, or yellow metal, 30 per cent. ad valorem.
Manufactures, articles, or wares, not specially enumerated or provided for in this act, composed wholly or in part of iron, steel, copper, lead, nickel, pewter, tin, zinc, gold, silver, platinum, or any other metal, and whether partly or wholly manufactured, 45 per cent. ad valorem.	Manufactures, articles, or wares, not specially enumerated or provided for, composed wholly or in part of copper, 35 per cent. ad valorem; manufactures, articles, or wares not specially enumerated or provided for, composed of iron, steel, lead, nickel, pewter, tin, zinc, gold, silver, platinum, or any other metal, or of which any of the foregoing metals may be the component material of chief value, and whether partly or wholly manufactured, 40 per cent. ad valorem.
	Machinery designed for the conversion of jute or jute butts into cotton bagging, to wit, cards, roving frames, winding frames, and softeners. Free-list.
WOOD.	WOOD.
Timber, squared or sided, not specially enumerated or provided for in this act, 1 cent per cubic foot.	Timber, squared or sided. Free-list.
Sawed boards, plank, deals, and other lumber of hemlock, white-wood, sycamore, and bass-wood, $1 per 1,000 feet, board measure; all other articles of sawed lumber, $2 per 1,000 feet, board measure. But when lumber of any sort is planed or finished, in addition to the rates herein provided, there shall be levied and paid for each side so planed or finished 50 cents per 1,000 feet, board measure. And if planed on one side and tongued and grooved, $1 per 1,000 feet board measure. And if planed on two sides and tongued and grooved, $1.50 per 1,000 feet, board measure.	Sawed boards, planks, deals, and all other articles of sawed lumber. Free-list.
SUGAR.	SUGAR.
All other confectionery, not specially enumerated or provided for in this act, made wholly or in part of sugar, and on sugars after being refined, when tinctured, colored, or in any way adulterated, valued at 30 cents per pound or less, 10 cents per pound.	All other confectionery, 40 per cent. ad valorem.
Confectionery valued above 30 cents per pound, or when sold by the box, package, or otherwise than by the pound, 50 per cent. ad valorem.	
PROVISIONS.	PROVISIONS.
Rice, cleaned, 2½ cents per pound; uncleaned, 1½ cents per pound.	Rice, cleaned, 2 cents per pound; uncleaned, or rice free of the outer hull, and still having the inner cuticle on, 1½ cents per pound.
Paddy, 1½ cents per pound.	Paddy, or rice having the outer hull on, 1 cent per pound.
Beef and pork, ham and bacon.	Meat, game, and poultry, free.
COTTON MANUFACTURES.	COTTON MANUFACTURES.
All manufactures of cotton, not specially enumerated or provided for in this act, and corsets, of whatever material composed, 35 per cent. ad valorem.	On all cotton cloth, 40 per cent. ad valorem.
FLAX, HEMP, AND JUTE.	FLAX, HEMP, AND JUTE.
Sunn, sisal-grass, and other vegetable substances, not specially enumerated or provided for in this act, $15 per ton.	Sunn, sisal-grass, and other vegetable fibers. Free-list.
Brown and bleached linens, ducks, canvas, paddings, cot bottoms, diapers, crash, huckabacks, handkerchiefs, lawns, and other manufactures of flax, jute or hemp, or of which flax, jute, or hemp shall be the component material of chief value, not specially enumerated or provided for in this act, 35 per cent. ad valorem.	Brown and bleached linens, ducks, canvas, paddings, cot bottoms, diapers, crash, huckabacks, handkerchiefs, lawns, or other manufactures of flax, jute, or hemp, or of which flax, jute, or hemp shall be the component material of chief value, not specially enumerated or provided for, 25 per cent. ad valorem: *Provided*, That cuffs, collars, shirts, and other manufactures of wearing apparel, made in whole or in part of linen, and not otherwise provided for, and hydraulic hose, 35 per cent. ad valorem.
Flax, hemp, and jute yarns, 35 per cent. ad valorem.	Flax, hemp, and jute yarns, and all twines of hemp, jute, jute butts, sunn, sisal-grass, ramie, and China grass, 15 per cent. ad valorem.
Burlaps, not exceeding 60 inches in width, of flax, jute, or hemp, or of which flax, jute, or hemp, or either of them, shall be the component material of chief value (except such as may be suitable for bagging for cotton), 30 per cent. ad valorem.	Burlaps, not exceeding 60 inches in width, of flax, jute, or hemp, or of which flax, jute, or hemp, or either of them, shall be the component material of chief value. Free-list.
Bags and bagging, and like manufactures, not specially enumerated or provided for in this act (except bagging for cotton), composed wholly or in part of flax, hemp, jute, gunny cloth, gunny bags, or other material, 40 per cent. ad valorem.	Bags of jute for grain. Free-list. Bags and bagging, and like manufactures, not specially enumerated or provided for, including bagging for cotton, composed wholly or in part of flax, hemp, jute, gunny cloth, gunny bags, or other material, three-eighths cent per pound.
Bagging for cotton, or other manufactures, not specially enumerated or provided for in this act, suitable to the uses for which cotton bagging is applied, composed in whole or in part of hemp, jute, jute butts, flax, gunny bags, gunny cloth, or other material, and valued at 7 cents or less per square yard, 1½ cents per pound; valued at over 7 cents per square yard, 2 cents per pound.	
Grass-cloth, and other manufactures of jute, ramie, China, and sisal grass, not specially enumerated or provided for in this act, 35 per cent. ad valorem.	Grass-cloth, and other manufactures of jute, ramie, China, and sisal grass, not specially enumerated or provided for, 25 per cent. ad valorem: *Provided*,

PRESENT LAW.	H. R. 9051.
	That as to jute, jute butts, sunn, and sisal grass, and manufactures thereof, except burlaps, not exceeding 60 inches in width, this act shall take effect January 1, 1889; and as to flax, hemp, manila, and other like substitutes for hemp, and the manufactures thereof, upon July 1, 1889.
WOOL AND WOOLENS.	WOOL AND WOOLENS.
Carpets and carpetings of wool, flax, or cotton, or parts of either or other material, not otherwise herein specified, 40 per cent. ad valorem; and mats, rugs, screens, covers, hassocks, bedsides, and other portions of carpets or carpetings, shall be subjected to the rate of duty herein imposed on carpets or carpeting of like character or description; and the duty on all other mats not exclusively of vegetable material, screens, hassocks, and rugs, shall be 40 per cent. ad valorem.	All other carpets and carpetings, druggets, bockings, mats, rugs, screens, covers, hassocks, bedsides of wool, flax, cotton, or parts of either, or other material, 40 per cent. ad valorem.
PAPER.	PAPER.
Paper boxes, and all other fancy boxes, 35 per cent. ad valorem.	Paper boxes, and all other fancy boxes, not otherwise provided for, 25 per cent. ad valorem.
Paper-hangings and paper for screens or fire-boards, paper antiquarian, demy, drawing, elephant, foolscap, imperial, letter, note, and all other paper not specially enumerated or provided for in this act, 25 per cent. ad valorem.	Paper-hangings and paper for screens or fire-boards, surface-coated paper, and all manufactures of which surface-coated paper is a component material not otherwise provided for, and cardboard, paper antiquarian, demy, drawing, elephant, foolscap, imperial, letter, note, and all other paper not specially enumerated or provided for, 25 per cent. ad valorem.
SUNDRIES.	SUNDRIES.
Bonnets, hats, and hoods for men, women, and children, composed of chip, grass, palm-leaf, willow, or straw, or any other vegetable substance, hair, whalebone, or other material, not specially enumerated or provided for in this act, 30 per cent. ad valorem.	Bonnets, hats, and hoods for men, women, and children, composed of hair, whalebone, or any vegetable material, and not specially enumerated or provided for, 30 per cent. ad valorem.
Bulbs and bulbous roots, not medicinal, and not specially enumerated or provided for in this act, 20 per cent. ad valorem.	Bulbs and bulbous roots, not medicinal. Free-list.
Fans of all kinds, except common palm-leaf fans, of whatever material composed, 35 per cent. ad valorem.	Fans of all kinds, except palm-leaf fans, of whatever material composed, 30 per cent. ad valorem.
Feathers of all kinds, crude or not dressed, colored, or manufactured, 25 per cent. ad valorem; when dressed, colored, or manufactured, including dressed and finished birds, for millinery ornaments, and artificial and ornamental feathers and flowers, or parts thereof, of whatever material composed, for millinery use, not specially enumerated or provide for in this act, 50 per cent. ad valorem.	Feathers of all kinds, crude or not dressed, colored, or manufactured. Free-list.
Gloves, kid or leather, of all descriptions, wholly or partially manufactured, 50 per cent. ad valorem.	Feathers of all kinds, when dressed, colored, or manufactured, including dressed and finished birds and artificial and ornamental feathers and flowers, or parts thereof, of whatever material composed, not specially enumerated or provided for, 35 per cent. ad valorem.
	Gloves, of all descriptions, wholly or partially manufactured, 40 per cent. ad valorem: *Provided*, That gloves made of silk taffeta shall be taxed 50 per cent. ad valorem.
Gutta-percha, manufactured, and all articles of, not specially enumerated or provided for in this act, 35 per cent. ad valorem.	Gutta-percha, manufactured, and all articles of hard rubber not specially enumerated or provided for, 30 per cent. ad valorem.
Hair, human, bracelets, braids, chains, rings, curls, and ringlets, composed of hair, or of which hair is the component material of chief value, 35 per cent ad valorem.	Bracelets, braids, chains, rings, curls, and ringlets composed of hair, or of which hair is the component material of chief value, and all manufactures of human hair, 25 per cent. ad valorem.

PRESENT LAW.	H. R. 9051.
Curled hair, except of hogs, used for beds or mattresses, 25 per cent. ad valorem.	Curled hair, for beds or mattresses, Free-list.
Hats, etc., materials for: Braids, plaits, flats, laces, trimmings, tissues, willow sheets and squares, used for making or ornamenting hats, bonnets, and hoods, composed of straw, chip, grass, palm-leaf, willow, hair, whalebone, or any other substance or material, not specially enumerated or provided for in this act, 20 per cent. ad valorem.	Hats, materials for: Braids, plaits, flats, willow sheets and squares, fit only for use in making or ornamenting hats, bonnets, and hoods, composed of straw, chip, grass, palm-leaf, willow, hair, whalebone, or any vegetable material, not specially enumerated or provided for, 20 per cent. ad valorem.
Hemp seed and rape seed, and other oil seeds of like character, other than linseed or flaxseed, one-quarter of 1 cent per pound.	Hemp and rape seed, and other oil seeds of like character. Free-list.
Garden seeds, except seed of the sugar beet, 20 per cent. ad valorem.	Garden seeds. Free-list. Beans, pease, and split pease. Free-list.
Marble of all kinds, in block, rough, or squared, 65 cents per cubic foot; veined marble, sawed, dressed, or otherwise, including marble slabs and marble paving tiles, $1.10 per cubic foot.	Marble of all kinds, in block, rough, or squared, 40 cents per cubic foot. Marble, sawed, dressed, or otherwise, including marble slabs and marble paving tiles, 85 cents per cubic foot.
Rags, of whatever material composed, and not specially enumerated or provided for in this act, 10 per cent. ad valorem.	Rags, of whatever material composed. Free-list.
Rattans and reeds, manufactured, but not made up into completed articles, 10 per cent. ad valorem.	Rattans and reeds, manufactured, but not made up into finished articles. Free-list.
Salt, in bags, sacks, barrels, or other packages, 12 cents per 100 pounds; in bulk, 8 cents per 100 pounds: *Provided*, That exporters of meats, whether packed or smoked, which have been cured in the United States, with imported salt, shall, upon satisfactory proof, under such regulations as the Secretary of the Treasury shall prescribe, that such meats have been cured with imported salt, have refunded to them from the Treasury the duties paid on the salt so used in curing such exported meats, in amounts not less than $100: *And provided further*, That imported salt in bond may be used in curing fish taken by vessels licensed to engage in the fisheries, and in curing fish on the shores of the navigable waters of the United States, under such regulations as the Secretary of the Treasury shall prescribe; and upon proof that the salt has been used for either of the purposes stated in this proviso, the duties on the same shall be remitted.	Salt, in bags, sacks, barrels, or other packages, or in bulk, when imported from any country which does not charge an import duty upon salt exported from the United States. Free-list.
Stones, unmanufactured or undressed, freestone, granite, sandstone, and all building or monumental stone, except marble, not specially enumerated or provided for in this act, $1 per ton; and upon stones as above, hewn, dressed, or polished, 20 per cent. ad valorem.	Stones, unmanufactured or undressed, freestone, granite, sandstone, and all building or monumental stone. Free-list.
Strings: All strings of catgut, or any other like material, other than strings for musical instruments, 25 per cent. ad valorem.	All strings of gut or any other like material. Free-list.
Watches, watch-cases, watch-movements, parts of watches, and watch materials, not specially enumerated or provided for in this act, 25 per cent. ad valorem.	Watches, watch-cases, watch-movements, parts of watches, watch-glasses and watch-keys, whether separately packed or otherwise, and watch materials not specially enumerated or provided for in this act, 25 per cent. ad valorem.
Webbing, composed of cotton, flax, or any other materials, not specially enumerated or provided for in this act, 35 per cent. ad valorem.	Webbing, composed of cotton, flax, or a mixture of these materials, not specially enumerated or provided for in this act, 30 per cent. ad valorem.

APPENDIX G.—*Comparison of rates of duty proposed by H. R. 9051 with present rates of duty on same articles, with the percentage of reduction of duty in each case.*

Articles.	Present rates of duty.	By H. R. 9051.	
		Rates.	Reduction.
			Per ct.
Blacking of all kinds	25 per cent.	20 per cent	20
Brass, and manufactures of:			
Manufactures of, not specially enumerated or provided for	45 per cent.	40 per cent	11
Bristles	15 cts. per pound	Free	100
Brooms of all kinds	25 per cent	20 per cent	20
Brushes of all kinds	30 per cent.	do	33
Carriages and parts of, not specially enumerated or provided for	35 per cent.	30 per cent	14
Chemicals, drugs, dyes, and medicines, not elsewhere specified:			
Acids—			
Acetic, acetous, or pyroligenous acid—			
Specific gravity exceeding 1.047	10 cts. per pound	5 cts. per pound	50
Boracic—			
Commercial	4 cts. per pound	Free	100
Pure	5 cts. per pound	do	100
Tannic and tannin	$1 per pound	50 cts. per pound	50
Alumina, alum, patent alum, alum substitute, sulphate of alumina, aluminous cake, and alum in crystals or ground.	$\frac{1}{2}$ ct. per pound	Free	100
Antimony, as regulus or metal	10 per cent.	do	100
Bark for tanning, extracts of: Hemlock	20 per cent	do	100

APPENDIX G.—*Comparison of rates of duty proposed by H. R. 9051 with present rates of duty, etc.*—Continued.

Articles.	Present rates of duty.	By H. R. 9051.	
		Rates.	Reduction.
			Per ct.
Borax:			
Crude	3 cts. per pound	Free	100
Refined	5 cts. per pound	do	100
Coal-tar, all preparations of not colors or dyes, not specially enumerated or provided for	20 per cent	do	100
Copper, sulphate of, or blue vitriol	3 cts. per pound	do	100
Crysilic wash for sheep (sheep dip)	20 per cent	do	100
Glycerine—			
Crude, brown, or yellow, of specific gravity of 1.25 or less at a temperature of 60° Fahrenheit, not purified by refining or distilling.	2 cts. per pound	do	100
Refined	5 cts. per pound	3 cts. per pound	40
Indigo:			
Carmined	10 per cent	Free	100
Extract of	do	do	100
Iodine	40 cts. per pound	do	100
Iron, sulphate of, or copperas	$\frac{1}{10}$ ct. per pound	do	100
Lead, acetate of:			
Brown	4 cts. per pound	2 cts. per pound	50
White	6 cts. per pound	3 cts. per pound	50
Nitrate of	3 cts. per pound	2 cts. per pound	33
Licorice:			
Paste or rolls	7½ cts. per pound	5 cts. per pound	33
Logwood and other dye-woods, extracts, and decoctions	10 per cent	Free	100
Magnesia:			
Calcined	10 cts. per pound	7 cts. per pound	30
Carbonate of, medicinal	5 cts. per pound	3 cts. per pound	40
Sulphate of, or Epsom salts	¼ ct. per pound	¼ ct. per pound	50
Mineral waters, all imitations of natural mineral waters, and all artificial mineral waters	20 per cent	Free	100
Morphia, or morphine, and salts thereof	$1 per ounce	50 cts. per ounce	50
Opium—			
Crude, containing 9 per cent. and over of morphia	$1 per pound	Free	100
Phosphorus	10 cts. per pound	do	100
Potash—			
Bicarbonate of, or saleratus, calcined or pearl-ash	1½ cts. per pound	¾ ct. per pound	50
Carbonate of, or fused	20 per cent	Free	100
Caustic	do	do	100
Chlorate of	3 cts. per pound	do	100
Chromate and bichromate of	do	2½ cts. per pound	17
Crude	20 per cent	Free	100
Nitrate of, or saltpeter—			
Crude	1 ct. per pound	do	100
Refined	1½ cts. per pound	1 ct. per pound	33
Prussiate of—			
Red	10 cts. per pound	7 cts. per pound	30
Yellow	5 cts. per pound	3 cts. per pound	40
Sulphate of	20 per cent	Free	100
Soda—			
Bicarbonate of, or supercarbonate of	1½ cts. per pound	¾ ct. per pound	50
Hydrate or caustic	1 ct. per pound	½ ct. per pound	50
Sal, or soda crystals	½ ct. per pound	¼ ct. per pound	50
Silicate of, or other alkaline silicate	½ ct. per pound	¼ ct. per pound	50
Sulphate of—			
Glauber salts	20 per cent	Free	100
Salt-cake, crude or refined, or niter-cake, crude or refined	do	do	100
Sulphur—			
Refined, in rolls	$10 per ton	Free	100
Sublimed, or flowers of	$20 per ton	$12 per ton	40
Barks, beans, berries, balsams, buds, bulbs and bulbous roots and excrescences, such as nut-galls, fruits, flowers, dried fibers, grains, gums and gum resins, herbs, leaves, lichens, mosses, nuts, roots and stems, spices, vegetables, seeds (aromatic, not garden seeds), and seeds of morbid growth weeds, woods used expressly for dyeing, and dried insects, any of the foregoing which are not edible, but which have been advanced in value or condition by refining or grinding, or by other process of manufacture.	10 per cent	Free	100
Preparations medicinal—			
Cerates, conserves, decoctions, emulsions, extracts, solid or fluid; infusions, juices, liniments, lozenges, mixtures, ointments, oleo-resins, pills, plasters, powders, resins, suppositories, sirups, vinegars, and waters, of any which alcohol is not a component part.	do	20 per cent	20
Preparations, proprietary, to wit:			
All pills, powders, troches, or lozenges, sirups, cordials, bitters, anodynes, tonics, plasters, liniments, salves, ointments, pastes, drops, waters, essences, spirits, oils, or preparations or compositions recommended to the public as proprietary articles, or prepared according to some private formula, as remedies or specifics for any disease or diseases or affections whatever, affecting the human or animal body (except cosmetics and toilet preparations).	50 per cent	30 per cent	40
Chicory root, ground or unground, burnt or prepared	2 cts. per pound	Free	100
Clay or earths:			
China clay, or kaolin	$3 per ton	$1 and $2 per ton	33
Unwrought or manufactured, not specially enumerated or provided for	$1.50 per ton	Free	100
Cocoa, prepared or manufactured	2 cts. per pound	do	100
Coffee substitutes, namely:			
Acorns and dandelion root, raw or prepared, and all other articles used or intended to be used as coffee, or as substitutes therefor, not specially enumerated or provided for.	2 cents per pound	Free	100
Copper and manufactures of:			
Ores, fine copper contained therein	2½ cts. per pound	Free	100
Regulus of, and black or coarse copper and copper cement, fine copper contained therein	3½ cts. per pound	do	100
Old, fit only for remanufacture	3 cts. per pound	do	100
Clippings from new copper	do	1 ct. per pound	67
Plates, not rolled; bars, ingots, Chili or other pig, and in other forms not manufactured or enumerated.	4 cts. per pound	2 cts. per pound	50
Plates, rolled, called braziers' copper, sheets, rods, pipes, and copper bottoms	35 per cent	30 per cent	14
Sheathing, or yellow metal, not wholly of copper, nor wholly nor in part of iron, ungalvanized, in sheets 48 inches long and 14 inches wide, and weighing from 14 to 34 ounces per square foot.	do	do	14
Manufactures, articles, or wares not specially enumerated or provided for, composed wholly or in part of copper, whether partly or wholly manufactured.	45 per cent	35 per cent	22
Cotton, manufactures of:			
Thread—			
Thread, yarn, wraps, or wrap-yarns, whether single or advanced beyond the condition of single by twisting two or more single yarns together, whether on beams or in bundles, skeins, or cops, or in any other form—			
Valued at not exceeding 25 cents per pound	10 cents per pound	do	21
Valued at over 25 and not exceeding 40 cents per pound	15 cents per pound	do	17
Valued at over 40 and not exceeding 50 cents per pound	20 cts. per pound	40 per cent	12
Valued at over 50 and not exceeding 60 cents per pound	25 cts. per pound	do	12
Valued at over 60 and not exceeding 70 cents per pound	33 cts. per pound	do	21
Valued at over 70 and not exceeding 80 cents per pound	38 cts. per pound	do	19
Valued at over 80 cents and not exceeding $1 per pound	48 cts. per pound	do	25
Valued at over $1 per pound	50 per cent	do	20

APPENDIX G.—*Comparison of rates of duty proposed by H. R. 9051 with present rates of duty, etc.*—Continued.

Articles.	Present rates of duty.	By H. R. 9051.	
		Rates.	Reduction.
			Per ct.
Cotton, manufactures of—continued.			
Thread on spools—			
Of 100 yards each spool	7 cts. per dozen.	40 per cent	26
Cloth—			
Not exceeding 100 threads to the square inch, counting the warp and filling—			
Not bleached, dyed, colored, stained, painted, or printed, valued at 8 cents or less per square yard.	2½ cts. per sq. yd	do	48
Bleached, valued at 10 cents or less per square yard	3½ cts. per sq. yd	do	47
Dyed, colored, stained, painted, or printed, valued at 13 cents or less per square yard	4½ cts. per sq. yd	do	45
Exceeding 100 and not exceeding 200 threads to the square inch, counting the warp and filling—			
Not bleached, dyed, colored, stained, painted, or printed, valued at 8 cents or less per square yard.	3 cts. per sq. yd	do	47
Bleached, valued at 10 cents or less per square yard	4 cts. per sq. yd	do	28
Dyed, colored, stained, painted, or printed, valued at 13 cents or less per square yard	5 cts. per sq. yd.	do	19
Exceeding 200 threads to the square inch, counting the warp and filling—			
Not bleached, dyed, colored, stained, painted, or printed—			
Valued at 10 cents or less per square yard	4 cts. per sq. yd	do	30
Bleached—			
Valued at 12 cents or less per square yard	5 cts. per sq. yd	do	23
Dyed, colored, stained, painted, or printed—			
Valued at 15 cents or less per square yard	6 cts. per sq. yd	do	17
Earthen, stone, and china ware:			
Bricks and tiles—			
Brick, other than fire-brick	20 per cent	Free	100
Tiles, encaustic	35 per cent	30 per cent	14
Tiles, glazed or enameled	60 per cent	45 per cent	18
Brown earthenware, common stoneware, gas retorts, and stoneware not ornamented	25 per cent	20 per cent	20
China, porcelain, parian, and bisque ware, plain white, and not ornamented or decorated in any manner.	55 per cent	40 per cent	27
China, porcelain, parian, or bisque, earthen, stone, and crockery ware, including plaques, ornaments, charms, vases, and statuettes, painted, printed, or gilded, or otherwise decorated or ornamented in any manner.	60 per cent	50 per cent	17
All other earthen, stone, and crockery ware, white, glazed, or edged, composed of earthy or mineral substances, not specially enumerated or provided for.	55 per cent	35 per cent	36
Fancy articles:			
Beads and bead ornaments of all kinds, except amber beads	50 per cent	40 per cent	20
Canes and sticks for walking—			
Finished	35 per cent	20 per cent	43
Unfinished	20 per cent	Free	100
Dolls and toys	35 per cent	30 per cent	14
Fans of all kinds, except common palm-leaf fans, of whatever material composed	do	do	14
Feathers, not artificial, not elsewhere specified—			
Crude, or not dressed, colored, or manufactured—			
Ostrich	25 per cent	Free	100
All other	do	do	100
Dressed, colored, or manufactured, including dressed and finished birds for millinery ornaments—			
Ostrich	50 per cent	35 per cent	30
All other	do	do	30
Feathers and flowers, artificial and ornamental, or parts thereof, of whatever material composed, for millinery use, not specially enumerated or provided for.	do	do	30
Perfumery, cosmetics, and toilet preparations—			
All toilet preparations whatever, not elsewhere specified	do	30 per cent	40
Flax, hemp, jute, and other textile grasses and vegetable substances, and manufactures of:			
Unmanufactured—			
Flax—			
Hackled, known as "dressed line"	$40 per ton	$10 per ton	75
Not hackled or dressed	$20 per ton	Free	100
Straw	$5 per ton	do	100
Tow of	$10 per ton	do	100
Hemp	$25 per ton	do	100
Hemp, tow of	$10 per ton	do	100
Manila and other like substitutes for hemp, not specially enumerated or provided for	$25 per ton	do	100
Sunn	$15 per ton	do	100
Jute	20 per cent	do	100
Jute butts	$5 per ton	do	100
Sisal grass	$15 per ton	do	100
Other vegetable substances, not specially enumerated or provided for	do	do	100
Manufactures—			
Thread, twine, and pack thread, flax or linen	40 per cent	25 per cent	38
Yarns—			
Flax	35 per cent	15 per cent	57
Grass (China grass)	20 per cent	do	25
Hemp	35 per cent	do	57
Jute	do	do	57
Bagging for cotton, or other manufactures not specially enumerated or provided for, suitable to the uses for which cotton bagging is applied, composed in whole or in part of hemp, jute, jute butts, flax, gunny bags, gunny cloth, or other materials, valued at 7 cents or less per square yard.	1¼ cts. per pound	⅜ ct. per pound	75
Bags and bagging and like manufactures, not specially enumerated or provided for (except bagging for cotton), composed wholly or in part of flax, hemp, jute, gunny cloth, gunny bags, or other material.	40 per cent	do	60
Brown and bleached linens, ducks, canvas, paddings, cot-bottoms, diapers, crash, huckabacks, handkerchiefs, and lawns, of flax, jute, or hemp, or of which flax, jute, or hemp shall be the component material of chief value.	35 per cent	25 per cent	29
Burlaps of flax, jute, or hemp, or of which flax, jute, or hemp, or either of them, shall be the component material of chief value (except such as may be suitable for bagging for cotton)—			
Not exceeding 60 inches in width	30 per cent	Free	100
Exceeding 60 inches in width	40 per cent	25 per cent	38
Grass-cloth and other manufactures of jute, ramie, China, and sisal grass, not specially enumerated or provided for.	35 per cent	25 per cent	29
Oil-cloth foundations or floor-cloth canvas made of flax, jute, or hemp, or of which flax, jute, or hemp, either of them, shall be the component material of chief value.	40 per cent	do	38
Oil-cloths for floors, stamped, painted, or printed, and all other oil-cloth (except silk oil-cloth) and water-proof cloth, not otherwise provided for.	do	do	38
Sail duck or canvas for sails	30 per cent	25 per cent	17
Sheetings, Russia and other, of flax or hemp, brown or white	35 per cent	do	29
Bags of jute for grain	40 per cent	Free	100
Cables and cordage—			
Cables and cordage, tarred	3 cts. per pound	25 per cent	17
Cordage, manila, untarred	2½ cts. per pound	do	24
Cordage, all other, untarred	3½ cts. per pound	do	17
All other manufactures not specially enumerated and provided for—			
Of flax, or of which flax shall be the component material of chief value	40 per cent	do	38
Of flax, jute, hemp, or manila, or of which flax, jute, hemp, or manila shall be the component material of chief value.	35 per cent	do	29
Of grass	30 per cent	do	17

APPENDIX G.—*Comparison of rates of duty proposed by H. R. 9051 with present rates of duty, etc.*—Continued.

Articles.	Present rates of duty.	By H. R. 9051.	
		Rates.	Reduction.
			Per ct.
Fruits, including nuts, not elsewhere specified:			
Currants, Zante or other	1 ct. per pound	Free	100
Dates	...do	...do	100
Figs	2 cts. per pound	...do	100
Raisins	...do	1½ cts. per pound	25
Nuts—			
Peanuts or ground beans—			
Not shelled	1 ct. per pound	¾ ct. per pound	25
Shelled	1½ cts. per pound	1 ct. per pound	33
Glassware—			
Articles of glass, cut, engraved, painted, colored, printed, stained, silvered, or gilded (not including plate-glass, silvered or looking-glass plate), porcelain and Bohemian glass, chemical glassware, painted glassware, and stained glass.	45 per cent	40 per cent	11
Cylinder, crown, and common window-glass, unpolished—			
Above 10 by 15 inches and not exceeding 16 by 24 inches	1¾ cts. per pound	1½ cts. per pound	14
Above 16 by 24 inches and not exceeding 24 by 30 inches	2½ cts. per pound	2 cts. per pound	15
All above 24 by 30 inches	2½ cts. per pound	2¼ cts. per pound	12
German looking-glass plates of blown glass	Same as cylinder	Free	100
Cylinder and crown glass, polished, unsilvered—			
All above 24 by 60 inches	40 cts. per sq. foot	30 cts per sq. foot	25
Plate-glass, cast, polished, silvered, or looking-glass plates—			
Above 24 by 30 inches and not exceeding 24 by 60 inches	35 cts. per sq. foot	25 cts. per sq. foot	29
All above 24 by 60 inches	60 cts. per sq. foot	45 cts. per sq. foot	38
All other manufactures of glass, or of which glass shall be the component material of chief value, not specially enumerated or provided for.	45 per cent	40 per cent	11
Glass plates or disks for spectacles	...do	Free	100
Gold and silver, manufactures of:			
Gold and silver, manufactures of, not specially enumerated or provided for	45 per cent	40 per cent	11
Grease, not elsewhere specified: All other grease, not especially enumerated or provided for	10 per cent	Free	100
Gunpowder and all explosive substances:			
Percussion caps	40 per cent	30 per cent	25
Gun-wads of all descriptions	35 per cent	25 per cent	29
Hair, not elsewhere specified, and manufactures of:			
Curled hair, except of hogs, used for beds or mattresses	25 per cent	Free	100
Human hair—			
Raw, unclean, and not drawn	20 per cent	...do	100
Clean or drawn, but not manufactured	30 per cent	20 per cent	33
Manufactured	35 per cent	25 per cent	29
Bracelets, braids, chains, rings, curls, ringlets composed of hair, or of which hair is the component material of chief value.	...do	...do	29
Halters' plush, composed of silk, or of silk and cotton	25 per cent	15 per cent	40
Hat bodies of cotton	35 per cent	30 per cent	41
India rubber and gutta-percha, manufactures of:			
Gutta-percha, manufactured, and all articles of, not specially enumerated or provided for	35 per cent	30 per cent	14
Inks of all kinds, and ink powders	30 per cent	20 per cent	33
Iron and steel, and manufactures of:			
Iron ores—			
Chromate of iron, or chromic ore	15 per cent	Free	100
Iron, in pigs and kentledge	$6.72 per ton	$6 per ton	11
Bar-iron—			
Bars, blooms, billets, or sizes or shapes of any kind in the manufacture of which charcoal is used as fuel.	$22 per ton	$20 per ton	10
Bars or shapes of rolled iron, not specially enumerated or provided for, and round iron in coils or rods, less than $\frac{3}{16}$ of 1 inch in diameter.	1$\frac{3}{10}$ cts. per pound	1 ct. per pound	
Rolled or hammered, comprising—			
Flats not less than 1 inch wide nor less than $\frac{3}{8}$ of 1 inch thick	$\frac{8}{10}$ ct. per pound	$\frac{7}{10}$ ct. per pound	13
Flats less than 1 inch wide or less than $\frac{3}{8}$ of 1 inch thick; round iron less than $\frac{3}{8}$ of 1 inch and not less than $\frac{3}{16}$ of 1 inch in diameter; and square iron less than $\frac{3}{8}$ of 1 inch square.	1$\frac{1}{10}$ cts. per pound	1 ct. per pound	9
Bars or rails for railways—			
Flat rails, punched, iron	$17.92 per ton	$15 per ton	16
Tee rails, weighing not over 25 pounds to the yard, steel	$20.16 per ton	$14 per ton	31
Other railway bars, weighing more than 25 pounds to the yard—			
Iron	$15.68 per ton	$11 per ton	30
Steel, or in part of steel	$17 per ton	...do	35
Beams, girders, joists, angles, channels, car-truck channels, T T columns and posts, or parts or sections of columns and posts, deck and bulb beams, and building forms, together with all structural shapes of iron or steel.	¼ cts. per pound	$\frac{8}{10}$ ct. per pound	51
Bars, billets, blooms, blanks, ingots, etc., of steel—			
Ingots, clogged ingots, blooms, or blanks, for railway wheels and tires, without regard to the degree of manufacture.	2 cts. per pound	1½ cts. per pound	25
Cotton-ties, or hoops for baling purposes, of iron and steel, not thinner than No. 20, wire gauge	35 per cent	Free	100
Hoop, band, scroll, or other iron, 8 inches or less in width—			
Thinner than No. 10 and not thinner than No. 20, wire gauge	1$\frac{1}{10}$ cts. per pound	1$\frac{1}{10}$ cts. per pound	9
Thinner than No. 20, wire gauge	1$\frac{3}{10}$ cts. per pound	1$\frac{2}{10}$ cts. per pound	7
Sheets, plates, and taggers' iron—			
Sheet-iron, common or black—			
Thinner than *1½ inches and not thinner than No. 20, wire gauge	1$\frac{1}{10}$ cts. per pound	1 ct. per pound	9
Thinner than No. 20 and not thinner than No. 25, wire gauge	1$\frac{1}{10}$ cts. per pound	1$\frac{1}{10}$ cts. per pound	9
Thinner than No. 25 and not thinner than No. 29, wire gauge	1$\frac{3}{10}$ cts. per pound	1¼ cts. per pound	17
Sheets and plates pickled or cleaned by acid or by any other material or process, and cold-rolled—			
Sheets—			
Thinner than *1½ inches and not thinner than No. 20, wire gauge	1$\frac{35}{100}$ cts. per pound	1$\frac{32}{100}$ cts. per pound	8
Thinner than No. 20 and not thinner than No. 25, wire gauge	1$\frac{40}{100}$ cts. per pound	1$\frac{37}{100}$ cts. p. pound	7
Thinner than No. 25 and not thinner than No. 29, wire gauge	1$\frac{85}{100}$ cts. per pound	1$\frac{70}{100}$ cts. p. pound	14
Sheets or plates of iron or steel (except what are commercially known as tin-plates, terne-plates, and taggers' tin), galvanized or coated with zinc or spelter, or other metals, or any alloy of these metals—			
Thinner than No. 20 and not thinner than No. 25, wire gauge	1$\frac{55}{100}$ cts. per pound	1$\frac{45}{100}$ cts. p. pound	18
Thinner than No. 25 and not thinner than No. 29, wire gauge	2$\frac{30}{100}$ cts. per pound	2 cts. per pound	11
Sheets of iron or steel, cold-rolled, cold-hammered, or polished in any way, in addition to the ordinary process of hot-rolling or hammering—			
Sheet-iron, common or black—			
Thinner than *1½ inch and not thinner than No. 20, wire gauge	1$\frac{1}{10}$ cts. per pound plus ¼ ct.	1$\frac{32}{100}$ cts. per pound	7
Thinner than No. 20 and not thinner than No. 25, wire gauge	1$\frac{1}{10}$ cts. per pound plus ¼ ct.	1$\frac{37}{100}$ cts. per pound	7
Thinner than No. 25 and not thinner than No. 29, wire gauge	1$\frac{1}{10}$ cts. per pound plus ¼ ct.	1¼ cts. per pound	14
Sheets or plates, or taggers' iron, coated with tin or lead, or with a mixture of which these metals are a component part, by the dipping or any other process, and commercially known as tin-plates, terne-plates, and taggers' tin, of iron or steel.	1 ct. per pound	Free	100
Wire rods of steel, not elsewhere specified	45 per cent	40 per cent	11
Iron or steel, flat, with ribs	$\frac{8}{10}$ ct. per pound	$\frac{7}{10}$ ct. per pound	13

*By H. R. 9051 "thinner than 1 inch."

APPENDIX G.—*Comparison of rates of duty proposed by H. R. 9051 with present rates of duty, etc.*—Continued.

Articles.	Present rates of duty.	By H. R. 9051.	
		Rates.	Reduction.
Iron and steel and manufactures of—continued.			*Per ct.*
Wire of iron—			
Smaller than No. 5 and not smaller than No. 10, wire gauge	1¼ cts. per pound.	"Shall pay the duties now provided by law: *Provided*, That no duty shall be in excess of 60 per cent."	10
Wire of steel—			
Smaller than No. 10 and not smaller than No. 16, wire gauge	2 cts. per pound		46
Wire and wire strand, made of iron wire—			
Galvanized—			
Smaller than No. 16 and not smaller than No. 26, wire gauge	4 cts. per pound		4
Smaller than No. 16 and not smaller than No. 26, wire gauge	4½ cts. per pound		40
Smaller than No. 26, wire gauge	5 cts. per pound		14
Galvanized—			
Smaller than No. 16 and not smaller than No. 26, wire gauge	do		47
Manufactures of, not elsewhere specified—			
Axles, parts thereof, axle-bars, axle-blanks, or forgings for axles, without reference to the stage or state of manufacture, of iron or steel.	2½ cts. per pound	1½ cts. per pound	40
Anchors, or parts thereof, mill-irons and mill-cranks, of wrought iron and wrought iron for ships, and forgings of iron and steel for vessels, steam-engines, and locomotives, or parts thereof, each weighing 25 pounds or more.	2 cts. per pound	do	25
Anvils	do	do	25
Card clothing—			
Manufactured from tempered steel wire	45 cts. per sq. foot	40 per cent	11
Other	25 cts. per sq. foot	20 per cent	20
Castings—			
Cast-iron pipe of every description	1 ct. per pound	$\frac{6}{10}$ ct. per pound	40
Chain or chains of all kinds, made of iron and steel—			
Not less than ¾ of 1 inch in diameter	1½ cts per pound	1½ cts. per pound	29
Less than ¾ of 1 inch and not less than ½ of 1 inch in diameter	2 cts. per pound	1½ cts. per pound	25
Less than ½ of 1 inch in diameter	2½ cts. per pound	2 cts. per pound	20
Files, file-blanks, rasps, and floats of all cuts and kinds:			
4 inches in length and under	35 cts. per dozen	35 per cent	32
Over 4 inches in length and under 9 inches	75 cts. per dozen	do	46
9 inches in length and under 14 inches	$1.50 per dozen	do	34
14 inches in length and over	$2.50 per dozen	do	45
Hammers and sledges (blacksmith's), track-tools, wedges, and crow-bars, of iron or steel	2½ cts. per pound	1½ cts. per pound	40
Hollow-ware, coated, glazed, or tinned	3 cts. per pound	2½ cts. per pound	17
Horse, mule, or ox shoes	2 cts. per pound	1½ cts. per pound	25
Machinery for the manufacture of jute	45 per cent	Free	100
Machinery, not elsewhere specified	do	40 per cent	11
Nails, spikes, tacks, brads, or sprigs:			
Cut nails and spikes of iron or steel	1½ cts. per pound	1 ct. per pound	20
Cut tacks, brads, or sprigs—			
Exceeding 16 ounces to the thousand	3 cts. per pound	do	56
Horseshoe nails, hob-nails, wire nails, and all other wrought-iron or steel nails, not specially enumerated or provided for.	4 cts. per pound	2½ cts. per pound	38
Spikes of wrought iron or steel	2 cts. per pound	1½ cts. per pound	25
Needles:			
For knitting or sewing machines	35 per cent	20 per cent	43
Sewing, darning, knitting, and all other, not specially enumerated or provided for	25 per cent	Free	100
Nuts and washers of wrought-iron or steel	2 cts. per pound	1½ cts. per pound	25
Railway fish-plates or splice-bars, of iron or steel	1½ cts. per pound	$\frac{6}{10}$ ct. per pound	37
Rivets, bolts, with or without threads or nuts, bolt blanks, and finished hinges, or hinge-blanks, of iron and steel.	2½ cts. per pound	1½ cts. per pound	40
Saws and saw-plates—			
Hand, back, and all other saws, not specially enumerated or provided for	40 per cent	30 per cent	25
Tubes or flues, or stays, of wrought-iron or steel—			
Boiler tubes, or flues, or stays	3 cts. per pound	1½ cts. per pound	50
Other tubes or pipes	2½ cts. per pound	do	33
Wheels of steel and steel-tired wheels for railway purposes, whether wholly or partly finished, and iron or steel locomotive, car, and other railway tires, or parts thereof, wholly or partly manufactured.	2½ cts. per pound	2 cts. per pound	20
All other manufactures of iron	45 per cent	40 per cent	11
All other manufactures of steel	do	do	11
Lead, and manufactures of—			
Molten and old refuse lead, run into blocks and bars, and old scrap lead, fit only to be manufactured.	2 cts. per pound	1½ cts. per pound	38
Ore and dross	1½ cts. per pound	¾ ct. per pound	50
Pigs and bars	2 cts. per pound	1½ cts. per pound	38
Sheets, pipes, and shot	3 cts. per pound	2¼ cts. per pound	25
Manufactures not especially enumerated or provided for	45 per cent	40 per cent	11
Leather, and manufactures of—			
Gloves, kid or leather, wholly or partially manufactured	50 per cent	40 per cent	20
Lime:			
Borate of	3 cts. per pound	Free	100
Liquors, spirituous and malt, and wines:			
Spirits, distilled—			
Alcohol, containing 94 per cent. anhydrous alcohol	$2 per proof gallon	Repealed	100
Compounds or preparations of which distilled spirits are a component part of chief value, not specially enumerated or provided for, containing 50 per cent. anhydrous alcohol.	$1 per gallon	Repealed	100
Marble and stone, and manufactures of:			
Marble—			
In blocks, rough or squared, of all kinds	65 cts. per cubic ft.	40 cts. per cubic ft.	38
Veined marble, sawed, dressed, or otherwise, including marble slabs and paving tiles	$1.10 per cubic ft.	85 cts. per cubic ft.	23
All manufactures of, not specially enumerated or provided for	50 per cent	30 per cent	40
Stone—			
Slate—			
Slates, slate-pencils, slate chimney-pieces, mantels, slabs for tables, and all other manufactures of slate.	30 per cent	20 per cent	33
Stones, freestone, granite, sandstone, and all building or ornamental stone, except marble, not specially enumerated or provided for—			
Unmanufactured or undressed	$1 per ton	Free	100
Grindstones, finished or unfinished	$1.75 per ton	do	100
Matches, friction or lucifer, of all descriptions	35 per cent	25 per cent	29
Metals, metal compositions, and manufactures of, not elsewhere specified:			
Bronze metal, manufactures of, not elsewhere specified	45 per cent	40 per cent	11
Japanned ware of all kinds, not specially enumerated or provided for	40 per cent	30 per cent	25
Metals, unwrought, not specially enumerated or provided for	20 per cent	Free	100
Nickel, nickel oxide, alloy of any kind in which nickel is the element of chief value*	15 cts. per pound	10 cts. per pound	33
Nickel, manufactures of, not specially enumerated or provided for	45 per cent	40 per cent	11
Pens, metallic	12 cts. per gross	35 per cent	19
Pewter, manufactures of, not specially enumerated or provided for	45 per cent	40 per cent	11
Platinum, manufactures of, not specially enumerated or provided for	do	do	11

* "Nickel in ore or matte" by H. R. 9051.

APPENDIX G.—*Comparison of rates of duty proposed by H. R. 9051 with present rates of duty, etc.*—Continued.

Articles.	Present rates of duty.	By H. R. 9051.	
		Rates.	Reduction.
			Per ct.
Metals, metal compositions, and manufactures of, not elsewhere specified—continued.			
Quicksilver	10 per cent	Free	100
Stereotype plates	25 per cent	15 per cent	40
Type metal	20 per cent	do	25
Type, new	25 per cent	do	40
Manufactures of all other metals, not specially enumerated or provided for	45 per cent	40 per cent	11
Mineral substances, not elsewhere specified:			
Minerals, non-dutiable, advanced in value or condition by refining or grinding, or by other process of manufacture, not specially enumerated or provided for.	10 per cent	Free	100
Mineral substances in a crude state, not specially enumerated or provided for	20 per cent	do	100
Oils, not elsewhere specified:			
Animal—			
Neat's-foot	do	do	100
Seal	do	do	100
Whale and fish, not elsewhere specified	do	do	100
All other animal oils and combinations of	do	do	100
Mineral—			
Naphtha, benzine, benzole, dead oil, and similar products of coal-tar	20 per cent	do	100
Petroleum, crude	10 per cent	do	100
Vegetable, fixed or expressed—			
Castor	80 cts. per gallon	40 cts. per gallon	50
Cotton-seed	25 cts. per gallon	Free	100
Croton	50 cts. per gallon	do	100
Flaxseed or linseed	25 cts. per gallon	15 cts. per gallon	40
Hemp-seed and rape-seed	10 cts. per gallon	Free	100
Olive	25 per cent	do	100
Salad, other than olive	do	do	100
Paints and colors:†			
Baryta, sulphate of, or barytes—			
Manufactured	¼ ct. per pound	¼ ct. per pound	50
Unmanufactured	10 per cent	Free	100
Lampblack	25 per cent	20 per cent	20
Barytes, artificial sulphate of, or blanc-fixe, or satin white	do	do	20
Blue—			
Prussian	do	do	20
Ultramarine	5 cts. per pound	3 cts. per pound	40
Brown—			
Spanish, Indian red, and colcothar, or oxide of iron	25 per cent	20 per cent	20
Vandyke, Cassel earth, or Cassel brown	do	do	20
Lead—			
Litharge	3 cts. per pound	1½ cts. per pound	50
Orange mineral	do	do	50
Red	do	do	50
White, dry or in pulp and ground or mixed in oil	do	2 cts. per pound	33
Ocher and ochery earths—			
Dry	¼ ct. per pound	Free	100
Oil and moist colors in collapsible tubes	25 per cent	20 per cent	20
Red—			
Venetian	do	do	20
Vermilion, quicksilver	do	do	20
Sienna and sienna earths—			
Dry	¼ ct. per pound	Free	100
Smalts and frostings	25 per cent	20 per cent	20
Umber and umber earths—			
Dry	¼ ct. per pound	Free	100
Water colors, in cakes or in moist pans	25 per cent	20 per cent	20
Zinc, oxides of—			
Dry	1½ cts. per pound	1 ct. per pound	20
Ground in oil	1½ cts. per pound	1½ cts. per pound	14
All other colors and paints, including lakes, whether dry or mixed, or ground with water or oil, not specially enumerated or provided for.	25 per cent	20 per cent	20
Paper and manufactures of:			
Paper—			
Printing paper unsized, used for books and newspapers exclusively	15 per cent	12 per cent	20
Sized or glued, suitable for printing paper	20 per cent	15 per cent	25
Manufactures of—			
Boxes	35 per cent	25 per cent	29
Envelopes	25 per cent	20 per cent	20
Papier-maché, manufactures, articles and wares of	30 per cent	25 per cent	17
Paris green	25 per cent	12½ per cent	50
Philosophical apparatus and instruments	35 per cent	25 per cent	29
Powders, finishing	do	Free	100
Provisions:			
Meats, game and poultry, not elsewhere specified, dressed or undressed, but not otherwise prepared	10 per cent	do	100
Tallow	do	do	100
Dairy products:			
Milk, fresh	do	do	100
Egg yelks	20 per cent	do	100
Rags, not specially enumerated or provided for	10 per cent	do	100
Rice, not elsewhere specified:			
Cleaned	2½ cts. per pound	2 cts. per pound	11
Uncleaned	1½ cts. per pound	1¼ cts. per pound	17
Paddy	1½ cts. per pound	1 ct. per pound	20
Granulated, or rice meal	20 per cent	15 per cent	25
Salt:			
In bags, sacks, barrels, or other packages	12 cts. per 100 pounds	Free	100
In bulk	8 cts. per 100 lbs	do	100
Seeds, not elsewhere specified:			
Bulbs and bulbous roots, not medicinal, not specially enumerated or provided for	20 per cent	do	100
Castor beans or seeds	50 cts. per bushel	25 cts. per bushel	50
Garden seeds, except of the sugar beet	20 per cent	Free	100
Hemp seed	¼ ct. per pound	do	100
Rape seed and other oil seed of like character	do	do	100
Soap: Hard and soft, not especially enumerated or provided for.	20 per cent	do	100
Starch:			
Corn or potato	2 cts. per pound	1 ct. per pound	50
Rice and all other	2½ cts. per pound	do	60
Strings of cat-gut, or any other like material, other than strings for musical instruments	25 per cent	Free	100
Sugar, molasses, sugar-candy, and confectionery:			
Molasses, testing by the polariscope—			
Not above 56 degrees	4 cts. per gallon	2.75 cts. per gallon	3
Above 56 degrees	8 cts. per gallon	6 cts. per gallon	

APPENDIX G.—*Comparison of rates of duty proposed by H. R. 9051 with present rates of duty, etc.*—Continued.

Articles.	Present rates of duty.	By H. R. 9051.	
		Rates.	Reduction.
			Per ct.
Sugar, molasses, sugar-candy, and confectionery—continued.			
Sugar, Dutch standard in color—			
Not above No. 13, tank bottoms, sirups of cane-juice, or beet-juice, melada, concentrated melada, concrete and concentrated molasses, testing by the polariscope—			
Not above 75 degrees	1.40 cts. per pound	1.15 cts. per pound	
Not above 76 degrees	1.44 cts. per pound	1.182 cts. per lb.	
Not above 77 degrees	1.48 cts. per pound	1.214 cts. per lb.	
Not above 78 degrees	1.52 cts. per pound	1.246 cts. per lb.	
Not above 79 degrees	1.56 cts. per pound	1.278 cts. per lb.	
Not above 80 degrees	1.60 cts. per pound	1.310 cts. per lb.	
Not above 81 degrees	1.64 cts. per pound	1.342 cts. per lb.	
Not above 82 degrees	1.68 cts. per pound	1.374 cts. per lb.	
Not above 83 degrees	1.72 cts. per pound	1.406 cts. per lb.	
Not above 84 degrees	1.76 cts. per pound	1.438 cts. per lb.	
Not above 85 degrees	1.80 cts. per pound	1.470 cts. per lb.	
Not above 86 degrees	1.84 cts. per pound	1.502 cts. per lb.	
Not above 87 degrees	1.88 cts. per pound	1.534 cts. per lb.	
Not above 88 degrees	1.92 cts. per pound	1.566 cts. per lb.	18.5
Not above 89 degrees	1.96 cts. per pound	1.598 cts. per lb.	
Not above 90 degrees	2.00 cts. per pound	1.630 cts. per lb.	
Not above 91 degrees	2.04 cts. per pound	1.662 cts. per lb.	
Not above 92 degrees	2.08 cts. per pound	1.694 cts. per lb.	
Not above 93 degrees	2.12 cts. per pound	1.726 cts. per lb.	
Not above 94 degrees	2.16 cts. per pound	1.758 cts. per lb.	
Not above 95 degrees	2.20 cts. per pound	1.790 cts. per lb.	
Not above 96 degrees	2.24 cts. per pound	1.822 cts. per lb.	
Not above 97 degrees	2.28 cts. per pound	1.854 cts. per lb.	
Not above 98 degrees	2.32 cts. per pound	1.886 cts. per lb.	
Not above 99 degrees	2.46 cts. per pound	1.918 cts. per lb.	
Not above 100 degrees	2.40 cts. per pound	1.950 cts. per lb.	
Above No. 13, and not above No. 16	2½ cts. per pound	2.20 cts. p. pound	20
Above No. 16, and not above No. 20	3 cts. per pound	2.40 cts. p. pound	20
Above No. 20	3½ cts. per pound	2.80 cts. p. pound	20
Sugar-candy and confectionery—			
Confectionery valued above 30 cents per pound, or when sold by the box, package, or otherwise than by the pound.	50 per cent	40 per cent	25
Confectionery, all other, not specially enumerated, made wholly or in part of sugar, and sugars after being refined, when tinctured, colored, or in any way adulterated, valued at 30 cents per pound or less.	10 cts. per pound	do	44
Tar and pitch:			
Pitch of coal tar	20 per cent	Free	100
Tar of coal, crude	10 per cent	do	100
Tar and pitch of wood	do	do	100
Teeth, manufactured	20 per cent	20 per cent	
Tin, manufactures of:			
Foil	45 per cent	40 per cent	11
All manufactures of, not specially enumerated or provided for	do	do	11
Turpentine, spirits of	20 cts. per gallon	Free	100
Umbrellas, parasols, shades, and parts of:			
Umbrellas, parasols, and shades—			
All other umbrellas	40 per cent	30 per cent	25
Umbrella and parasol ribs, and stretchers, frames, tips, runners, handles, or other parts thereof, when made in whole or chief part of iron, steel, or other metal.	do	do	25
Vegetables:			
Beans and pease, not for seed	10 per cent	Free	100
Pease, split	20 per cent	do	100
Other, in their natural state or in salt or brine	10 per cent	do	100
Waste, all not specially enumerated or provided for	do	do	100
Wax, and manufactures of, not elsewhere specified:			
Bees' wax	20 per cent	do	100
Wood, and manufacturers of:			
Bassword and other fiber, not otherwise provided for	10 per cent	do	100
Brush, for crib-work	do	do	100
Unmanufactured, not specially enumerated or provided for	20 per cent	do	100
Timber:			
Used for spars and in building wharves	do	do	100
Hewn and sawed	do	do	100
Square or sided, not specially enumerated or provided for	1 ct. per cubic foot	do	100
Lumber—			
Boards, planks, deals, and other sawed lumber, of hemlock, whitewood, sycamore, and basswood—			
Not planed or finished	$1 per M feet	do	100
Planed or finished on one side	$1.50 per M feet	do	100
Planed or finished on two sides	$2 per M feet	do	100
Planed on two sides, and tongued and grooved	$2.50 per M feet	do	100
All other articles of sawed lumber, not elsewhere specified—			
Not planed or finished	$2 per M feet	do	100
Planed or finished on one side	$2.50 per M feet	do	100
Planed or finished on two sides	$3 per M feet	do	100
Planed on one side and tongued and grooved	do	do	100
Planed on two sides and tongued and grooved	$3.50 per M feet	do	100
Clapboards—			
Pine	$2 per M	do	100
Spruce	$1.50 per M	do	100
Hubs for wheels, posts, last, wagon, oar, gun, and heading blocks, and all like blocks or sticks, rough-hewn or sawed only	20 per cent	do	100
Laths	15 cts. per M	do	100
Pickets and palings	20 per cent	do	100
Shingles	35 cts. per M	do	100
Shooks, sugar-box, and packing boxes, and packing-box shooks	30 per cent	do	100
Staves of all kinds	10 per cent	do	100
Cabinet-ware and house furniture, finished	35 per cent	30 per cent	14
Cedar-wood, granadilla, ebony, mahogany, rosewood, and satin-wood, manufactures of	do	do	14
Osier or willow, prepared for basket-makers' use	25 per cent	Free	100
Osier and willow baskets, and all other articles composed of, not specially enumerated or provided for.	30 per cent	do	100
Rattans and reeds, manufactured, but not made up into completed articles	10 per cent	do	100
All other manufactures of wood, or of which wood is the chief component part, not specially enumerated or provided for.	35 per cent	30 per cent	14

APPENDIX G.—*Comparison of rates of duty proposed by H. R. 9051 with present rates of duty, etc.*—Continued.

Articles.	Present rates of duty.	By H. R. 9051.	
		Rates.	Reduction.
			Per ct.
Wools, hair of the alpaca, goat, and other like animals, and manufactures of:			
Unmanufactured—			
Class 1, clothing wools: That is to say, merino, mestina, metz or metis wools, other wools of merino blood, immediate or remote, Down clothing wools, and wools of like character with any of the preceding, including such as have been heretofore usually imported into the United States from Buenos Ayres, New Zealand, Australia, Cape of Good Hope, Russia, Great Britain, Canada, and elsewhere, and also including all wools not hereinafter described or designated in classes 2 and 3—			
Value 30 cents or less per pound	10 cts. per pound	Free	100
Value over 30 cents per pound	12 cts. per pound	do	100
Washed wool—			
Value (before washing) 30 cents or less per pound	20 cts. per pound	Free	100
Value (before washing) over 30 cents per pound	24 cts. per pound	do	100
Scoured wool—			
Value (before scouring) 30 cents or less per pound	30 cts. per pound	do	100
Value (before scouring) over 30 cents per pound	36 cts. per pound	do	100
Class 2, combing wools: That is to say, Leicester, Cotswold, Lincolnshire, Down combing wools, Canada long wools, or other like combing wools of English blood, and usually known by the terms herein used, and also hair of the alpaca, goat, and other like animals—			
Value 30 cents or less per pound	10 cts. per pound	do	100
Value over 30 cents per pound	12 cts. per pound	do	100
Scoured wool, value (before scouring) 30 cents or less per pound	30 cts. per pound	do	100
Class 3, carpet wools, and other similar wools: Such as Donskoi, native South American Cordova, Valparaiso, native Smyrna, and including all such wools of like character as have been heretofore usually imported into the United States from Turkey, Greece, Egypt, Syria, and elsewhere—			
Value 12 cents or less per pound	2½ cts. per pound	do	100
Value over 12 cents per pound	5 cts. per pound	do	100
Scoured wool—			
Value (before scouring) 12 cents or less per pound	7½ cts. per pound	do	100
Value (before scouring) over 12 cents per pound	15 cts. per pound	do	100
Wool on the skin the same rates as other wools		do	100
Manufactured—			
Balmorals—			
Valued at above 30 and not exceeding 40 cents per pound	12 cts. per pound and 35 per cent.	40 per cent	41
Valued at above 40 and not exceeding 60 cents per pound	18 cts. per pound and 35 per cent.	do	39
Valued at above 60 and not exceeding 80 cents per pound	24 cts. per pound and 35 per cent.	do	41
Valued at above 80 cents per pound	35 cts. per pound and 40 per cent.	do	40
Belts or felts, endless, for paper or printing machines	20 cts. per pound and 30 per cent.	30 per cent	24
Blankets—			
Valued at not exceeding 30 cents per pound	10 cts. per pound and 35 per cent.	40 per cent	50
Valued at above 30 and not exceeding 40 cents per pound	12 cts. per pound and 35 per cent.	do	37
Valued at above 40 and not exceeding 60 cents per pound	18 cts. per pound and 35 per cent.	do	43
Valued at above 60 and not exceeding 80 cents per pound	24 cts. per pound and 35 per ct.	do	42
Valued at above 80 cents per pound	35 cts. per pound and 40 per cent.	do	43
Bunting	10 cts. per sq. yd. and 35 per cent.	do	50
Carpets and carpeting of all kinds—			
Aubusson, Axminster, and Chenille carpets, and carpets woven whole for rooms	45 cts. per sq. yd. and 30 per cent.	do	15
Brussels carpets	30 cts. per sq. yd. and 30 per cent.	do	32
Druggets and bockings, printed, colored, or otherwise	15 cts. per sq. yd. and 30 per cent.	do	46
Mats, screens, hassocks, and rugs, not exclusively of vegetable material	40 per cent	do	
Of wool, flax, or cotton, or parts of either, or other material, not specially enumerated or provided for.	do	30 per cent	25
Patent velvet and tapestry velvet carpets, printed on the warp or otherwise	25 cts. per sq. yd. and 30 per cent.	40 per cent	27
Saxony, Wilton, and Tournay velvet carpets	45 cts. per sq. yd. and 30 per cent.	do	26
Tapestry Brussels, printed on warp or otherwise	20 cts. per sq. yd. and 30 per cent.	do	35
Treble ingrain, three-ply, and worsted-chain Venetian carpets	12 cts. per sq. yd. and 30 per cent.	do	13
Yarn, Venetian, and two-ply ingrain carpets	8 cts. per sq. yd. and 30 per cent.	do	11
Clothing, ready-made, and wearing apparel (except knit goods), not specially enumerated or provided for, composed wholly or in part of wool, worsted, the hair of the alpaca, goat, or other (like) animals, made up or manufactured wholly or in part by the tailor, seamstress, or manufacturer—			
Cloaks, dolmans, jackets, talmas, ulsters, or other outside garments for ladies' and children's apparel, and goods of similar description, or used for like purposes.	45 cts. per pound and 40 per cent.	45 per cent	34
Clothing, ready-made, and wearing apparel of every description not specially enumerated or provided for, and balmoral skirts and skirting, and goods of similar description or used for like purposes.	40 cts. per pound and 35 per cent.	do	17
Cloths, woolen—			
Valued at not exceeding 80 cents per pound	35 cts. per pound and 35 per cent.	40 per cent	55
Valued at above 80 cents per pound	35 cts. per pound and 40 per cent.	do	42
Dress goods, women's and children's, coat linings, Italian cloths, and goods of like description—			
Composed in part of wool, worsted, the hair of the alpaca, goat, or other animals—			
Valued at not exceeding 20 cents per square yard	5 cts. per sq. yd. and 35 per cent.	do	41
Valued at above 20 cents per square yard	7 cts. per sq. yd. and 40 per cent.	do	32
Composed wholly of wool, worsted, the hair of the alpaca, goat, or other animals, or of a mixture of them, and all such goods of like description, with selvages made wholly or in part of other materials, or with threads or materials introduced for the purpose of changing the classification—			
Weighing 4 ounces or less per square yard	9 cts. per sq. yd. and 40 per cent.	do	52
All weighing over 4 ounces per square yard	35 cts. per pound and 40 per cent.	do	43

APPENDIX G.—*Comparison of rates of duty proposed by H. R. 9051 with present rates of duty, etc.*—Continued.

Articles.	Present rates of duty.	By H. R. 9051.	
		Rates.	Reduction.
			Per ct.
Wool—continued.			
Flannels—			
Valued at not exceeding 30 cents per pound	10 cts. per pound and 85 per cent.	40 per cent	46
Valued at above 30 and not exceeding 40 cents per pound	12 cts. per pound and 35 per cent.	do	40
Valued at above 40 and not exceeding 60 cents per pound	18 cts. per pound and 35 per cent.	do	41
Valued at above 60 and not exceeding 80 cents per pound	24 cts. per pound and 35 per cent.	do	41
Valued at above 80 cents per pound	35 cts. per pound and 40 per cent.	do	45
Hats of wool:			
Valued at above 30 and not exceeding 40 cents per pound	12 cts. per pound and 35 per cent.	do	45
Valued at above 40 and not exceeding 60 cents per pound	18 cts. per pound and 35 per cent.	do	45
Valued at above 60 and not exceeding 80 cents per pound	24 cts. per pound and 35 per cent.	do	40
Valued at above 80 cents per pound	35 cts. per pound and 40 per cent.	do	23
Knit goods, and all goods made on knitting-frames—			
Valued at not exceeding 30 cents per pound	10 cts. per pound and 35 per cent.	do	53
Valued at above 30 and not exceeding 40 cents per pound	12 cts. per pound and 35 per cent.	do	39
Valued at above 40 and not exceeding 60 cents per pound	18 cts. per pound and 35 per cent.	do	42
Valued at above 60 and not exceeding 80 cents per pound	24 cts. per pound and 35 per cent.	do	43
Valued at above 80 cents per pound	35 cts. per pound and 40 per cent.	do	36
Rags, shoddy, mungo, waste, and flocks, woolen	10 cts. per pound	Free	100
Shawls, woolen:			
Valued at not exceeding 80 cents per pound	35 cts. per pound and 35 per cent.	40 per cent	55
Valued at above 80 cents per pound	35 cts. per pound and 40 per cent.	do	39
Composed wholly or in part of worsted, the hair of the alpaca, goat, or other animals	40 cts. per pound and 35 per cent.	do	35
Webbings, gorings, suspenders, braces, beltings, bindings, braids, galloons, fringes, gimps, cords, cords and tassels, dress trimmings, head-nets, buttons or barrel-buttons, or buttons of other forms for tassels or ornaments, wrought by hand or braided by machinery, made of wool, worsted, the hair of the alpaca, goat, or other animals, or of which wool, worsted, the hair of the alpaca, goat, or other animals is a component material	50 cts. per pound and 50 per cent.	50 per cent	24
Yarns, woolen and worsted—			
Valued at not exceeding 30 cents per pound	10 cts. per pound and 35 per cent.	40 per cent	42
Valued at above 30 and not exceeding 40 cents per pound	12 cts. per pound and 35 per cent.	do	41
Valued at above 40 and not exceeding 60 cents per pound	18 cts. per pound and 35 per cent.	do	41
Valued at above 60 and not exceeding 80 cents per pound	24 cts. per pound and 35 per cent.	do	42
Valued at above 80 cents per pound	35 cts. per pound and 40 per cent.	do	42
All manufactures of every description not specially enumerated or provided for, made wholly or in part of—			
Wool—			
Valued at not exceeding 80 cents per pound	35 cts. per pound and 35 per cent.	do	55
Valued at above 80 cents per pound	35 cts. per pound and 40 per cent.	do	38
Worsted, the hair of the alpaca, goat, or other animals (except such as are composed in part of wool)—			
Valued at not exceeding 30 cents per pound	10 cts. per pound and 35 per cent.	do	48
Valued at above 30 and not exceeding 40 cents per pound	12 cts. per pound and 35 per cent.	40 per cent	42
Valued at above 40 and not exceeding 60 cents per pound	18 cts. per pound and 35 per cent.	do	41
Valued at above 60 and not exceeding 80 cents per pound	24 cts. per pound and 35 per cent.	do	41
Valued at above 80 cents per pound	35 cts. per pound and 40 per cent.	do	44
Zinc, spelter, or tutenegue, and manufactures of:			
In blocks or pigs	1¼ cts. per pound	1¼ cts. per pound	17
In sheets	2½ cts. per pound	2 cts. per pound	20
Old worn-out, fit only to be remanufactured	1¼ cts. per pound	1¼ cts. per pound	17
Manufactures of, not specially enumerated or provided for	45 per cent	40 per cent	11
Sacks, crates, boxes, etc., designed to evade duties thereon (section 7, act of March 3, 1883)	100 per cent	Repealed	100

VIEWS OF THE MINORITY.

The views of the minority presented by Mr. HARRIS are as follows:

House bill No. 9051, "To reduce taxation and simplify the laws in relation to the collection of the revenue," passed the House of Representatives on the 21st day of July, 1888, and was referred to the Senate Committee on Finance on the 23d day of the same month.

The majority of the committee, not being willing to accept the House bill as a basis of revision of existing revenue laws and to correct existing evils, decided to strike out all after the enacting clause and report an entirely new bill.

In the preparation of this substitute no member of the minority of the committee was consulted, or informed as to its provisions until it was reported to the full committee, on the 25th day of September, 1888.

The chairman of the committee in May last appointed a subcommittee to hear such persons as wished to be heard upon the revenue question, and much time has been consumed and thousands of pages have been printed of the statements, arguments, and appeals of manufacturers and others, who demand that the present high rate of tariff taxation shall be maintained, and in most instances increased, prompted not by any revenue necessities, but alone for the purpose of increasing their own profits at the expense of sixty millions of tax-payers.

It is safe to say that all the interests benefited by a high protective tariff have been fully heard and have had much influence in shaping this substitute, while the great body of the people, the tax-payers and victims of this policy, have not appeared and have not been heard.

The short time that the substitute has been in the hands of the minority of the committee, and the many changes made in existing classifications, as well as changes from ad valorem to specific duties,

and the many compound duties imposed, render it difficult for the minority to approximate, with satisfactory certainty, the extent to which tariff taxation is increased or diminished upon the articles included in the various schedules, or what effect these changes will probably have upon the amount of revenues to result from such changes.

The essential difference between the House bill and the Senate substitute is apparent and radical at the outset in the matter of revenue. The one is framed in the interest of the public Treasury; the other in the interest of private pockets. The one is framed in the interest of the whole people; the other in the interest of a few thousand manufacturers. The one is designed to reduce both Government revenue and taxation, the taxation especially which bears heaviest on the necessaries of life; the other is intended to raise public revenue indeed, but to maintain private revenues by increasing and retaining taxation on all the necessaries of life.

The advocates of the substitute freely propose to reduce duties or abolish them on those things which yield only Government revenue, but refuse to reduce or abolish duties on those things which produce private revenue. This purpose is avowed, and is defended on the ground that it is all for labor. When it is remembered that the average tariff duty on all manufactured goods is 47 per cent. and the average share of labor therein is about 20 per cent., it will be seen that their love for the workingman is based on the other 27 per cent., which they pocket. Having robbed him of more than half of the bonus which the law gives the workingman they can well afford to love him; and that love will continue unabated until he insists on having all the law gives him.

But the minority think it safe to say that the chief reductions in tariff taxation, as provided by the substitute, are confined to the articles of sugar and rice, with jute, jute butts, molasses, Zante currants, and a few other unimportant articles put upon the free-list, while there is an increase of duties imposed upon the multiform manufactures of cotton, wool, iron, and steel—articles that the whole people, and especially the poor and the most needy classes, are compelled to use.

The substitute relieves the non-necessary tobacco in all its forms, except cigars, cheroots, and cigarettes, from internal taxation, and gives free alcohol to the arts. Taking the tax off of tobacco will reduce revenue about $24,000,000; and it is estimated that the tax taken from alcohol for the arts will make a further reduction of about $7,000,000. But in view of the impossibility of preventing frauds upon the revenue that should be derived from distilled spirits used for purposes other than the arts, the loss of revenue may be safely estimated at many times $7,000,000.

Practically, the substitute offers to the people free whisky and free tobacco, leaving all the expensive machinery for the collection of the revenue and enforcement of the law in full force, while it increases taxation upon the actual and indispensable necessaries of life, and this, too, when there is a large surplus in the Treasury, and under existing laws that surplus is being increased at the rate of over $10,000,000 per month; thus withdrawing and withholding from the channels of trade, commerce, and business of the country money absolutely necessary to their successful operations.

But to better illustrate let us refer to the following schedules: Take Schedule C, metals.

In no single instance is the policy upon which the substitute was framed more clearly demonstrated than in that of railway iron.

The cost to produce rails at a leading mill in the United States in 1887 was less than $27 per ton, of which less than $4.25 per ton was paid in wages.

The present rate of duty on steel rails is $17, and by the substitute it is reduced to $15.68 per ton. The question arises whether this will reduce the wages of the operatives $1.32, or whether $11.43 bounty above the whole cost paid for labor will satisfy the manufacturers.

The labor cost in a ton of steel rails being $4.25, on the pretense that this is so much higher than the former wages, the burden of $15.68 is thus laid upon every ton of steel rails imported into the United States, and thus governing the prices here, in order to equalize the difference in domestic and foreign wages.

This burden is laid upon the transportation of the country, on its foreign trade measured by the amount of duty collected; but where it is transferred to our internal commerce the burden is measured by every pound of rails over which that commerce has to pass, and ultimately falls with crushing weight upon the agriculturist, whose bulky products must seek a foreign market over these tax-laden roads and in foreign ships; and when these foreign markets are reached these products must compete with the pauper products of the cheapest labor to be found anywhere under the sun.

The House bill made a great stride for the farmers' relief when it reduced this tax to $11 per ton.

The rods out of which the farmer's wire fence is made are not apparently changed in rate, but by various changes in classification actual and important additional burdens are imposed. A reduction in dutiable value from 3½ to 3 cents per pound weight accomplishes this. An additional size, No. 6, added without an apparent change of rate does adroitly increase the rate paid on wire rods of this size from 45 per cent. to about 54 per cent., and is an increased tax on this one size of wire rods of nearly $300,000, upon the basis of the importations of 1887, and there is added a proviso by which rods smaller than No. 6 are classified as wire, and thus effect a third distinct increase of tax in this one section—and this is called part of a "system," and rightly so called.

Steel ingots, cogged ingots, billets, bars, etc., now pay 45 per cent. duty if valued at less than 4 cents per pound. By the substitute, if valued at 1 cent or less, they are dutiable at one-half cent per pound; and as some of these items were valued at seven-tenths of a cent per pound in the imports of 1887, the rate of one-half cent is an increase from 45 to over 70 per cent., and nearly a million dollars tax added by this one section.

Cotton-ties also receive careful consideration by the majority. It is not enough that the most formidable and insolent trust which ever laid its hand upon the throat of honest labor, threatening every class, from the poor colored cotton-picker, whose few pounds of crop he could not get to market for lack of means to wrap it, to the merchant and capitalist who had advanced the necessaries of life to sustain that labor through the season. To these come the proposed revision, not with helping hand, but other burdens, and the cotton-ties which their own friends had reduced to 35 per cent. in the tariff of 1883 (one of the bright oases in a desert of iniquity) they omit by name, but include in a new classification, so that instead of 35 per cent. it must pay, according to the valuation of 1887, over 100 per cent., adding nearly a quarter million dollars tax on the imported ties alone, all of which is a loss to the cotton producer. Even with this they are not content, but still further tax the struggling agriculturist in this schedule by raising the duties on trace chains, and all other kinds less than three-eighths of an inch thick, from 2½ cents, which is equivalent to 44.37 per cent., to 3 cents per pound, equivalent to a rate of 53.57 per cent. Can ingenuity go further?

That taggers' iron should be raised from 30 per cent. to 65 per cent.; that table cutlery for the poor should be raised by specific rates added to ad valorem; that knives for the poor should be more heavily taxed and made cheaper for the rich; that breech-loading shotguns should be made cheaper for the $200 grade and dearer for the $15 grade by making each pay the same tax, $10 and 25 per cent. ad valorem; all these and more are no longer startling, and prepare the mind for a thousand other inconsistencies and discriminations hidden by new and obscure classifications that only time and patient investigation will reveal.

COTTON SCHEDULE.

In this schedule again the great progress of "leveling up" is called into requisition, to what end or for what purpose who can say? For instance, medium yarns are raised 3 cents per pound—they are already paying about 45 per cent. tariff tax. Is this to pay the difference in wages here and abroad? Hardly, since by the census of 1880 it is shown that cotton-goods workers are only paid 21.06 per cent. of the product. They do not get half of the present tariff, yet it is proposed to still further increase the rate. By changes in classification and by new subdivisions, still further complicating the administration, and by changes in rates, in effect principally increasing taxes, most glaring inconsistencies and discriminations are perpetrated in this so-called revision.

Cotton yarns pay about 50 per cent. Cotton cloths made from this yarn pay 45 per cent., while the clothing ready made by the tailor or seamstress from this cloth must pay 40 per cent. Hosiery is made dearer for the poor, but undisturbed for the rich. A sock worth 75 cents per dozen must pay 60 cents per dozen and 20 per cent. ad valorem, or 100 per cent., but after they reach $3 per dozen in value the tax is left at the old rate.

Collars are raised from 30 per cent. to 80 per cent. and upwards on the cheaper kinds of linen or cotton.

WOOLEN SCHEDULE.

The substitute not only retains a duty on raw wool, but increases the duty from 10 to 11 cents a pound on clothing and combing wool, and the existing duty is retained on carpet wools, which all parties agree are not produced in this country, and the changes made in the manufactures of wool increases the taxation, and to that extent increases the cost of the manufactured article, and especially the cheaper grades—the clothing of the poor.

To illustrate, take this example: The cheapest woolen dress goods, costing only 15 cents a square yard, is taxed by the substitute 6 cents a square yard and 40 per cent. ad valorem, making the whole tax thus imposed 80 per cent.

On dress goods wholly of wool the duty is increased from 9 cents a square yard and 40 per cent. ad valorem to 11 cents per square yard and 40 per cent. ad valorem, making an increase of taxation on this single article upon the basis of the importations of the fiscal year 1887, when 31,136,149 yards were imported, of $622,722.

And as these goods only cost an average of 21 cents a yard in the foreign market and under existing law are taxed 82.96 per cent. ad valorem, they are by the substitute increased to 92 per cent. ad valorem.

Of this class of goods we imported in the fiscal year 1887, $6,522,568 worth, upon which we collected $5,411,280, with many times that

amount extorted from consumers in the form of bounty to the manufacturers.

But the people will better understand the effect of this change when they see that they are paying in the form of taxation about 19½ cents upon a square yard of goods that cost in the foreign market only 21 cents a yard, making the cost to the consumer 40½ cents a yard.

While it is impossible for the minority to state the exact amount of the increase of revenue resulting from these changes, it is confidently expected that there will be an increase of revenue upon these three schedules of at least $10,000,000 per annum.

LUMBER.

The duty on lumber is practically left undisturbed, and an aggravated tax thus continued on the whole people, and more particularly upon the distant farmers and settlers whose shelter must be brought from great distances, and the tax thus retained inures to the benefit of but a few individuals to the distress of millions.

SALT.

Bulk salt, which is now dutiable at nearly 80 per cent., is continued in the substitute at the same rate. Salt is a product of the sea and earth, which nature's God bestowed upon man for his use. So free is it in nature's plan that a little sea water exposed to the sun heat and the air, nature's own factory, and the residuum is salt. Wherever found we employ the great forces of steam and electricity instead of manual labor in preparing it for use. Why a tax should be imposed on an article so easy of production and of such prime necessity and universal use is not shown. The existing law gives free salt to the fishery interests of New England and taxes salt to the farmer and dairyman. The House bill makes salt free of tax to all.

PROVISIONS.

Macaroni and vermicelli, put upon the free-list long ago for the benefit of the poor, are now taken from the free-list and burdened with a tax of 2 cents per pound, over 35 per cent. ad valorem.

Animals, live, are made dutiable at specific rates, at $20 per head for horses and mules.

Animals for breeding purposes are now free, and over two and a quarter million dollars' worth of breeding horses were imported in the year 1887 for the purpose of improving the stock of this country, and on this importation alone the farmers of the country would pay under the proposed substitute over $300,000 more tax than now.

And other animals now paying 20 per cent. are taxed at the same rate as the more valuable breeding animals. None are benefited but the wealthy. A $10,000 coaching team of six, which cost $2,000 to import under the present law, may come in under the substitute at only $120, while six bronchos from across our southern border, worth $10 a head, which would now come in for $24, must, under the proposed substitute, pay 200 per cent.

TRUSTS.

The present tariff is the nursing mother of trusts. It is the wall behind which these combinations are formed, by which the people are plundered. Tariffs keep out the foreign competition and the combination suppresses the domestic, and the whole people are at their mercy and must pay whatever is demanded. Language is inadequate to describe the iniquity of these corporations against the rights of the people, or to depict their disastrous effects upon the general welfare. As the tariffs, which render trusts possible, are established and maintained at the special instance of those who form them, it would seem but simple justice as well as good policy to tear down as much as possible of their covert and refuse to longer aid them in wrong-doing.

They are not "private affairs," as has been asserted, but public evils of the gravest character, affecting the price of every article which contributes to the comfort and support of the people. The provisions of the substitute favor them greatly, and will serve to encourage their formation in still other branches of manufacture. Many of those belonging to trusts appeared before the Finance Committee, clamorous for such legislation as would promote their interests. They are all opposed to the House bill, which should commend it to all who condemn their methods. It is bad enough to permit those who are most interested—manufacturers—to appear before our committees and suggest the legislation they wish, but surely we should not listen to the trusts and aid them to rob with both hands.

The minority can not pass by in silence the absurd accusation that the House bill means "free trade," "the ruin of industry," and the "degradation of American labor." These charges are as false as they are misleading. How the flow of surplus money into the Treasury can be stopped without reducing the taxes which produce it no man can devise; how these taxes can be reduced without taking off from the top toward the bottom no imagination can conceive. Therefore it would seem no man can propose to cut off excessive taxation without subjecting himself to the charge of "free trade," because any reduction whatever "looks toward free trade." True, Government revenues might be reduced by making duties so high as to prohibit importations altogether; but that is the other end of the road, which increases the taxes paid to private persons. If the first method of reduction leads to free trade, the other leads to free plunder, which is worse.

Republican Presidents and Secretaries of the Treasury for years past have warned Congress of the accumulating surplus and advised the reduction of taxes. Were they all free-traders, advising the destruction of industry and the degradation of labor? The Tariff Commission of 1882, composed of nine men, eight of whom, at least, were protectionists, after perambulating all the country east of the Rocky Mountains, admitted the urgent necessity of reduction, and reported a bill which they said would lower taxes 25 per cent. They said:

> Any amelioration of the unnecessarily burdensome restrictions bearing upon the importations, provided the duties required for the equalization of the different conditions of capital and labor here and abroad are preserved, is a boon not only to commerce considered as a separate national interest, but to production.

That which, with them, was "a boon to production," when offered by the House bill becomes free trade and the ruin of production. They were not accused of free trade or hostility to labor; on the contrary their report was welcomed and applauded by the entire body of protectionists in this Chamber. The Finance Committee based its bill, which is the present law, upon it, and announced that it would reduce duties at least 20 per cent.; yet all advocates of the House bill, which reduces only 5 per cent., are free-traders, so denounced by those who in 1883 proposed a cut in duties four times as great. It is safe to say that there is not a Senator in this body, or a man in any way prominent in the councils of the Republican party in the United States, who, at one time or another, has not admitted the necessity of reducing taxes in order to stop the surplus. They are, therefore, free-traders, and desire the ruin of industry and the degradation of labor.

The minority respectfully submit that those are the enemies of industry who so enhance the cost of the raw material as to restrict its production and limit its markets; and those are its true friends who cheapen its material and enlarge its production and its markets. They further submit that those are the enemies of American labor, who supplant it with the labor of unnaturalized foreigners, whenever that can be obtained cheapest, and who receive by the law 47 per cent. from the consumer in trust for the American labor which makes their products, and fraudulently withhold more than half that trust fund from its owners, and who also lessen and restrict the amount of labor by limiting production and markets by tariffs and trusts; and that those are its true friends who seek to shut off unnatural and heathen competition, enlarge its products and markets, and to lessen for it the cost of the necessities of life.

THE WAGE SCARE.

In a country like our own, where the direction of legislation is determined by the general suffrage, it is only possible for the favored few to secure their bounties by an appeal to the multitude of wage-workers, and the enlistment of their sympathies through their interests, real or imaginary.

So far has this been done in support of the present system that the bread-winners have loaded themselves down with unnecessary and extravagant taxes in hope of fancied returns in better wages and more work, until at last it has become apparent to many at least that taxation does not enrich the man who pays the taxes, and it only needs intelligent comparison of the effects of past legislation to convince any fair-minded man of the beneficial results to be expected from a reduction of the burdens of the people.

Cotton was long ago placed upon the free-list. Did that make free-traders of those who voted for that measure? Did it reduce the wages of operatives in cotton or close the cotton-mills, or did it destroy the cotton plantations? On the contrary, we have grown more cotton than ever since that legislation; we have exported more cotton than ever. Our cotton-mills are more profitable to-day than any other, and our cotton operatives have steadier work and better wages than those who work in other mills, and we export their finished products by the hundred million yards, while protected wool has stopped one-fourth of the woolen machinery and thrown 25 per cent. of the woolen operatives out of employment.

More than a decade and a half ago hides were placed upon the free-list. Did that destroy the leather industry in this country? On the contrary we lead the world in its manufacture, save in a few minor branches, and, with largely increased population, our importations of leather have decreased and our exportations of finished products have increased.

We do import more hides than formerly because our own supply is insufficient, but this raw material furnishes labor to many hands and adds to our national wealth. We imported last year upwards of twenty-four million dollars' worth of hides free. Does that make free-traders of those who made hides free; and if $24,000,000 of free hides does not make one free-trader, does two-thirds as much free wool make free-traders of half our people?

What has happened with cotton and with hides it is confidently believed and promised will happen with free wool. Our production of wool will increase, our manufactories will revive, our woolen operatives will have steadier work and therefore better wages. Our products of woolen goods will increase and as well our exportations of woolen goods to foreign countries. Not ten years ago quinine was placed upon the free-list against protests louder and more vehement than are heard now about the wanton destruction of an honorable industry—with what re-

sult? With immensely increased production in this country, without one cent loss of wages to operatives; but, on the contrary, to their great gain, for as we now make two and a quarter million ounces it can not but mean steadier work to more employés, and the shivering consumer reaps a benefit measured not by cents but by dollars per ounce, and the only destruction which followed in the wake of this reduction was of what was then the most formidable trust in existence. The monopoly went down and legitimate manufacture prospered.

Here is a case where with benefit both to the employé and the consumer, the placing upon the free-list of a finished article was immediately followed by a wonderful cheapening of that product, and it is quite as just to claim the decline in price was entirely due to the removal of the duty as that other claim so often made, that the imposition of duty reduces prices by competition, and in proof of which is cited the general decline of prices in this country, due, as is claimed, to the tariff, ignoring the discovery of new supplies and improvements in methods of manufacture and the supplanting of manual labor in every department of life with inanimate machinery operated by natural forces intelligently controlled.

Take the agriculturist, for example, and note the fearful decline in his returns in a half dozen years. In 1886 nearly 18,500,000 acres more land was cultivated and planted in cereal crops than in 1881 and more than three-fourths of a billion more bushels of grain were raised and sold; yet, instead of receiving nearly $400,000,000 more for the extra outlay of labor and capital on lands poorer on the average than those already occupied, the farmers of the country suffered a loss in values on those grain crops alone of over $600,000,000 on that year's harvest as compared with the values of 1881.

Everything declines save the taxes, and these same farmers, who must send their surplus abroad to find a market, found, on bringing the reduced returns of their crops home, that notwithstanding they were enabled to buy foreign products slightly cheaper than before, that their taxes had been increased in that period, and that they were compelled in 1886 to pay more than $2.30 customs dues on each $100 worth imported, more than they did for like importations in 1881; and to-day those taxes are nearly $4 more per $100 worth than in 1881.

And when, in view of the above cited facts of a decline of about 33⅓ per cent. in the value of his crops in 1886 below the values of 1881, he asks that for to-morrow his taxes be made $3 less per $100 than in that same year 1881, he is met with the cry of free-trader, and that is considered argument enough.

FREE WOOL.

The minority are firmly convinced that besides the incalculable advantage to the whole country which would result from the placing of wool upon the free-list, it is easily demonstrable that no class will suffer, but that each will reap his share of the benefit.

With a consumption of 600,000,000 pounds of raw wool in 1887 and a population of 60,000,000, the average per capita consumption is easily reckoned at 10 pounds, or 50 pounds to the average family of five persons, and the Northern farmer, constantly exposed to the rigors of our winters, consumes something more than the average.

It requires from 3 to 4 pounds of raw wool to make a pound of cloth, so that from 12 to 16 pounds of woolen clothing for the family will be seen to be a low average. This is now taxed from 55 to nearly 90 per cent. The manufacturer is not benefited, because his finished product comes into competition with the foreign product made not only from untaxed wool but cheaper wool.

It is reckoned that 3½ pounds make a pound of cloth, and when the manufacturer pays 10 cents per pound duty he is supposed to be compensated therefor by the specific duty of 35 cents per pound on his woolen goods. Now, this is on the assumption that 3 pounds of raw wool make one of scoured wool; that is, that the wool shrinks in the cleaning not above 66⅔ per cent.

But many South American and other wools contain more than that proportion of foreign matter, running as high as 75 and 80 per cent. This wool our manufacturer can not buy, because his tax on the cloth would then run from 45 to 60 cents per pound, and his compensatory duty is only 35 cents. Therefore for these wools the foreign dealer finds no American competitor in the market and buys them at his own price, and these cheaper wools, untaxed and manufactured abroad, compete here with unfair advantage with our own heavily handicapped woolens, and successfully, too.

Now, if the tax be taken off wools our manufacturers at once become bidders for this wool against the foreign manufacturer, and as a certain consequence the price will rise, and this operates doubly against the foreign manufacturer. He buys his wools dearer and meets untaxed in our markets corresponding grades.

We will import more wools, of course, and in no other way can our great factories prosper, because their capacity is beyond our own wool production. When the factories are turning out more product the employés have steadier work and better wages, and, indirectly of course, the whole country is benefited.

Under the House bill the manufacturers, with free wool, secure even a higher competitive advantage over the foreign than under the present law or the substitute. The manufacturers will export woolen goods as we now export cotton and leather, and the demand for the wool will better the wool market and encourage increased production, while the average wool-grower himself will reap from cheapened clothing more benefits than he ever did from a tax on his product, which he must himself pay.

The minority, therefore, dissenting from the report of the majority, commend to the Senate and the country the bill of the House of Representatives, No. 9051, as a measure for the reduction of taxes based alike upon justice and good policy.

As the best exposition of the effect of bill H. R. 9051 upon taxation and revenue, the report of the majority of the Committee on Ways and Means submitted with the bill to the House of Representatives is hereto appended, with our concurrence

ISHAM G. HARRIS.
Z. B. VANCE.
D. W. VOORHEES.

I concur in the above report, indorsing the House bill in respect to articles placed upon the free-list, but desire some modifications in the dutiable-list.

J. R. McPHERSON.

[House Report No. 1496, Fiftieth Congress, first session.]

TO REDUCE TAXATION AND SIMPLIFY THE LAWS IN RELATION TO THE COLLECTION OF THE REVENUE.

April 2, 1888.—Committed to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union and ordered to be printed.

Mr. MILLS, from the Committee on Ways and Means, submitted the following report (to accompany bill H. R. 9051):

The Committee on Ways and Means, to whom was referred the annual message of the President, calling the attention of Congress to the large surplus now in the Treasury, daily growing larger on account of the excess of receipts over expenditures, have given to the subject that careful consideration which its importance demands, and in response to his recommendations beg leave to report to the House a bill to prevent the accumulation of surplus revenue by reducing the present excessive and unjust rates of taxation imposed upon the people.

Our revenues for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1887, amounted to $371,403,277.66, while our expenditures for the same time, including interest and sinking fund for the public debt, amounted to $315,835,428.12; leaving a surplus of $55,567,849,54 over and above all requirements for current expenditure. The receipts for the current year up to March 1 amounted to $253,905,890, and the estimates for the remaining four months are $136,094,110; making total receipts for the year $390,000,000. The expenditures for the current year to March 1 amount to $180,594,915, and the estimates of expenditure for the remaining four months amount to $128,405,085; making a total of expenditures of $309,000,000; leaving a surplus of $81,000,000.

As our customs and internal taxes are levied on articles which go into consumption, we may expect our revenues to increase with the increase of consumption, which must keep pace with the growth of population and wealth. On the other hand, with an honest and economical administration of public affairs, our annual expenditures may be expected to decrease. The large surplus now in the Treasury, which it is estimated will exceed $150,000,000 by the 1st day of July next, together with such as may thereafter be in the Treasury, may be applied to the reduction of the debt and the payment of annual interest charge on the same.

It is, then, safe to say that the above surplus, together with the yearly purchase of bonds required by law for the sinking fund, which is an expenditure included in the annual estimates of expenditures, and not in the estimate of the surplus, will extinguish by the date of their maturity in 1891 all the outstanding 4½ per cent. bonds, amounting at this time to $234,427,250, and still leave over $60,000,000.

With receipts growing larger and expenditures growing smaller, we must soon gather into the Treasury the larger part of the circulation of the country to the great injury of its business and the bankruptcy of many of its people. Some method must be adopted by Congress to prevent the congestion which must occur under existing laws.

There are two ways in which this excessive accumulation may be prevented. We may reduce taxation to the level of expenditures and leave in the pockets of the people all moneys not needed for public purposes, or we may raise expenditures to the height of taxation, seeking out new and useless objects of appropriation on which to lavish the great and growing revenues, not needed for any legitimate wants of the public service.

If we adopt the latter course these very objects of useless expenditure will gather upon Congress in such increasing numbers and with such growing demands as to fasten upon the Government a permanent and unchangeable policy of extravagant and reckless appropriations.

This policy once adopted will not only breed corruption in public life and demoralization in private life, but will compel, in periods of depression, an increased rate of taxation for the people or an increase of bonded debt for the Government.

There is but one safe course, and that is to reduce taxation to the necessary requirements of an honest, economical, and efficient administration of Government. Having determined upon this course as the

one which a wise and just policy demands, we are confronted with the question, Upon what articles shall the reduction be made? Shall we leave our import duties as they are and repeal the internal-revenue taxes on alcoholic liquors and tobacco? Or shall we leave the internal-revenue tax as it is and make the reduction on imports alone? Or shall we reduce the taxes on both?

The committee have determined to recommend a reduction of the revenues from both customs and internal taxes. They have given the whole subject a careful and painstaking examination, and in the revision of the schedules have endeavored to act with a spirit of fairness to all interests. They have carefully kept in view at all times the interests of the manufacturer, the laborer, the producer, and the consumer.

The bill herewith reported to the House is not offered as a perfect bill. Many articles are left subject to duty which might well be transferred to the free-list. Many articles are left subject to rates of duty which might well be lessened. In both respects the bill could be improved; but in its preparation the committee have not undertaken or felt authorized to construct a new and consistent system of tariff taxation. They have dealt with the existing system, seeking to free it of much of its injustice, to simplify its provisions, to diminish its complexity, and, as far as practicable, to lighten its pressure on the taxpayer, and make it more contributory to our industrial prosperity and progress.

Furthermore, we have felt constrained to consult the opinions and give weight as far as possible to the views of our associates from different parts of the United States, always subordinate, however, to the paramount consideration of the welfare of the entire country. From the beginning of our Government tariff legislation has been based on the principles of mutual concession. The present bill does not depart from this precedent.

In the progressive growth of our manufactures, we have reached the point where our capacity to produce is far in excess of the requirements of our home consumption. As a consequence, many of our mills are closed, and many of those still in operation are running on short time. This condition is hurtful to the manufacturer, to the laborer, and producer of the materials consumed in manufacture.

The manufacturer loses the profit on his capital, the laborer loses his wages, and the producer of the materials consumed in manufacture loses the market for his products. Manufacturers in many instances, to guard against losses by low prices caused by an oversupply in the home market, are organizing trusts, combinations, and pools to limit production and keep up prices. This vicious condition of business could not exist with low duties, but is the legitimate outgrowth of prohibitory duties on imports. Prohibitory tariffs surround the country with lines of investment and prevent all relief from without, while trusts, combinations, and pools plunder the people within.

In a country like ours, prolific in its resources, where the rewards of labor ought to be large, the capitalist may by such methods keep his investments secure and still make profits; but what is to become of the laborers who are thrown out of employment by stopping the wheels of machinery and limiting the amount of product? And what is to become of the producer of the materials to be consumed by the manufacturer? When the fires are shut off, the laborer and the materials are shut off at the same time, and the market for both is gone; whether they labor in the factory or the field; whether they produce cotton, wool, hemp, flax, coal, or ore; whether the product of their daily labor is cloth, iron, steel, boots, or shoes, they must have constant employment to obtain for themselves and families the necessaries and comforts of life.

When out of employment, with earnings cut short, with low prices for their products caused by the closing of the market, they still must pay for whatever their daily wants require the prices which the trusts have fixed. What is the remedy for this wrong? It is more extended markets for the sale of our products and a constant and active competition in business. With active competition combinations and pools are impossible. With the markets of the world open to us our manufacturers may run their mills on full time, give constant employment to their laborers, with a steadily-increasing rate of wages. With the markets of the world open to the sale of their products they will create an active and constant demand for all the raw materials required in manufactures, which will stimulate, promote, and reward the wool-grower and the producer of cotton, hemp, flax, hides, ores, and other materials of manufacture. We are the largest producers of cotton in the world, we are second in the production of wool, we put on the market annually quantities of hemp and flax, and our country is full of ores and coal. What we need is manufactures enough to consume all the annual product of these materials and create an active demand for them, so that all our workmen may be constantly employed and receive high prices for their labor.

To accomplish this our manufacturers must have markets for the sale of their wares, and these markets are to be found in foreign countries as well as at home. To take the foreign market from the foreign manufacturer we must produce our goods at a lower cost than he can. The principal elements of cost are labor and material. In many of our manufactures the labor cost is lower than in any country in the world, and if the cost of materials was as low here as in foreign countries we could produce our goods more cheaply than they and largely increase our exports to foreign markets.

The annual product of our manufactories is now estimated at $7,000,000,000, of which amount we export only about $136,000,000, or less than 2 per cent. If we could obtain free of duty such raw materials as we do not produce and can only be procured in foreign countries, and mix with our home product in the various branches of manufacture, we could soon increase our exports several hundred millions. With untaxed raw materials we could keep our mills running on full time, our operatives in constant employment, and have an active demand for our raw materials in our own factories. If there should be no duty on any materials entering into manufactures many articles now made abroad would be made at home, which, while it would give more employment to our own labor, would give a better market to many articles which we produce and which enter into manufactures, such as cotton, wool, hemp, flax, and others.

With this end in view we have gone as far as we could and done what we could in the present condition of things to place our manufactures upon a firm and unshaken foundation, where they would have advantages over all the manufacturers of the world. Our manufacturers, having the advantage of all others in the intelligence, skill, and productive capacity of their labor, need only to be placed on the same footing with their rivals in having their materials at the same cost in the open markets of the world. In starting on this policy we have transferred many articles from the dutiable to the free-list. The revenues now received on these articles amount to $22,189,595.48. Three-fourths of this amount is collected on articles that enter into manufactures, of which wool and tin-plates are the most important. The revenues derived from wool during the last fiscal year amounted to $5,899,816.63, and the revenues from tin-plates to $5,706,433.89.

The repeal of all duties on wool enables us to reduce the duties on the manufactures of wool $12,332,211.65. The largest reduction we have made is in the woolen schedule, and this reduction was only made possible by placing wool on the free-list. There is no greater reason for a duty on wool than there is for a duty on any other raw material. A duty on wool makes it necessary to impose a higher duty on the goods made from wool, and the consumer has to pay a double tax. If we leave wool untaxed the consumer has to pay a tax only on the manufactured goods.

It is contended by some that if we put wool on the free-list we should also put woolen goods on the free-list. If this is sound policy we should also put cotton goods on the free-list, for raw cotton is free, and we should put silk goods on the free-list, for raw silk is free. Then where would the Government get its revenues? Duties are imposed to raise revenue, and they should be so imposed as to obtain the revenue with as little burden as possible to the tax-payer and as little disturbance as possible to the business of the country. This is accomplished by imposing the duty on the finished goods alone, and in no tariff, from the first to the last, have woolens, cottons, silks, or linens been placed on the free-list.

We say to the manufacturer we have put wool on the free-list to enable him to obtain foreign wools cheaper, make his goods cheaper, and send them into foreign markets and successfully compete with the foreign manufacturer. We say to the laborer in the factory we have put wool on the free-list so that it may be imported and he may be employed to make the goods that are now made by foreign labor and imported into the United States. We say to the consumer we have put wool on the free-list that he may have woolen goods cheaper. We say to the domestic wool-grower we have put wool on the free-list to enable the manufacturer to import foreign wool to mix with his, and thus enlarge his market and quicken the demand for the consumption of home wool, while it lightens the burden of the tax-payer.

The duty on wool now prevents nearly all the better classes of wool from coming into the country; the domestic product can supply only about one-half of the amount required for home consumption. The statistician of the Agricultural Department puts the domestic product for the year 1887 at 265,000,000 pounds. Others place it higher, but none at more than half the annual consumption of our people. It requires about 600,000,000 pounds of wool and other fibers manufactured with it, which are now paying duty, to supply the annual demands of home consumption.

Why, then, should we keep out by high duties the foreign wools so necessary to the clothing of the people? The Wool-Growers' Association asks us to put on a duty high enough to prevent the importation of all wools. The Wool-Manufacturers' Association asks us to put on a duty high enough to keep out all manufactures of wool. If Congress grants this joint request, what are the people to do for woolen clothing? Are the people to be compelled by Congress to wear cotton goods in the winter or go without, to give bounties to wool-growers and wool manufacturers?

During the last fiscal year there were 114,404,173 pounds of wool imported, and of that amount 81,504,447 were cheap carpet wool, the greater part of which paid 2½ cents per pound duty. The high duty of 10 cents per pound on the finer wools that go into clothing was so great a barrier against the importation of the better wools that only 33,099,696 pounds were imported. But our people required clothing, and if Congress puts a duty so high on wool as to keep it out, still, high as was the duty on woolen goods, $44,235,243 worth were im-

ported and consumed in this country, upon which duties were paid amounting to $29,729,717.

If the charges constantly being made are true, that great quantities of these goods are coming in undervalued, underweighed, and undermeasured, then the aggregate amount is much larger. Frauds of this character, smuggling, and bribery follow prohibitory duties just as the shadow follows the substance. These goods for the most part could be manufactured in the United States, and if the wools in them could be admitted free of duty it would give employment to many thousands of our own operatives, start into life and keep in active operation many of our factories now idle, and largely reduce the cost of these goods to the consumers.

We must find a way to foreign markets for our woolen goods. In the foreign market we must compete with the foreign producer, and in order to do so successfully we must produce our goods at a lower cost and be able to undersell the foreign product and take the market. We are now exporting only $500,000 worth of woolen goods, while England, with free wool, exports more than $100,000,000. With free wool we may not only supply the home market with the greater part of the woolen goods now imported, but we can begin to export woolen goods and soon build up a prosperous foreign trade.

We submit herewith a table showing equivalent ad valorem duties now paid on manufactures of wool—those proposed by the committee and those proposed by the joint agreement of Wool-Growers' and Wool Manufacturers' Associations, adopted in Washington, D. C., January 14, 1888:

Articles.	Present equivalent ad valorem.	Proposed equivalent ad valorem.	Proposed by convention of wool dealers, growers, and manufacturers.
Wools, hair of the alpaca, goat, and other like animals—			
Manufactures—			
Balmorals—			
Valued at above 30 and not exceeding 40 cents per pound	67.72	40	111.73
Valued at above 40 and not exceeding 60 cents per pound	65.59	40	
Valued at above 60 and not exceeding 80 cents per pound	68.15	40	96.50
Valued at above 80 cents per pound	66.35	40	
Belts or felts, endless, for paper or printing machines	52.87	30	78.59
Blankets—Valued at not exceeding 30 cents per pound	79.66	40	
Valued at above 30 and not exceeding 40 cents per pound	63.85	40	128.76
Valued at above 40 and not exceeding 60 cents per pound	69.56	40	
Valued above 60 and not exceeding 80 cents per pound	69.36	40	99.36
Valued at above 80 cents per pound	70.30	40	
Bunting	80.75	40	95.75
Carpets and carpeting of all kinds—			
Aubusson, Axminster, and Chenille carpets, and carpets woven whole for rooms	47.14	30	72.85
Brussels carpets	59.03	30	88.67
Druggets and bockings, printed, colored, or otherwise	73.92	30	123.20
Mats, screens, hassocks, and rugs, not exclusively of vegetable material	40.00	30	50.00
Of wool, flax, or cotton, or parts of either, or other material not specially enumerated or provided for	40.00	30	55.03
Patent velvet and tapestry velvet carpets, printed on the warp or otherwise	55.10	30	85.13
Saxony, Wilton, and Tournay velvet carpets	54.27	30	82.36
Tapestry Brussels, printed on the warp or otherwise	61.13	30	88.76
Treble ingrain, three-ply, and worsted chain Venetian carpets	45.79	30	69.73
Yarn, Venetian, and two-ply ingrain carpets	44.70	30	68.37
Hemp and jute carpets	24.76	30	79.03
Clothing, ready-made, and wearing apparel (except knit goods), not specially enumerated or provided for, composed wholly or in part of wool, worsted, the hair of the alpaca, goat, or other (like) animals, made up or manufactured wholly or in part by the tailor, seamstress, or manufacturer—			
Cloaks, dolmans, jackets, talmas, ulsters, or other outside garments for ladies' and children's apparel, and goods of similar description, or used for like purposes	67.74	45	83.11
Clothing, ready-made, and wearing apparel of every description not specially enumerated or provided for, and balmoral skirts and skirting, and goods of similar description, or used for like purposes	54.18	45	
Cloths, woolen—			
Valued at not exceeding 80 cents per pound	89.84	40	128.33
Valued at above 80 cents per pound	68.91	40	91.30
Dress goods, women's and children's coat linings, Italian cloths, and goods of like description—			
Composed in part of wool, worsted, the hair of the alpaca, goat, or other animals—			
Valued at not exceeding 20 cents per square yard	67.89	40	102.61
Valued at above 20 cents per square yard	59.06	40	71.78
Composed wholly of wool, worsted, the hair of the alpaca, goat, or other animals, or of a mixture of them, and all such goods of like description, with selvages made wholly or in part of other materials, or with threads of other materials introduced for the purpose of changing the classification—			
Weighing 4 ounces or less per square yard	82.96	40	107.28
All weighing over 4 ounces per square yard	69.68	40	92.40
Flannels—Valued at not exceeding 30 cents per pound	73.42	40	
Valued at above 30 and not exceeding 40 cents per pound	66.20	40	121.39
Valued at above 40 and not exceeding 60 cents per pound	67.69	40	
Valued at above 60 and not exceeding 80 cents per pound	67.65	40	108.66
Valued at above 80 cents per pound	78.02	40	
Hats of wool—Valued at above 30 and not exceeding 40 cents per pound		40	134.54
Valued at above 40 and not exceeding 60 cents per pound	73.04	40	
Valued at above 60 and not exceeding 80 cents per pound	66.22	40	69.77
Valued at above 80 cents per pound	62.07	40	
Knit goods, and all goods made on knitting frames—			
Valued at not exceeding 30 cents per pound	88.33	40	
Valued at above 30 and not exceeding 40 cents per pound	65.20	40	125.71
Valued at above 40 and not exceeding 60 cents per pound	69.14	40	
Valued at above 60 and not exceeding 80 cents per pound	69.62	40	83.29
Valued at above 80 cents per pound	62.58	40	
Shawls, woolen—			
Valued at not exceeding 80 cents per pound	88.44	40	126.32
Valued at above 80 cents per pound	65.41	40	84.19
Composed wholly or in part of worsted, the hair of the alpaca, goat, or other animals	61.53	40	
Webbings, gorings, suspenders, braces, beltings, bindings, braids, galloons, fringes, gimps, cords, cords and tassels, dress trimmings, head nets, buttons or barrel buttons, or buttons of other forms for tassels or ornaments, wrought by hand or braided by machinery, made of wool, worsted, the hair of the alpaca, goat, or other animals, or of which wool, worsted, the hair of the alpaca, goat, or other animals is a component material	66.21	50	77.00
Yarns, woolen and worsted—			
Valued at not exceeding 60 cents per pound	69.40	40	
Valued at above 30 and not exceeding 40 cents per pound	67.99	40	116.69
Valued at above 40 and not exceeding 60 cents per pound	68.08	40	
Valued at above 60 and not exceeding 80 cents per pound	69.08	40	117.11
Valued at above 80 cents per pound	68.79	40	
All manufactures of every description not specially enumerated or provided for, made wholly or in part of—			
Wool—Valued at not exceeding 80 cents per pound	88.81	40	126.87
Valued at above 80 cents per pound	64.46	40	84.93
Worsted, the hair of the alpaca, goat, or other animals (except such as are composed in part of wool)—			
Valued at not exceeding 30 cents per pound	76.49	40	
Valued at above 30 and not exceeding 40 cents per pound	69.38	40	123.10
Valued at above 40 and not exceeding 60 cents per pound	68.28	40	
Valued at above 60 and not exceeding 80 cents per pound	68.15	40	112.65
Valued at above 80 cents per pound	71.99	40	

From the above table it will be seen that the wool-growers and wool-manufacturing association are clamoring for higher taxes. The contest in the woolen schedule is not between the present rate and the rate proposed by the committee, but between the rate proposed by the committee and the schedule agreed upon by the Wool-Growers' Association and Wool-Manufacturers' Association. The committee propose free wool and a reduction from present rates to 40 per cent. ad valorem on all manufactures except carpets, which were made dutiable at 30 per cent.; ready-made clothing at 45 per cent., and webbings, gorings, etc., at 50 per cent. The joint agreement of the two associations proposes to increase the present rates to 128 per cent. on some of the cheaper cloths; to 102 per cent. on the cheaper grades of women's and children's dress goods when composed in part of wool, and to 107 per cent. when composed wholly of wool; on cheaper grades of flannels to 121 per cent.; on cheaper grades of wool hats to 134 per cent.; on cheaper grades of knit goods to 125 per cent.; on cheaper grades of woolen shawls to 126 per cent.; on woolen blankets to 128 per cent.

These rates, high as they are, are not the highest that are imposed on all woolen goods by the joint agreement. They are only the highest rate on the lowest valued goods, as shown in the agreement. All goods at a lower value are taxed at a still higher rate.

This most extraordinary schedule has been made and agreed upon by the two parties named, and it has been introduced into the House and referred to this committee.

In the woolen schedule we have substituted ad valorem for specific duties. The specific duty is the favorite of those who are to be benefited by high rates, who are protected against competition, and protected in combinations against the consumer of their products. There is a persistent pressure by manufacturers for the specific duty because it conceals from the people the amount of taxes they are compelled to pay to the manufacturer.

The specific duty always discriminates in favor of the costly article and against the cheaper one, and therefore it imposes a heavier burden as it goes down from the highest priced articles to the lowest. This discrimination is peculiarly oppressive in woolen and cotton goods, which are necessaries of life to all classes of people. In order that this fact may be clearly seen and comprehended we append a table taken from the first annual report of the Commissioner of Labor (page 251):

This table states the description of the goods, their width in inches, and the weight per yard of each kind; the price of the goods at the factory; the rate and the amount of duty per pound and ad valorem, and the total amount of duty levied under the compound rate; and also the per cent. which the total duty is of the price per yard at the factory in England.

Price per yard of Leeds (England) woolen and mixed goods, duties, etc.

Name.	Description.		Price at factory.	Duty.						Cost in New York, not including packing, carriage to port, ocean freight, and insurance.
				Rate.		Amount.				
	Width (inches).	Weight (ounces).		Per pound.	Ad valorem (per cent.).	Per pound.	Ad valorem.	Total.	Per cent. of price at factory.	
West of England broadcloth	60	17	$3.60	$0.35	40	$0.372	$1.440	$1.812	50.3	$5.412
Fine worsted trousering	28	11	1.62	.35	40	.241	.648	.889	54.9	2.509
Imitation sealskin (mohair and cotton)	50	31	4.50	.35	40	.678	1.800	2.478	55.0	6.978
West of England beaver	58	25	3.36	.35	40	.547	1.344	1.891	56.3	5.251
West of England all-wool Moscow	58	29	3.60	.35	40	.634	1.440	2.074	57.6	5.674
Fine worsted coating	56	24	2.88	.35	40	.525	1.152	1.677	58.2	4.557
Fine worsted trousering	28	12	1.42	.35	40	.263	.568	.831	58.5	2.251
Indigo blue Cheviot coating	58	24	2.40	.35	40	.612	.960	1.572	65.5	3.972
Low worsted coating (worsted face, woolen back, cotton warp)	50	24	.82	.18	35	.270	.287	.557	68.0	1.377
Low worsted trousering (woolen back)	28	11	.48	.24	35	.165	.168	.333	69.4	.813
Ottoman (worsted face, woolen back, cotton warp)	50	27	.82	.18	35	.304	.287	.591	72.0	1.411
Matelesse (worsted face, woolen back, cotton warp)	50	28	.84	.18	35	.315	.294	.609	72.5	1.449
Mantle cloth (worsted face, woolen back, cotton warp)	50	24	.68	.18	35	.270	.238	.508	74.7	1.188
Wool, fancy suiting	54	25	.94	.35	35	.547	.329	.876	93.2	1.816
Cotton-warp cloth	50	15	.54	.35	35	.328	.189	.517	95.7	1.057
Fancy coating	54	23	.78	.35	35	.503	.273	.776	99.5	1.556
Fancy Cheviot	54	25	.82	.35	35	.547	.287	.834	101.7	1.654
Wool, fancy suiting	54	22	.70	.35	35	.481	.245	.725	103.7	1.426
Diagonal Cheviot	54	25	.76	.35	35	.547	.266	.813	107.0	1.573
Common blue Cheviot coating	52	25	.72	.35	35	.547	.252	.799	111.0	1.519
Cotton-warp Moscow	52	35	.96	.35	35	.766	.336	1.102	114.8	2.062
Cotton-warp cloth	52	25	.64	.35	35	.547	.224	.771	120.5	1.411
Cotton-warp twilled Melton	50	16½	.42	.35	35	.361	.147	.508	121.0	.928
Cotton-warp Moscow	52	30	.74	.35	35	.656	.259	.915	123.6	1.655
Cotton-warp cloth	50	13	.32	.35	35	.284	.112	.396	123.7	.716
Fancy overcoating (cotton warp)	50	34	.82	.35	35	.744	.287	1.031	125.7	1.851
Cotton-warp reversible	50	31	.74	.35	35	.678	.259	.937	1 5.6	1.677
Fancy overcoating (cotton warp)	50	33	.76	.35	35	.700	.266	.966	127.0	1.726
Cotton-warp coating	50	17	.40	.35	35	.372	.140	.512	128.0	.912
Imitation sealskin (calf hair mixed with wool, cotton warp)	50	28	.56	.35	35	.612	.196	.808	144.3	1.358
Cotton-warp coating	50	23	.46	.35	35	.503	.161	.664	144.3	1.124
Cotton-warp Melton	50	13	.24	.35	35	.284	.084	.368	153.3	.668
Cotton-warp serge Melton	50	15½	.26	.35	35	.339	.091	.430	165.4	.690
Reversible diagonal (cotton warp)	50	29	.48	.35	35	.634	.168	.802	167.1	1.282
Reversible nap (cotton warp)	50	29	.44	.35	35	.634	.154	.788	179.1	1.228
Cotton-warp reversible	50	30	.45	.35	35	.656	.157	.813	180.7	1.263

This table is well worthy of careful study. In examining the figures given in the column headed "Price at factory" and the column headed "Per cent. of price at factory," which the total duty amounts to, the startling inequalities in the rate of duty to be paid in this country becomes apparent. The highest priced goods named in the table is West of England broadcloth, worth $3.60 per yard in Leeds, the specific duty being 35 cents per pound and the ad valorem duty 40 per cent., making a total of 50.3 per cent. on the value at the factory. This is on a high grade of goods. In looking at the bottom of the table the last entry is for cotton-warp reversible cloth made in imitation of a better kind. It is worth but 45 cents per yard at the factory. The specific duty is the same as on the West of England broadcloth, 35 cents per pound, the ad valorem duty is 35 per cent., but the specific duty and the ad valorem duty together make the rate on the price at the factory 180.7 per cent. That is to say, the cheaper the goods at the factory the greater is the proportional increment of duty. The column headed "Per cent. of price at factory," which shows the percentage that the duty is of the factory price, brings this out clearly.

The above table shows the true nature of specific duties, and the consumer can see why it is that manufacturers clamor for them. They know the different values of these goods, and what apt words will embrace the high and low priced together, and make the poorer people pay the same tax for a yard of cloth worth 45 cents that the wealthy do for a yard that costs $3.66; but that fact the specific tariff conceals. The ad valorem rate taxes everything according to its value. A duty of 40 per cent. ad valorem would have imposed a tax of $1.44 on the yard of broadcloth and 18 cents on the cotton-warp cloth that cost 45 cents, and the duty would have been fair to both. As it is, the tax is 180 per cent. on the cheap cloth and 50 per cent. on the high-priced broadcloth.

In the cotton-goods schedule we see the same "vicious, inequitable, and illogical" results of the specific duty. As an illustration, we refer to the report of the Secretary of the Treasury on the revision of the tariff, February 16, 1886, pages 84, 85, 86, and 87. It will be seen in his report, by the tables sent to him by persons dealing in cotton goods imported into the United States from foreign countries, that cheap goods costing 3.55 cents per yard pay 176 per cent. duty, while those costing 8.12 cents per yard pay 77 per cent. duty; and goods that cost 4 cents per yard pay a duty of 94 per cent., while those that cost 2 cents per yard pay a duty of 203 per cent. These inequalities run throughout the whole specific system. It is that feature that specially commends it to

the manufacturer of the competing article. As these excessive rates are thought to be more hurtful in cotton and woolen goods than in the articles embraced in the other schedules, the committee have substituted the ad valorem for the specific duties as to all articles in the woolen schedule, and in all, except yarns, in the cotton schedules.

In 1789 a duty was imposed on imported hemp, and in 1828 on imported flax, and while at intervals these fibers were imported free without harm to the American producer, yet since 1842 American flax and hemp have been "protected," and this necessitated the imposition of duties upon all manufactures from these and like fibers.

In spite of these duties American hemp has decreased in the amount of production from 74,493 tons in 1860 to 5,025 tons in 1880, as shown by the census reports of those two years, and flax from 7,709,676 pounds in 1850 to 1,565,546 pounds in 1880. But the demand and necessity for the products manufactured from these and similar fibers has greatly increased, and the importations of the raw material and of the finished product have necessarily equally increased.

Formerly every pound of American cotton was covered with bagging and tied with rope made from American hemp; now over 50,000,000 yards of cotton bagging manufactured from imported jute butts are used to cover the 7,000,000 bales of American cotton which are tied with iron cotton-ties, while the present mode of harvesting the immense grain crop of the country requires about 33,000 tons of twine, nearly all of which is made from imported material. So that, in the effort to "protect" probably 8,000 tons of American hemp and 1,500,000 pounds of American flax, a tax larger than the entire value of both these products is imposed on cotton and wheat, whose price to the producer is fixed in the foreign market, where they come in competition with cotton raised in India and wheat raised in foreign countries.

Your committee have put all these fibers upon the free-list, thereby relieving the goods manufactured in America of the tax, amounting last year to $1,930,340 on raw material. It has also put on the free-list burlaps not exceeding 60 inches in width, none of which is made in America, and of which last year there was imported $3,260,117.40 worth, upon which were levied and paid $978,035.22. It has reduced the duties on all the manufactures from these fibers, so that, except on a very few articles, no duty is higher than 25 per cent., and some as low as 15 per cent. The aggregate estimated reduction on this schedule is $4,766,846.88.

Your committee feel assured that no industry will be injured by this reduction of taxation, while it will enable the American manufacturer to compete on equal terms with his rivals, will reduce the cost of production of cotton and wheat, and will cheapen to the consumer the goods which he must purchase.

The duty on sugar is nearly a revenue tax, about 85 per cent. of it being purely a tax paid into the public Treasury; and all the sugars used in America are refined in this country. Your committee desired, in reducing the revenue received from this source, not to endanger the profitable production and refining of sugar here, and yet to prevent oppression by trusts and combinations. After much consideration, we now recommend that the revenue received from sugar be reduced by reducing the rates 20 per cent.

This reduction of rates on all sugars above No. 13 will render possible the importation of foreign refined sugars, so as to prevent exorbitant prices and protect consumers against combinations.

In the earthen and glass ware schedules we have made fair reductions, the larger part of these articles, such as common earthenware and window-glass, being necessary articles of consumption by the great body of the people, and especially the laboring classes. Ornamented china and decorated earthenware we have reduced from 60 to 45 per cent., common earthenware from 60 to 35 per cent., and window-glass from 83 and 106 to 62 and 68 per cent.

In the metal schedule the most important reduction is in steel railway bars, which are now dutiable at $17 per ton, and by the proposed bill at $11 a ton. This is a reduction of about 35 per cent. ad valorem. This reduction will be of great value in promoting and cheapening the construction of railroads and lowering the rates of transportation of freight. Two years ago steel rails sold in this country at $27 a ton. The manufacturers during last year ran the price up to $40. The present price is $31.50. Last year 12,724 miles of railroad were constructed in the United States, which required 1,300,000 tons of rails. It is therefore patent that, by reason of the present exorbitant duty of $17 a ton, the manufacturers were able to raise the price more than $8.50 a ton. They were therefore able to realize, over and above a legitimate profit, more than $11,000,000.

This sum was an increase in the cost of construction, upon which the farmers must pay interest and dividends by way of increased freights upon their wheat, cotton, corn, and other products. The price of rails on board of ship in Liverpool last year was $21; adding freight, the cost of same without duty in this country was $23.50. The duty fixed by the committee, $11, would increase the price to $34.50, or $3 above the price for which American rails are now selling. It is therefore apparent that the rate of duty allowed by the committee is more than enough to compensate our manufacturers for the difference in cost between the American and foreign product.

While we have been constrained to leave high duties on almost all the articles we have touched—duties higher than any necessity either of revenue or of difference of cost of American over foreign products required—we have felt that we ought to give some relief to other branches of industry not benefited by high duties imposed for private purposes. A large number of our people are interested in manufacturing tin, and others in putting up meats, fish, fruit, vegetables, oils, and other articles in manufactures of tin. Many of these products are exported and many consumed at home. During the last fiscal year there were imported into the United States 570,643,389 pounds of tin-plate, valued at $16,883,813.95, on which duties were paid amounting to $5,706,433.89.

We are informed that the value of the salmon caught in the Columbia River, Oregon, and canned and exported during the last fiscal year, amounted to nearly $2,000,000, while the lard that was canned and exported exceeded $14,000,000, and the fruits and meats exceeded $4,000,000. We believe that the removal of the duty on tin-plate would reduce the cost of these and other canned goods now being exported, and give to our people engaged in that trade such an advantage in the foreign market as would effectually overcome all competition, and enable them to hold the market and build up a large foreign trade.

The exporter, under existing law, has a drawback of 90 per cent. of the duty paid on tin-plate, but the repeal of the duty would give him the remaining 10 per cent., and enable him to sell so much lower and give him additional advantage over his foreign competitor. Besides this, the consumers of canned goods at home would obtain them at a reduced price.

The manufacture of tin cans is growing into an extensive industry in the United States. More than 150,000,000 cans are made per year in the city of Baltimore alone, while New York, Philadelphia, Chicago, and other Northern cities produce large quantities of articles manufactured from tin-plate.

We have placed cotton ties also on the free-list. The duties received from them during the last fiscal year were $121,098.99. Cotton is our largest exporting product. The price is so low, and has been for a number of years, that it hardly pays the cost of producing it, and the committee felt that it was a proper subject for consideration while they were repealing taxes and reducing the surplus revenue of the Government. To our farmers in the Middle and Northern States, engaged in raising hogs and selling their products, we have made salt free of duty and released revenues amounting to $676,865.50. To the people who are settling up the vast prairies of the West, inclosing their lands and building farm-houses, we have made lumber free, and removed duties amounting to $1,039,207.35.

The bill which the committee reports provides for the repeal of all restrictions on the sale of tobacco by the producer, and for the repeal of all taxes on tobacco except on cigars, cigarettes, and cheroots, and of all privilege and license taxes except those for manufacturing and selling cigars, cigarettes, and cheroots. The repeal of special and privilege taxes is also recommended. These taxes have been a fruitful source of the petty prosecutions which have crowded the Federal court dockets in some portions of the country. It is not believed that their retention is essential to the efficient collection of the revenue, and they should no longer be retained.

The changes in the administrative features of the present law are fully shown by the letter of the Secretary of the Treasury, dated March 14, 1888, and the reductions in the internal revenue will be shown by the letter of the Commissioner of Internal Revenue, dated March 12, 1888, both of which are hereto appended.

TREASURY DEPARTMENT, OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Washington, D. C., March 14, 1888.

SIR: Mr. Talbott, clerk of your committee, has presented me copies, respectively, of the proposed bill "to reduce taxation and simplify the laws in relation to the collection of the revenue," and of the tables relating to the same, with the request that I communicate to you my views as to probable effect the adoption of the administrative sections of the bill would have upon the revenue, and also that I cause the computations in the tables to be verified, and footings of the column of "values" therein to be made by experts in this Department.

With regard to the effect sections 5 to 23 of the bill would have upon the revenue, I have to advise you as follows:

1. The proposed substitute for section 2499 Revised Statutes would not, it is thought, affect the revenue one way or the other further than to prevent loss of duties by securing uniformity of action in the classification of merchandise.

2. The tendency of the amendment to "Schedule A," respecting "anhydrous alcohol," etc., would be to restrict importations of the article. This would not, however, affect the revenue appreciably, as the importations are trifling in amount.

3. The amendment to the free-list as to "articles of growth, produce, and manufacture of the United States," etc., would not apparently affect the revenue.

4. The amendment relating to "wearing apparel, personal effects," etc., would naturally result in an increase of revenue. But there is no definite basis for determining such increase. It would probably not fall short, however, of $500,000 per annum.

5. While the effect of section 6 would be to increase the dutiable value of merchandise subject to ad valorem duties, its tendency, at the same time, would be to restrict speculative importations, which have been stimulated by the opportunities for evasion afforded by the present law, as interpreted by the Supreme Court and construed by the Attorney-General. The section would not, therefore, in my opinion, operate to increase materially, if at all, the aggregate amount of revenue collected.

No better illustration of the unreliability of mere individual opinions concerning the probable effect upon the revenue of tariff legislation can be cited than the estimates given by the customs officers of the amount required to pay refunds due importers under the Oberteuffer decision, respecting coverings, and

the annual reduction of duties on this account. These estimates, as to the amount necessary to pay refunds, were from $3,000,000 to $5,000,000, while the annual reduction of duties was variously estimated at from $6,000,000 to $10,000,000.

It is now practically ascertained that the amount actually paid and to be paid as refunds covering a period of near three years will not exceed $2,000,000, while the importations and revenue have largely increased, due doubtless in some measure to the opportunity for evasions as above stated.

6. Sections 7 and 8 are calculated to promote orderly administration and the convenience of importers, but will not, it is thought, have any positive effect upon the revenue.

7. The effect of section 9 would be (1) to abolish the 10 per cent. additional duty now collected (under sec. 2970, R. S.) on merchandise remaining in bond more than one year, amounting approximately to $35,000 per annum; and (2) to reduce the revenue by reason of the assessment of duties on the quantity of merchandise withdrawn from warehouse instead of on the quantity actually imported and entered originally, as required by existing law (sec 2983, R. S.). The amount of such reduction can not be estimated. It would certainly be considerable, and might be very large. The tendency of the proposed amendments would be to increase the volume of goods warehoused and the consequent liability of loss of duties thereon.

8. There is nothing in sections 10 or 11 apparently calculated to affect the revenue.

9. Section 12 abolishes fees collected on entry of merchandise only. As these fees are not separately reported to the Department, there is no ready means of ascertaining the exact amount thereof. It may be safely assumed, however, that the reduction on this account would not exceed $375,000 per annum.

10. The tendency and effect of sections 13 to 18, inclusive, would be to prevent fraudulent attempts upon the revenue, and to insure a more strict and honest enforcement of the tariff laws. Whatever increased duties might result from such improved administrations would probably be offset by a decrease of speculative importations made with a view of defrauding the revenue.

11. SEC. 19. There being no available data for determining the precise amount of duties remitted on account of damage, the exact effect of this section upon the revenue can not be stated. A certain proportion of the merchandise on which damage is now allowed would be abandoned under this section and no duties collected thereon. Another result of this section would be to prevent the importation of any but sound goods, and especially to discourage the shipment, now common, of damaged fruits, nuts, and other such articles, upon which large damage allowances are now made. In any event it is not thought the section would affect the revenue to exceed $500,000 annually. Its great advantage would be to protect honest importers and stop frauds.

I inclose herewith copy of the tables on which footings have been made as requested. With the exception of a few unimportant errors these tables, as printed, appear to be arithmetically correct.

Respectfully, yours,

C. S. FAIRCHILD, *Secretary.*

Hon. R. Q. MILLS.
Chairman Committee on Ways and Means,
House of Representatives.

Estimate of effect of proposed bill on revenues, based on importations of 1887.

Free-list.	Importations of 1887. Values.	Importations of 1887. Duties.	Average ad valorem under— Present.	Proposed.
			Per cent.	*Per cent.*
Wood, salt, hemp, chemicals, metals, etc.	$61,672,120.42	$16,799,450.75	27.24	.....
Wool	18,206,987.97	5,390,054.73	29.60	.....
Total free-list	79,879,108.39	22,189,505.48	27.78	.....

Schedules (dutiable).	Importations of 1887. Values.	Importations of 1887. Duties.	Estimated— Duties under proposed bill.	Estimated— Amount of duties remitted.		
A. Chemicals	$5,050,325.28	$2,012,120.51	$1,133,846.78	$878,273.73	39.84	22.45
B. Earthenware and glassware	10,492,067.32	6,920,108.16	5,163,820.44	1,756,287.72	65.96	49.21
C. Metals	16,152,789.24	8,456,847.29	6,976,374.70	1,480,472.59	52.35	43.19
D. Wood and wooden ware	889,558.56	307,805.13	260,217.95	47,587.18	34.60	29.25
E. Sugar	68,897,102.27	56,515,601.67	45,223,513.73	11,292,087.94	82.04	65.64
F. Tobacco	26,441.00	21,567.00	10,064.60	11,502.40	81.57	58.06
G. Provisions	3,235,987.68	1,711,805.92	1,380,320.92	331,485.00	52.89	42.65
I. Cotton and cotton goods	2,423,585.23	1,213,599.57	935,989.28	277,610.29	50.90	40.00
J. Hemp, jute, and flax goods	17,434,514.05	6,224,310.41	4,185,954.62	2,042,355.79	35.72	24.01
K. Wool and woolens	42,448,127.04	29,256,442.90	16,925,861.70	12,330,581.20	68.92	39.87
M. Books, papers, etc.	57,298.01	13,982.25	10,425.35	3,556.90	24.40	18.19
N. Sundries	11,221,253.04	4,984,936.33	3,905,795.33	1,079,141.00	44.42	34.79
Total dutiable	178,329,048.72	117,663,127.14	86,132,185.40	31,530,941.74	65.98	49.30
Total free-list	79,879,108.39	22,189,505.48	.....	22,189,505.48	27.78	.....
Total tariff reductions	258,208,157.11	139,852,632.62	86,132,185.40	53,720,447.22	54.16	33.36
Total internal-revenue reduction	.....	.....	.....	24,455,607.00	.....	.....
Total proposed reduction	.....	.....	.....	78,176,054.22	.....	.....

TREASURY DEPARTMENT, OFFICE OF INTERNAL REVENUE,
Washington, March 12, 1888.

Estimated reduction of internal taxation under the provisions of "A bill to repeal certain tobacco and other taxes, and to modify internal-revenue laws."

Total receipts from tobacco, fiscal year 1887		$30,108,067
Deduct cigars and cigarettes	$12,157,196	
Deduct special taxes manufacturers of cigars 18,570×$3=	55,710	
Deduct special taxes dealers in tobacco..... 514,000×$1=	514,000	
		12,726,906
Receipts from proposed repealed sources, fiscal year 1887		17,381,161
The increase in the receipts of that part of the tobacco tax which this bill proposes to repeal during the first seven months of the current fiscal year over the receipts for the corresponding period of the last fiscal year was $1,234,101, or 13 per cent. Assuming that this rate of increase will continue to the close of the fiscal year, the receipts from these objects of taxation would be increased		2,259,551
Special taxes retail liquor dealers, fiscal year 1887		4,587,268
Special taxes retail dealers in malt liquors, fiscal year 1887		177,148
Special taxes manufacturers of stills and stills manufactured, fiscal year 1887		3,721
Add for assessed penalties		41,758
Add for interest clause in section 10, say		5,000
Total estimated reduction		24,455,607

JOSEPH S. MILLER, *Commissioner.*

THE VIEWS OF HON. JAMES B. BECK, OF THE MINORITY OF THE COMMITTEE.

Not having seen the bill proposed by the Republican majority of the Finance Committee of the Senate until within the last few days, and having no idea what sort of report will accompany it, except that it is announced in the public press that it will contain an elaborate and bitter attack on the propositions and principles contained in the bill that came from the House of Representatives, and being further advised that the views of the minority are expected to be ready promptly, as the subject will be brought before the Senate very soon, I can only enter my protest against the principles presented by the Republican majority of the Senate committee, and give in a general way the reasons I have for supporting the principles presented by the House bill. That bill is an earnest effort to reduce taxation by diminishing the cost of the raw materials used by American manufacturers, so as to enable them to compete in the markets of the world with their foreign competitors who produce similar goods. It proceeds upon the recognized fact that raw materials are not consumed in that form, but are necessary for the production of commodities to which the industry of the country may be properly applied; and it is an honest effort to reduce the cost to the American consumer of the goods which they must necessarily have, retaining, as far as possible, such taxes as are imposed upon articles which the people may use or not just as they please, and the proceeds of which taxation, less the cost of collection, reaches the Treasury of the United States. It seeks to promote trade with all the world, to restore and build up our lost commercial marine, and thus exchange commodities with other people upon somewhat fair and equal terms.

The struggle of the majority of the Senate Committee on Finance seems to be—its effect certainly is—to close our ports as far as possible against commerce from abroad, to make our people dependent for their supplies upon the products of the machinery of the home manufacturer, by limiting and restricting their right to use manufactured articles to such as American producers furnish and at such prices as they see fit to exact, the obvious effect being to surrender to other nations the trade and commerce of the outside world and subject our exports to such extortions in freight charges as combinations of foreign ship-owners see fit to exact. The Senate substi-

tute, when carefully examined, will show that in every feature of it it aims to increase the cost of the goods he needs to the home consumer, and to close the markets of the world against imports and exports as well, except such as are purely agricultural and have to be sold abroad for any price they will bring in free open market with foreign competition. Under it we can have no successful commerce, no return cargoes, indeed, no ships in the foreign trade, and no sailors except such as hover around our coasts protected by the combinations and monopolies in our coastwise trade where all competition is excluded.

This attempt by the majority of the committee to restore specific instead of ad valorem rates simply means, no matter what pretenses may be set up, that the goods used by the poor shall be taxed out of all proportion to those used by the rich, and that the people shall derive no benefits and no reduction of taxation from the invention of new machinery or economic processes made or devised, either at home or abroad, which cheapen the cost of the production of goods. Specific rates exclude the consumer from all benefit of all the progress of science, skill, and invention in cheapening production, while the blanket that costs $1, which only the poor buy, pays the same tax as the blanket that costs $3; and, as the committee were shown in New York on our visit there to prepare a bill to guard against undervaluation, the bridal veil costing $2,000 in Paris would pay no more tax than the imitation article which cost $50. All that, however, is in the interest of the combinations of wealth and power, which alone seem to be worthy of consideration by the majority of the committee. They need no ships, they need no commerce, they seek to exclude imports which may compete with them, and they refuse to sell their goods at such prices as the people abroad will buy them at; therefore the seas might as well, for their purpose, be oceans of fire instead of God-given highways for the world's commerce. The right to plunder all our people is all they ask; that seems to be the object which the majority of the Finance Committee, by their bill, endeavor to attain.

The question now presented is not one of temporary taxation. The pretenses upon which high-tariff taxes are now demanded will be as strong fifty years hence as they are at present. It is no longer infant industries that are clamoring. The manufacturers are stalwart giants now, with machinery equal to the best in the world, and much of it imported from foreign countries and owned by foreigners, who bring it and their workmen here to secure the subsidy Congress gives them, as was confessed by the men engaged in the bagging conspiracy and by many others who appeared before the committee, as their statements show. They control this market against foreign-made goods, and with their machinery at home control all foreign markets against our products.

The Republicans now confess in their platform and the measures they advocate that they never intend that American goods shall be sent for sale into foreign markets, because they know that the ground upon which they demand protection, to wit, the difference in wages here and in other countries, will continue for generations to come, so long indeed as the free lands of this continent are open to homestead settlers. Their affected interest in American labor is simply a false pretense; their whole course has been opposed to the interests of labor, as shown from the time the high war tariffs were enacted and laws were passed by them for the importation of foreign contract labor from all parts of the earth at the lowest foreign wages, duty free, which allowed the employer of the foreign pauper laborer to follow his serfs out like a sleuth-hound if he dared to run away, and to sell his humble homestead over his head unless he worked for the pauper wages he had, in ignorance of our wage-rates, agreed while in Asia or Europe to take. The country is well advised of the desperate struggles they made to obtain and retain Chinese labor to the exclusion of American workmen. Their efforts in that direction became so flagrant that even Republican Senators had to rise in the Senate and denounce their action.

In 1882, during the discussion of the Chinese question, Senator John F. Miller, Republican, from California, said:

> The average American manufacturer is interested generally in two things, namely, the highest protective tariff, and the cheapest labor. * * * It is not difficult to perceive the origin of that political economy which suggests high protective tariff and at the same time advocates the admission of servile laborers into this country without limit. It means high prices for the products of manufacture and low prices for the labor which produces them; the aggrandizement of capital and the debasement of labor; greater wealth to the wealthy and greater poverty to the poor.

Before the discussion on this bill closes, and I hope it will be full and exhaustive, the country will see how false their pretenses now are. No man has denounced high protective taxes or praised the low Democratic revenue tariff of 1846 and shown its advantages to all the interests of the country better or more elaborately than the distinguished Senator from Iowa [Mr. ALLISON], as the records show. Even the Senator from Maine [Mr. HALE], in the Forty-second Congress (Globe, first session, No. 1, page 34), moved to put salt on the free-list, and expressed a desire (page 80) to have coal added to his proposition. The measure was passed by a vote of 147 to 47, and the amendment of Mr. Farnsworth to Mr. HALE'S free-salt proposition (page 90), made at Mr. HALE'S suggestion, making coal free, also passed by a vote of 130 to 57, many Republicans now in the Senate voting for both propositions. And notwithstanding the demand now so earnestly made for free tobacco in every form, when the Democrats of the Senate in 1883 were insisting upon a reduction of the tobacco tax to 8 cents per pound the Republican party were almost a unit in opposition to it, their candidate for the Presidency, Mr. Harrison,* saying among other things:

> I believe that we can not enter into the general subject of tariff reduction, and we ought not perhaps to reduce much now the taxes on those three articles which I believe the common concurrent consent and common sense of all the people agree should be the last subjects of internal revenue—I mean whisky, beer, and tobacco. I do not announce a doctrine from which I expect any general dissent, certainly not on the Democratic side of the Chamber. * * * I come then to say that, in supporting this measure from our Finance Committee, we are reducing our internal-revenue taxes to those three articles which by common consent should remain, at least till the indefinite future, upon our list of products upon which excise taxes are to be levied.—*Congressional Record*, page 6250, part 6, volume 13, Forty-seventh Congress, first session.

And the distinguished Senator from Ohio, Mr. SHERMAN, opposed the same proposition in language as strong as he knew how to employ, saying, among other things:

> Senators on the other side may think from the vote—I can almost refer to it as a party vote, though it is not entirely a party vote—that they can make political capital by reducing the tax on tobacco. I do not believe it. I believe the plain people of this country, as Mr. Lincoln called them, see through it. They are willing to pay the tax on tobacco, on whisky, and on beer. They are the only internal taxes that they are willing to pay, and I am willing to let these three taxes stand as they are until we can gradually reduce them as the condition of our revenue may allow. Strip your internal revenue of all other classes, even if to do so does benefit some of the banks, even if it does repeal taxes that might be kept on a little while longer with no very great injury; yet it confines the system to these three articles, which in every country are the subjects of taxation. Then spread the balance of your reduction on the external taxes, and do what little good you can until the tariff commission enables us to reduce the whole system of external taxes. * * *

Again he said:

> But do not give away of our surplus revenue more than half of it on an article which is the proper source of revenue, the legitimate subject of taxation, on which the tax is more cheerfully paid and more easily collected than on any other in the whole range or gamut of taxes.

And when on my motion the right was demanded to allow the producer of tobacco to sell $100 of his own product, it raised a storm of indignation among all the Republican Senators, who are now so clamorous for the protection of the producers of tobacco, that a person who either listened to the debate or reads it now would suppose that the country would have been ruined by even allowing them the slight privilege which was given them by the votes mainly of the Democratic party.

The pretense that they are going to aid chemists, machinists, and others by giving them free alcohol is also a sudden conversion, because every report that has been made by the Treasury Department from the time of Secretary Sherman to the present shows that any effort to do that would simply be the breaking down of all barriers against fraud in the collection of revenue on distilled spirits. It would, however, have the effect which perhaps is desired by the Republican gentlemen who deny the existence of trusts, of giving the whisky trust of Peoria, Ill., the right to sell their alcohol at any price they please free from all competition at home or abroad.

But I do not propose now to argue the details of the bill. That, as I have said, will be done to the satisfaction of the country before it leaves the Senate. I shall therefore confine myself to a general statement of the reasons why I support the measure as it came from the House, and oppose that as now presented by the majority of the Finance Committee.

The President of the United States, in his letter of acceptance, has stated the position of his party in regard to taxation and the principles that ought to govern it so clearly that I do not know how better to begin a statement of those principles than to quote a few extracts from that letter.

The President says:

> Our Government is the creation of the people, established to carry out their designs and accomplish their good. It was founded on justice, and was made for free, intelligent, and virtuous people. It is only useful when within their control, and only serves them well when regulated and guided by their constant touch. It is a free government because it guaranties to every American citizen the unrestricted personal use and enjoyment of all the reward of his toil and of all his income except what may be his fair contribution to necessary public expense.
>
> Therefore it is not only the right but the duty of a free people in the enforcement of this guaranty, to insist that such expense should be strictly limited to the actual public needs. It seems perfectly clear that when the Government, this instrumentality created and maintained by the people to do their bidding, turns upon them and through an utter perversion of its powers extorts from their labor and capital tribute largely in excess of public necessities, the creature has rebelled against the creator and the masters are robbed by their servants. The cost of the Government must continue to be met by tariff duties collected at our custom-houses upon imported goods, and by internal-revenue taxes assessed upon spirituous and malt liquors, tobacco, and oleomargarine.
>
> I suppose, too, it is well understood that the effect of this tariff taxation is not limited to the consumers of imported articles, but that the duties imposed upon such articles permit a corresponding increase in price to be laid upon domestic productions of the same kind, which increase, paid by all our people as consumers of home productions and entering every American home, constitutes a form of taxation as certain and as inevitable as though the amount was annually paid into the hands of a tax-gatherer. These results are inseparable from the plan we have adopted for the collection of our revenue by tariff duties.
>
> And yet this is our condition. We are annually collecting at our custom-houses and by means of our internal-revenue taxation many millions in excess of all legitimate needs. As a consequence there now remains in the national Treasury a surplus of more than $130,000,000. No better evidence could be furnished than

*Seeking to confine the reduction to taxes on banks, matches, and patent medicines.

that the people are exorbitantly taxed. The extent of the superfluous burden indicated by this surplus will be better appreciated when it is suggested that such surplus alone represents taxation aggregating more than $108,000 in a county containing 50,000 inhabitants.

Taxation has always been the feature of organized government the hardest to reconcile with the people's ideas of freedom and happiness. When presented in a direct form nothing will arouse popular discontent more quickly and profoundly than unjust and unnecessary taxation. Our farmers, mechanics, laborers, and all our citizens closely scan the slightest increase in the taxes assessed upon their lands and other property, and demand good reasons for such an increase. And yet they seem to be expected, in some quarters, to regard the unnecessary volume of insidious and indirect taxation visited upon them by our present rate of tariff duties with indifference, if not with favor.

General Harrison, in his letter, controverts all the positions taken by the Democratic party, but states the truth very pointedly when he says: "It is not a contest between schedules, but between wide-apart principles." In that I agree with him, and am willing to go before the country on that issue.

There is no dispute about the fact that the present surplus in the Treasury, which is not only needless but dangerous and corrupting in all its tendencies, must continue to increase unless taxation is reduced, and it is equally true that that surplus was produced by the maintenance of unnecessary and, therefore, unjust and oppressive taxation, against the protest of the Democratic party, by the Republican leaders, who are now opposing tariff reduction.

Until now it has been conceded by all men that tariff taxation ought to be reduced from the existing war standard to a peace footing. It is needless to go into detail to show that the present tariff taxes were intended to be only temporary, and were imposed to compensate the manufacturers for the oppressive internal-revenue taxes which were placed upon them and all others by the necessity of war. Senator MORRILL and all the advocates of protection publicly proclaimed that over and over again, and inserted it in the preamble of the acts "temporarily" increasing tariff taxation.

The Senator from Vermont [Mr. MORRILL] had charge of the bill of 1864 in the House of Representatives. His speech, made when he presented it, will be found in the Globe of June 2, 1864. He said, among many other things:

The Treasury requires a larger supply of means, and such sources of revenue as have not already yielded their maximum contributions must now be sought, so that we may fill the measure of our wants. This has made an increase of internal duties necessary, and that increase to a considerable extent imposes upon us the duty as well as affords us the power of obtaining an increased revenue from duties on imports from abroad. The withdrawal of the large number of men now in the field from industrial pursuits leaves a paucity of numbers at home, thereby advancing wages and the cost of living, so that a bushel of corn, a pound of wool, a yard of cloth, or a ton of iron can not now, even reducing the currency to a specie standard, be produced at the same cost that they were three years ago. With the tariff considerably increased, and even if we had no internal taxes to pay, our people will hardly find it less difficult to compete with foreign productions and manufactures than they did in times of peace without any increase of tariff. And when we impose a tax of 5 per cent. upon our manufactures and increase the tariff to the same extent upon foreign manufactures, we leave them upon the same relative footing they were at the start, and neither has cause of complaint. The rates proposed are high nominally, and may be so regarded by foreign nations, but considering the weights carried by our own people, other nations will still be able to continue the race with us upon nearly the same terms as heretofore.

* * * * * * *

In making an estimate of the effect of such a war tariff as is now proposed, it is important that we should bear in mind that as we increase the cost of any article we diminish the number of those who are able to consume it.

Again, he said:

Protection was never defended on any other ground than that in the end the consumer obtained his supplies more cheaply. I know sound policy dictates that for proper encouragement of manufacturers all raw materials should be free, and where nations manufacture for exportation no other policy can be maintained. This accounts for the course of France and England upon this subject. They export largely; we do not.

Mr. Shellabarger, then a member from Ohio, asked Mr. MORRILL if there was any increase of duty over and above the tariff of 1861, save and except the compensating duty made necessary by internal-revenue taxes. Mr. MORRILL said in reply that there was no increase except for that purpose, or for the purpose of revenue upon articles not produced in this country.

At the close of his speech Mr. MORRILL made this pledge:

"This is intended as a war measure, a temporary measure, and we must give it our support as such."

Again, he speaks of it as "a war measure, imposed by the necessities of the Government, the scarcity of laborers, and the enormous direct taxation."

On the following day Mr. ALLISON, again resuming, said:

This large internal-revenue tax was made the excuse and the cause of the advance of the tariff of July 14, 1862, and June 30, 1864. I quoted the language yesterday of the then chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means in 1862, Mr. Thaddeus Stevens, himself a protectionist, and certainly in favor of the protection of the great interest of Pennsylvania, iron. He made a pledge upon this floor in 1862 that those additions of duties upon manufactured articles imported in this country were made necessary because of the internal-revenue taxes. Both he and Mr. MORRILL, subsequently chairman of the Ways and Means Committee, declared that the act of June 30, 1864, was a temporary measure, a war measure, and was not intended as a measure which should remain upon the statute-book as a protective tariff in the time of peace.

Mr. ALLISON yielding the floor for a moment to Mr. COX, that gentleman said:

I desire to say in addition to what has been said by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. ALLISON] that I was on the committee of conference upon the tariff of 1864. The reason why that conference report was made as it was made, the reason given by Mr. MORRILL and Mr. Fessenden, was that the internal tax had been raised, but that the moment that tax was reduced they would be in favor of reducing the customs duties. That was understood when the report was made upon the tariff of 1864; it was one of the conditions leading the conference committee to report that measure.

Mr. ALLISON said further:

It is admitted by all that the increase of the tariff was commenced and carried on upon the basis of the protective duties of the Morrill tariff of 1861; the increase of direct taxation, added to the price of domestic manufactures, rendered an increased tariff necessary in order to prevent our country being flooded with cheaper foreign productions. Certainly, then, upon the decrease of internal taxation the tariff may be, and ought to be, decreased in proportion, the danger being no longer in existence which was sought to be averted by these increased duties.

But I may be asked how this reduction shall be made. I think it should be made upon all leading articles, or nearly all; and for that purpose when I get the opportunity in the House, if no gentleman does it before me, I shall move that the pending bill be recommitted to the Ways and Means Committee with instructions to report a reduction upon existing rates of duty equivalent to 20 per cent. upon the existing rates, or one-fifth reduction. Even this will not be a full equivalent for the removal of all internal taxes upon manufactures. It will not be difficult to make a reduction upon this basis.

The position taken by these gentlemen at that time sufficiently illustrates the grounds on which the temporary increase of tariff taxation was agreed to by Congress and accepted by the country.

In 1866 the internal-revenue taxes, as shown by the report of the Commissioner of Internal Revenue for 1880 (see page 159), amounted to $310,906,984, of which $236,336,037.37 were imposed upon manufactures, railroad receipts, incomes, special taxes, legacies, etc., manufactured products alone paying $127,230,608.66 that year, as shown by the following statement:

1.	Manufacturing products	$127,230,608.66
2.	Gross receipts, railroads, etc	11,262,429.82
3.	Sales, stocks, gold, etc	4,002,282.91
4.	Special taxes, etc	14,844,418.05
5.	Incomes	72,982,153.03
6.	Legacies	924,823.97
7.	Successions	246,154.88
8. 9.	Miscellaneous	1,693,122.73 3,750,037.32
	Total	236,236,037.37

All these taxes were repealed nearly twenty years ago, yet the corresponding tariff taxation which was imposed to compensate for the burdens temporarily imposed by them is to-day almost as high as it was at any period during the war.

The injustice of that condition induced a Republican Congress to strike off on all leading articles 10 per cent. from the tariff taxation in 1872, but in 1875, under the false pretense that the sinking fund was in danger, that 10 per cent. was again restored, and additional taxes were imposed on whisky, tobacco, and sugar. As early as 1881 the surplus arising from the increased taxation became so oppressive that the then President of the United States and the country demanded tariff reduction, although the average duty was at that time 4 or 5 per cent. ad valorem lower on imported goods than it is to-day—as low indeed as the House bill proposes to make it now. After a long struggle on the part of the protectionists to retain their extortions a while longer they obtained a tariff commission, organized in their own interests, which they knew would make as slight reductions as possible. That commission, after reviewing the whole situation, was compelled, among other things, to make the following statement in their report:

Early in its deliberations the commission became convinced that a substantial reduction of tariff duties is demanded not by a mere indiscriminate popular clamor, but by the best conservative opinion of the country, including that which has in former times been most strenuous for the preservation of our national industrial defenses. Such a reduction of the existing tariff the commission regards not only as a due recognition of public sentiment and a measure of justice to consumers, but one conducive to the general industrial prosperity, and which, though it may be temporarily inconvenient, will be ultimately beneficial to the special interests affected by such reduction. No rates of defensive duties, except for the establishment of new industries, which more than equalize the conditions of labor and capital with those of foreign competitors, can be justified. Excessive duties, or those above such standard of equalization, are positively injurious to the interest which they are supposed to benefit. They encourage the investment of capital in manufacturing enterprise by rash and unskilled speculators, to be followed by disaster to the adventurers and their employés, and a plethora of commodities, which deranges the operations of skilled and prudent enterprise.

Numerous examples of such disasters and derangements occurred during and shortly after the excessively protective period of the late war, when tariff duties were enhanced by the rates of foreign exchange and premiums upon gold. Excessive duties generally, or exceptionally high duties in particular cases, discredit our whole national economic system and furnish plausible arguments for its complete subversion. They serve to increase uncertainty on the part of industrial enterprise, whether it shall enlarge or contract its operations, and take from commerce, as well as production, the sense of stability required for extended undertakings. It would seem that the rates of duties under the existing tariff—fixed, for the most part, during the war under the evident necessity at that time of stimulating to its utmost extent all domestic production—might be adapted, through reduction, to the present condition of peace requiring no such extraordinary stimulus. And in the mechanical and manufacturing industries, especially those which have been long established, it would seem that the improvements in machinery and processes made within the last twenty years, and the high scale of productiveness which has become a characteristic of their establishments, would permit our manufacturers to compete with their foreign rivals under a substantial reduction of existing duties.

Entertaining these views, the commission has sought to present a scheme of tariff duties in which substantial reduction should be the distinguishing feature. The average reduction in rates, including that from the enlargement of the free-list and the abolition of the duties on charges and commissions, at which the commission has aimed, is not less on the average than 20 per cent., and it is the opinion of the commission that the reduction will reach 25 per cent.

The legislation which followed the report of the tariff commission in the last session of the Forty-seventh Congress was perhaps the most discreditable that ever occurred in the history of American politics. The House of Representatives, at the first session of that Congress, had sent to the Senate a bill relating exclusively to internal revenue. It took up the Tariff Commission bill in January,

1883, and after struggling along until about the middle of February without reaching the schedules in regard to sugar, cotton, or woolen goods, or indeed anything beyond the iron schedule, which it only partially considered, it abandoned all attempts to pass any measure, and by devices which were confessed at the time to be revolutionary it resolved to get into conference with the Senate upon a bill which that body had passed in order to endeavor to secure advantages to the protected interests through the action of the conference committee, which the House, so far as it had gone, refused to give them, and which the Senate had in every form repudiated. The debates and the bill of the House, which can be found in the document-rooms of both Houses, will verify this statement. The leading members of the House on the Democratic side denounced the proceeding in every form, but without avail. A few extracts will illustrate this. Mr. BLACKBURN, of Kentucky, a member of the Committee on Rules (see RECORD, page 3370), charged on the floor what the "Keifer-Boynton" investigation has since verified, if any proof was needed when no man denied what he alleged.

Unwilling—

He said—

to trust to a count, which, if common rumor is to be credited, has been carefully made; a count made upon a written agreement signed by members on the other side, binding and obligating themselves to stand for this report and to stand for the motion of non-concurrence; though with care and particularity, as rumor has it (and I doubt not correctly), you have taken time since the Kasson resolution was sent to the Committee on Rules, two weeks ago, to marshal your forces, to obligate them in every manner that is binding, unless it be in open bond, with good and approved securities for the performance of the contract; in the face of all this the majority side of the House dare not allow a motion, which is admitted under every parliamentary law, or parliamentary rule, or parliamentary practice ever known among civilized men. You dare not allow a vote to be taken to concur in the Senate amendments to the text of the bill.

Mr. COX, of New York, said:

It is a fraud upon parliamentary law; a fraud upon all that is just and fair in our politics; it is revolutionary.

Mr. HOUSE, of Tennessee, said:

It is an open, unblushing attempt to concoct, in a secret chamber of a packed conference committee, a tariff bill which the promoters of this movement know can not be passed upon the floor of this House under the rules which govern it. It is an attempt by an indefensible, arbitrary, revolutionary act to wrest from the representatives of the people the right of legislation; to tie their hands, and to deny them the poor privilege of lifting their voices against it.

The House was not even allowed the privilege of agreeing with the Senate on the tariff bill passed by that body. The leading Republican members of the Senate, professing to be conferees on the part of the Senate, were only too anxious to get into the secret recesses of the conference committee chamber, not for the purpose of sustaining the action of the body they professed to represent, but for the purpose of annulling what had been deliberately decided upon, often by a yea-and-nay vote, in the Senate of the United States on many questions against their wishes. Time and space will not permit anything like a full history to be given of the outrages committed in that conference committee.

Late one night, just before the adjournment of Congress, when the conference report was brought into the Senate, and no explanation made as to its provisions, I endeavored to point out, and did point out, many of the outrages committed in that conference report, by which the wishes of both Houses, deliberately expressed, had been violated. That speech will, perhaps, call the attention of Senators, when the debate on this bill comes up, to matters that even now require explanation; but there were many things, not then known to any Senator, concealed by the conferees, which subsequently came to light and developed the flagrant character of that so-called conference. Important clauses were added to the cotton and woolen schedules, increasing the tax upon whole classes of goods, which propositions had never been submitted to either House, or when submitted to the Senate had been defeated by that body, because they never were before the House in any form.

If Senators will take the trouble to look up the bill as it went to the conference committee, and examine it as it left that body, they will find in regard to cotton goods increases far beyond anything that had been even suggested, embracing the most important classes of products in which New England was specially interested.

In Schedule I, cotton goods, a new proviso was added, increasing the tax as follows:

On all cotton cloth not exceeding two hundred threads to the square inch, counting the warp and filling, not bleached, dyed, colored, stained, painted, or printed, valued at over 8 cents per square yard; bleached, valued at over 10 cents per square yard; dyed, colored, stained, painted, or printed, valued at over 13 cents per square yard, there shall be levied, collected, and paid a duty of 40 per cent. ad valorem.

And in Schedule K, wool and woolens, the conference committee, in the ready-made clothing schedule, after "clothing, ready-made, and wearing apparel of every description," inserted the words "not specially enumerated or provided for in this act," and then inserted a provision increasing taxation on the following goods:

Cloaks, dolmans, jackets, talmas, ulsters, or other outside garments for ladies' and children's apparel, and goods of similar description, or used for like purposes, composed wholly or in part of wool, worsted, the hair of the alpaca, goat, or other animals, or of which wool, worsted, the hair of the alpaca, goat, or other animals, is a component material, 30 cents per pound, and, in addition thereto, 50 per cent. ad valorem.

The debates in both Houses will show that no suggestion was ever made looking to such increases as these. The result was that instead of a reduction on cotton and woolen goods, Hon. Joseph Nimmo, jr., Chief of the Bureau of Statistics, on March 10, 1884, furnished Congress with an official statement of the duties upon the leading articles under the old law prior to March 3, 1883, and under the act of March 3, 1883, which, instead of a reduction of from 20 to 25 per cent., shows large increases in the manufactures of wool, cotton, earthenware, and china beyond what existed before the law was passed.

The table is as follows:

Values of imports of dutiable merchandise entered for consumption in the United States, with the amount of duty and the ad valorem rate of duty collected during the following periods during the six months ended December 31.

Articles.	Under the old law—1882.		
	Value.	Duty collected.	Ad valorem rate of duty collected.
			Per cent.
All dutiable merchandise	$260, 856, 237	$111, 266, 507	42.65
Sugar and melada	44, 432, 311	23, 180, 59[illegible]	52.17
Iron and steel and manufactures thereof	32, 499, 426	12, 713, 996	39.12
Wool:			
Clothing	1, 210, 689	671, 415	55.46
Combing	135, 123	67, 839	50.19
Carpet	3, 505, 980	974, 202	27.79
Manufactures of wool	22, 400, 387	14, 943, 626	66.71
Manufactures of cotton	14, 967, 850	5, 629, 658	37.61
Manufactures of silk	19, 999, 119	11. 728, 469	58.69
Earthen and china ware	4, 423, 146	1, 896, 705	42.88
Glass and glassware	4, 271, 305	2, 327, 660	54 49
Spirits and wines	5, 203, 625	3, 706, 142	71.22
Malt liquors	511, 772	227, 370	44.43

Articles.	Under act of March 3, 1883.			Increase + Decrease —	
	Value.	Duty collected.	Ad valorem rate of duty collected.	Value.	Ad valorem.
			Per cent.		*Per. cent.*
All dutiable merchandise	$235, 898, 109	$96, 514, 136	40.91	—$24, 958, 128	— 1.74
Sugar and melada	46, 800, 671	23, 121, 601	49.40	+ 2, 368, 360	— 2.77
Iron and steel and manufactures thereof	23, 698, 937	7, 924, 225	33.44	— 8, 800, 489	— 5.68
Wool:					
Clothing	2, 399, 515	1, 073, 311	44.73	+ 1, 188, 826	—10.73
Combing	615, 677	267, 704	43.48	+ 480, 554	— 6.71
Carpet	4, 345, 385	1, 087, 094	25.02	+ 839, 405	— 2.77
Manufactures of wool	22, 064, 512	15, 202, 183	68.99	— 335, 875	+ 2.19
Manufactures of cotton	12, 067, 631	4, 835, 714	40.07	— 2, 900, 219	+ 2.46
Manufactures of silk	21, 286, 252	10, 617, 057	49.83	+ 1, 287, 133	— 8.86
Earthen and china ware	3, 824, 951	1, 830, 363	47.85	— 598, 195	+ 4.97
Glass and glassware	3, 943, 197	2, 187, 362	55.47	— 328, 108	+ .98
Spirits and wines	2, 945, 001	2, 659, 312	90.30	— 2, 258, 624	+19.08
Malt liquors	490, 315	235, 823	48.10	— 21, 457	+ 3.67

JOSEPH NIMMO, JR.,
Chief of Bureau.

TREASURY DEPARTMENT,
Bureau of Statistics, March 10, 1884.

Even before the bill went into conference the cotton schedule, under the manipulations of the New England manufacturers, had been so changed that Senator SHERMAN had to confess:

The classification is so changed that none but an expert can understand it.

And in regard to the same matter, Senator ALLISON said in the Senate Chamber, on the 3d day of February, 1883 (see RECORD of that date, page 2030):

Now I want to say one word in regard to the Tariff Commission report upon the cotton schedule. The truth is that the Tariff Commission did not examine this cotton matter at all; it may as well be said on the floor of the Senate; nor did they make this schedule that is called the Tariff Commission report schedule. It was made by a cotton manufacturer from Boston with an expert appraiser in New York, and the Tariff Commission accepted it. When the knowledge of that fact came to me I had no particular faith in the Tariff Commission report on this cotton schedule, and therefore I examined it as best I could for myself, hearing the witnesses, reading the testimony, and hearing people who I supposed knew something about it, and in whom I had faith.

When the Senator from Texas [Mr. MAXEY] asked him what faith there was to be placed in their report on anything else, after such conduct as that was developed, Mr. ALLISON answered—

I do not choose to express my opinion of their report or anything else.

Much light was thrown upon this subject by a controversy that sprung up between Senator SHERMAN and Senator MORRILL. Mr. SHERMAN had published an elaborate interview in the Commercial

Gazette, of Cincinnati, dated March 14, 1883, in which, among other things, he said:

The truth is, there was a grave fault in constituting the committee on the part of the Senate. The two members of the Finance Committee from New England were put on the conference committee, when, by custom and precedents, Mr. JONES, of Nevada, should have been a member, or, if he declined, Mr. ALLISON. The result was that these two New England Senators controlled the conference, and they were known to be opposed to the duty on wool and in favor of an increase on woolen and cotton goods.

During the debate in the Senate Mr. SHERMAN insisted that the rates upon woolen goods especially were too high, even as they passed the Senate, and of course he regarded the increase made in the conference, which, as I said before, the Senate knew nothing about until after Congress had adjourned, as an outrage; his language in the debate being:

That about one-half of the cost of these woolen goods is in the cost of the raw material, the wool, and the other half is the cost of manufacture. Take, therefore, a lot of these goods; suppose that the value of the goods imported is $1,000, and one-half of that is the cost of the wool, and the other half is the cost of manufacture. The duty on $500, the cost of the wool, has already been fully compensated for and more than compensated for by the specific duty. Then, as to the duty as levied, not as 40 per cent. of the $500, the cost of manufacture, which is all the manufacturer puts upon it, but the duty is levied at 40 per cent. on the thousand, thus giving him a protection of $400, or 80 per cent. on the cost of manufacture. It seems to me that is too large, that the relative duties upon wool and woolen goods are unequal and unfair. The duty ought to be in proportion to the manufactures.

And in the interview above referred to he repeated his charges of improper conduct against his co-conferees from New England, saying:

By the new tariff the whole reduction falls on the wool-grower. It is true there is a reduction of the specific duty on woolens equal to the reduction on wool, but that only leaves the manufacturer in *statu quo*, while the former loses one fifth of his protection. The protective duty of 35 per cent ad valorem in favor of the manufacturer remains unchanged, and in important branches is changed to 40 per cent.; and the classification is so changed that none but an expert can understand it. Even in the conference committee additional duties were put on both cotton and woolen goods of certain grades, far in advance of existing law. The wool-growers, who did not understand in the beginning what was going on, felt, and still feel, no doubt, that their interests were sacrificed by a reduction of duties on wool without a corresponding reduction on woolens, and with an absolute increase on some grades.

And in that same interview he expressed not only his disgust at the advantage which the New England conferees had obtained over him, but his regret that, having no Democratic conferees to trouble them, they had not fixed up a bill to suit themselves, regardless of their responsibility to the Senate or the wishes of either house. His answer to the newspaper correspondent clearly proves this:

CORRESPONDENT. What effect upon the conference had the withdrawal of Senators Bayard and BECK?

Senator SHERMAN. I can not say that it had any, except to enable the conferees to patch up a little the iron schedule, as I have already stated. But their withdrawal gave the Republican conferees the opportunity of reporting and proposing a thoroughly protective tariff bill, just and harmonious in all its rates.

Again he said:

The conferees would not take this responsibility, and accordingly left the rates named and some others palpably unjust, and have opened the door to contests in the future. If these errors had been corrected the bill would have received every Republican vote in the Senate. The struggle over the bill proved that the Democratic party was hostile to the policy of protection, though occasionally a Democratic Senator voted with us to protect his local industry. The system must stand or fall with the Republican party. We might, in the way stated, have made a square political issue, which I always prefer to do rather than to lean on my political adversaries for occasional votes.

Mr. MORRILL answered Mr. SHERMAN, in a labored article, dated April 28, and published in the New York Tribune. He confesses and avoids the truth of the charges. His main defense is that Mr. SHERMAN was as deep in the mud as he was in the mire. Both did their best to show their want of due respect for the expressed will of the Senate, although neither of them had any right to undertake the task of sustaining the action of the body that appointed them, unless they were determined to maintain and uphold its action by every honorable means, whether they approved it or not. It is painfully apparent from their own statements that neither of them either did so or attempted to do so. Mr. MORRILL says:

The distinguished Senator is a remarkably cool and sagacious man, but he was evidently in a pet, and by this time he will regret some of his rather exaggerated and hasty statements. He criticises the fact that two members of the conference committee were from New England, and would seem to indicate that this brought to bear a malign sectional influence, forgetting that two of the members of the conference committee were from the State of Ohio alone, and perhaps, too, sensitively remembering that the large increase of duties on plain white crockery-ware had never been insisted upon in the Senate by New England.

Again, he says:

But the Senator complains that the duties on woolens were raised in the conference committee; so they were on pig and bar iron.

Again, he says:

Only a proviso was inserted in the conference committee by which a special class of cotton cloth should be subject to a duty of 40 per cent., which is the same or a little less than the existing law.

And adds:

This is not much above the rate fixed on pig-iron, and can hardly be called a local favor.

These interviews show that the conferees, so called, paid no sort of respect to the wishes of the two Houses. They made the tariff which we are now cursed with to suit themselves. One accuses the other of increasing the burdens on cotton and woolen goods, and the other retaliates by charging his accuser with having increased the taxes on earthenware, pig and bar iron, and other things in the iron schedule which the Senate had over and over again defeated him in when he attempted to impose them upon the country on this floor.

Mr. MORRILL adds:

The Senator sought to raise in the Senate the rates fixed in committee on pig-iron, and, not succeeding, he joined Senator BROWN, of Georgia, in cutting down generally the rates upon bar-iron and upon steel railway bars; for as he correctly observes, "a single Republican Senator voting with the Democrats could reduce the duty." A restoration of these rates, even in a committee of conference, was an unpromising risk. If any one was more responsible than Senator SHERMAN for making the "harmony and symmetry of the plan" of the commission's iron schedule "as rough as a saw" I do not remember it.

He was right in saying that—

A restoration of these duties even in such a conference committee, was an unpromising risk.

The Senate bill had passed on the 22d day of February by a vote of 42 to 19, yet the conference report was passed by a vote of only 32 to 31.

I hope these articles in the Commercial Gazette and Tribune, both of which are on file in the Library of Congress, will be carefully studied, as they throw much light upon the spirit that animated the Senate conferees. When they are examined the country will not appreciate the remark made by the Senator from Ohio on the floor of the Senate, within the last few weeks, that the action of the Democratic Senators in refusing to take part in that conference was the most cowardly act he had ever known. The refusal was simply a protest by Democrats against being used to give countenance to or a semblance of acquiescence in what was known to be an effort to overrule the action of the Senate, and not to sustain it.

Mr. MORRILL might very well observe in this interview that the restoration of these duties even in such a conference committee was an unpromising risk, because if Senators had known half of what had been done against their known wishes by their own conferees, instead of the bill being passed, as it was, by a vote of 32 to 31, it would have been defeated by an overwhelming majority, and the condemnation of the conference would have been too pronounced even for them to have ventured into the newspapers to quarrel over their action. Perhaps the worst part of their conduct was not referred to by either of them, and that was in regard to the duties on sugar.

The House had never acted upon that schedule, as their bill shows, but the Senate had in the most emphatic manner determined that the tax on sugar between No. 13 and No. 16 Dutch standard should not exceed $2.40 per 100 pounds. It had fixed the tax on sugar under No. 13 Dutch standard at a satisfactory rate; but that class of sugar was simply raw material for the refiner, not being used in any form except by them, and $2.40 was, by a yea-and-nay vote of the Senate, as is shown by the RECORD, after full discussion, fixed as the proper tax upon sugar between 13 and 16 Dutch standard. Mr. MORRILL and others protested that it was too low, and that foreign competitors would interfere with domestic refiners.

Some of us who had strongly urged $2.40 as a proper rate, believing that it might possibly cripple our domestic refiners in their operations, agreed to $2.50, after being assured by Senators on the other side, especially by Senator MORRILL, that $2.50 per hundred would be entirely satisfactory. I hope the record of that debate will be turned to. It will be found on pages 2548 to 2555 of the RECORD of that session. Yet the conference committee deliberately increased the rate of taxation upon imported sugar between 13 and 16 to $2.75 per hundred, thereby giving to the sugar refiner an absolute monopoly of the sugar-refining business. They thus laid the foundation for the trusts which have been so much and so justly complained of by the country against the domestic refiners of sugar. That act on the part of the Senate conference, which was not only wholly unjustifiable and unwarranted but in violation of pledges they had given, has cost the consumers of sugar in this country not less than $8,000,000, while the fact that they had made such a change in the conference committee was carefully concealed from the Senate, as the record will show.

In the face of facts like these, and these are only the outlines, it is absurd for the Republican leaders to contend that they are now paying or ever have paid any regard to the interests of the tax-payers or the consumers of the country.

Of course, after the passage of that act, the surplus revenue continued to accumulate in the Treasury until all the bonds that could be paid at par were paid off. Not less than $700,000,000 in excess of all the requirements of the sinking fund was paid in the redemption of the principal of the public debt, yet there is at this time almost enough idle money in the Treasury to pay off every dollar that can be paid off until 1907, when the last of our indebtedness, amounting to a fraction over $700,000,000, matures, and we are compelled by law to-day either to lock up the surplus money in the Treasury or to pay to the holders of our bonds any premium they see fit to ask in order to keep the money of the people in circulation for their use.

We are now absolutely at the mercy of any combination the bondholders may make. There is no longer even a decent pretext for the maintenance of any law providing for a sinking fund, which now exceeds $50,000,000 a year, as no man will pretend that we made any agreement to pay the bondholder one dollar of premium upon the bonds he holds; yet the premium upon the 4 percents has in-

creased in the last six months from 124 to 130, and as time goes on will continue to increase, and the Republican candidate for the Presidency, in his letter of acceptance, is urging and demanding that that premium shall be paid to them, although they have no claim, legal or equitable, whatever to it, and are only receiving it now because of the opposition the Republicans are making to the demand of the President for the reduction of taxation so as to make the payment of such premium unnecessary.

Never before has the Republican party boldly avowed its purpose to license the manufacturers of the country to force the people—all the people—of the United States, whether the Government needs revenue or not, to pay them $147 for every $100 worth of their products which the people at large are compelled to have. Never before was the avowal boldly made in a party platform that the American market should be controlled by American manufacturers, by trusts, and combinations, to suit themselves, and that Congress should by law prevent our citizens from buying with their own money what they needed, except from them and at their prices.

Individual members of Congress, I admit, have advocated protection for protection's sake, and have said that, independently of revenue and regardless of public needs, they would maintain tariff taxation for the protection of American manufacturers. Local partisan leagues and neighborhood conventions, and such newspapers as are owned or subsidized by protected organizations, have demanded taxation for protection's sake; but until now the platforms of all former Republican conventions have demanded that taxation should be confined to the amount needed for revenue, only asking that within that limit it should be adjusted so as incidentally to protect American manufacturing industries and the labor employed therein. I need not quote from them. The facts I state can not be successfully denied, as the former platforms have been made part of the record time and again in the debate in the House of Representatives and elsewhere.

The bills now presented by the respective political organizations are infinitely more important in the principles they represent than in the amount of taxation they propose to remove measured merely in money. The Democrats seek cautiously and prudently to reduce all taxation to the revenue standard, so as to take from the people nothing except for public uses and purposes, and only such an amount as is needed to support an economically administered Government, at the same time taking care that no injury is done to any domestic industry, even though unduly stimulated by protection, on whose success the employment of any considerable portion of our own people depends. They seek to aid our manufacturers, by cheapening, wherever it is possible, the raw materials from which finished products are made, so that the markets for them may be enlarged and extended to other countries, and steadier employment, which extended sales necessarily give, be furnished to those who produce them. We seek thus to enable all of our people to obtain what they need or those products with a less expenditure of the money they have earned in their various occupations than they can now.

The Democratic party will cease to exist whenever it fosters monopoly, or legislates to enrich the few out of the hard earnings of the many, or in any way promotes class legislation. Its object and purpose is, always has been, and always must be, to oppose all schemes, however specious, and all legislation, however plausible, that takes the money earned by one class of citizens and gives it to another. Of course it can never command the support of the combinations of wealth that seek to enrich themselves by law out of the earnings of other people; therefore it has no promises of special advantages to make to its supporters. It can only appeal to the manhood of men to stand by and support a political organization pledged to secure to them equal rights and privileges with all other men, and to resist all the combinations organized to obtain by legislation undue advantage over their fellow-citizens.

If the Republic is to last and realize the hopes of its founders, it must be on the basis of securing equal rights to all, granting exclusive privileges to none. Every department of the Government must be limited to the just exercise of the powers specially granted to it, and each Representative, whether of States or people, must be made to recognize the fact that this Government is only a trustee, with limited powers, and that he is only the servant of the people who place him where he is and pay him for his work out of their earnings.

It can not be too often repeated that this Government is simply a trustee, and has not, and can not, get a dollar except what it takes by taxation in some form or other, directly or indirectly, from the people who earn it; that one legitimate industry is as honorable and as much entitled to protection as another; and that all taxes shall be uniform, and must be imposed to pay the debts and provide for the common defense and general welfare of the United States. All our courts, State and Federal, have decided that all taxation must be confined to public uses and purposes, in terms so emphatic, and with such clearness of statement and aptness of illustration that no strength can be added by amplification to what they have so repeatedly decided.

I have given extracts and references to these decisions elsewhere in this report which prove the truth of my assertions, that taxation, to be legal or even honest, must be for public purposes only, and that all class legislation, whether in the form of protection or subsidy, which takes by taxation from the people the money they have earned, or deprives them of the right to use it to the best advantage to themselves in procuring what they need, in order to enrich a favored class, is legalized robbery. The voters of the country will have to settle the question between the contending parties this fall, whether they want to do so or not. The issue is made, and has come to stay. It can be neither avoided nor evaded; it looks to a permanent policy on one basis or the other. The Republican party has moved forward with rapid strides in its assertion of the power of Congress and its right to impose taxes for other than public uses. They no longer hesitate to avow their purpose to force all the consumers of home-made manufactured goods to pay any price home producers or, more properly, home-machine owners demand, by taxing all similar goods made elsewhere so high as to prohibit our people from buying them, under the pretense that they are protecting the "home market." Of course, they simply protect the home seller and thus rob the home buyer; and as the buyers are at least one hundred times more numerous than the sellers, they propose, under the forms of law, to rob one hundred of our citizens to enrich one. They illustrate the principle so aptly stated by Hallam in his History of the Middle Ages:

> We find in the history of all usurping governments, time changes anomaly into system and injury into right. Examples beget custom and custom ripens into law; and the doubtful precedents of one generation become the fundamental maxims of another.

At last, and for the first time, the American people are distinctly called upon, each man for himself, to decide whether the sovereignty, about which so much is said and so little is understood, exists in the individual citizen or in the Congress of the United States. They will, this fall, settle the question, for this generation at least, as conclusively as the late civil war settled the question of secession, whether this is a government of the people, by the people, and for the general welfare of all, or whether it is a paternal government, to be conducted and controlled by Congress to promote such objects and purposes as the majority in Congress from time to time may determine to fasten on the country.

The contest will be none the less earnest because it is waged with ballots instead of bullets, and the result will be none the less conclusive because of its peaceful character. Both parties have put forth candidates worthy of the support of those who advocate the principles they represent, and both sides are organizing, I am happy to say, through national, State, and local clubs, so as to bring out the full strength of their respective organizations.

The questions at issue are as old in principle as the establishment of civil government among men. On the one side will be arrayed, as they always have been, all the organizations and combinations of capital and power that seek wealth by legislation, and especially those who demand from Congress protection by tariff taxation against competition with goods produced abroad, in order that the American consumers of the goods they produce here may be compelled to pay them the prices they demand for the goods they make. On the other side will be arrayed those who deny the power of Congress to grant special privileges to favored classes at the public expense, and who claim that all taxation of the people by their representatives, in whatever form imposed, must be for public purposes, and that it can be imposed only to the extent necessary to support an economically administered government.

Of course there is a large class of voters—far more than enough to determine which party shall win—who, up to this time, have not studied carefully the propositions involved. My hope is that the discussion all over the country this fall will convince the people that their true interests will be best promoted by the success of the Democracy.

Perhaps it is fortunate that the public mind rarely grasps with vigor more than one great public question at a time. When its energies are concentrated on a single vital issue, it ordinarily succeeds in sifting it thoroughly and in separating the grain from the chaff. "Everybody is wiser than anybody," because everybody's interest is that equal justice shall be meted out to all, and that unequal or exclusive privileges shall not be granted to favored classes. Happily for the country there is nothing to distract the public mind from the calm and deliberate consideration of the great issue which the President of the United States deemed so far-reaching and overshadowing as to make it the sole subject to which he directed the attention of Congress in his last annual message, a few extracts from which I propose to quote. The opening sentences are as follows:

> *To the Congress of the United States:*
>
> You are confronted at the threshold of your legislative duties with a condition of the national finances which imperatively demands immediate and careful consideration.
>
> The amount of money annually exacted, through the operation of present laws, from the industries and necessities of the people largely exceeds the sum necessary to meet the expenses of the Government.
>
> When we consider that the theory of our institutions guaranties to every citizen the full enjoyment of all the fruits of his industry and enterprise, with only such deduction as may be his share towards the careful and economical maintenance of the Government which protects him, it is plain that the exaction of more than this is indefensible extortion and a culpable betrayal of American fairness and justice. This wrong inflicted upon those who bear the burden of national

taxation, like other wrongs, multiplies a brood of evil consequences. The public treasury, which should only exist as a conduit conveying the people's tribute to its legitimate objects of expenditure, becomes a hoarding-place for money needlessly withdrawn from trade and the people's use, thus crippling our national energies, suspending our country's development, preventing investment in productive enterprise, threatening financial disturbance, and inviting schemes of public plunder.

This condition of our Treasury is not altogether new; and it has more than once of late been submitted to the people's representatives in the Congress, who alone can apply a remedy. And yet the situation still continues, with aggravated incidents, more than ever presaging financial convulsion and widespread disaster.

After stating what expedients he had been compelled to resort to in order to avoid national bankruptcy, which must follow the locking of the circulating medium in the public Treasury, he says:

While the expedients thus employed, to release to the people the money lying idle in the Treasury, served to avert immediate danger, our surplus revenues have continued to accumulate, the excess for the present year amounting on the 1st day of December to $55,258,701.19, and estimated to reach the sum of $113,000,000 on the 30th of June next, at which date it is expected that this sum, added to prior accumulations, will swell the surplus in the Treasury to $140,000,000.

There seems to be no assurance that, with such a withdrawal from use of the people's circulating medium, our business community may not in the near future be subjected to the same distress which was quite lately produced from the same cause. And while the functions of our national Treasury should be few and simple, and while its best condition would be reached, I believe, by its entire disconnection with private business interests, yet when, by a perversion of its purposes, it idly holds money uselessly subtracted from the channels of trade, there seems to be reason for the claim that some legitimate means should be devised by the Government to restore in an emergency, without waste or extravagance, such money to its place among the people.

The President, of course, advises Congress that there is but one honest and just way to obviate the evils and right the wrongs which confessedly exist, and that is to reduce the taxation needlessly and therefore wrongfully imposed upon the people by existing laws, to the annual requirements of an economically administered Government. I again quote, as no man in all the debate in either House of Congress or elsewhere has presented the whole question as well as the President has. He says:

Our scheme of taxation, by means of which this needless surplus is taken from the people and put into the public Treasury, consists of a tariff or duty levied upon importations from abroad and internal-revenue taxes levied upon the consumption of tobacco and spirituous and malt liquors. It must be conceded that none of the things subjected to internal-revenue taxation are, strictly speaking, necessaries; there appears to be no just complaint of this taxation by the consumers of these articles, and there seems to be nothing so well able to bear the burden without hardship to any portion of the people.

But our present tariff laws, the vicious, inequitable, and illogical source of unnecessary taxation, ought to be at once revised and amended. These laws, as their primary and plain effect, raise the price to the consumers of all articles imported and subject to duty, by precisely the sum paid for such duties. Thus the amount of the duty measures the tax paid by those who purchase for use these imported articles. Many of these things, however, are raised or manufactured in our own country, and the duties now levied upon foreign goods and products are called protection to these home manufactures, because they render it possible for those of our people who are manufacturers to make these taxed articles and sell them for a price equal to that demanded for the imported goods that have paid customs duty. So it happens that while comparatively a few use the imported articles, millions of our people, who never used and never saw any of the foreign products, purchase and use things of the same kind made in this country, and pay therefor nearly or quite the same enhanced price which the duty adds to the imported articles. Those who buy imports pay the duty charged thereon into the public Treasury, but the great majority of our citizens who buy domestic articles of the same class pay a sum at least approximately equal to this duty to the home manufacturer. This reference to the operation of our tariff laws is not made by way of instruction, but in order that we may be constantly reminded of the manner in which they impose a burden upon those who consume domestic products as well as those who consume imported articles, and thus create a tax upon all our people.

It is not proposed to entirely relieve the country of this taxation. It must be extensively continued as the source of the Government's income; and in a readjustment of our tariff the interests of American labor engaged in manufacture should be carefully considered, as well as the preservation of our manufacturers. It may be called protection or by any other name, but relief from the hardships and dangers of our present tariff laws should be devised with especial precaution against imperiling the existence of our manufacturing interests. But this existence should not mean a condition which, without regard to the public welfare or a national exigency, must always insure the realization of immense profits instead of moderately profitable returns. As the volume and diversity of our national activities increase new recruits are added to those who desire a continuation of the advantages which they conceive the present system of tariff taxation directly affords them. So stubbornly have all efforts to reform the present condition been resisted by those of our fellow-citizens thus engaged that they can hardly complain of the suspicion, entertained to a certain extent, that there exists an organized combination all along the line to maintain their advantage.

Again, he says:

By the last census it is made to appear that of the 17,392,099 of our population engaged in all kinds of industries, 7,670,493 are employed in agriculture, 4,074,238 in professional and personal service (2,934,876 of whom are domestic servants and laborers), while 1,810,256 are employed in trade and transportation, and 3,837,112 are classed as employed in manufacturing and mining.

For present purposes, however, the last number given should be considerably reduced. Without attempting to enumerate all, it will be conceded that there should be deducted from those which it includes 375,143 carpenters and joiners, 285,401 milliners, dressmakers, and seamstresses, 172,726 blacksmiths, 133,756 tailors and tailoresses, 102,473 masons, 76,241 butchers, 41,309 bakers, 22,083 plasterers, and 4,891 engaged in manufacturing agricultural implements, amounting in the aggregate to 1,214,023, leaving 2,623,089 persons employed in such manufacturing industries as are claimed to be benefited by high tariff.

* * * * * * *

To these the appeal is made to save their employment and maintain their wages by resisting a change. There should be no disposition to answer such suggestions by the allegation that they are in a minority among those who labor, and therefore should forego an advantage, in the interest of low prices for the majority; their compensation, as it may be affected by the operation of tariff laws, should at all times be scrupulously kept in view; and yet with slight reflection they will not overlook the fact that they are consumers with the rest; that they, too, have their own wants and those of their families to supply from their earnings, and that the price of the necessaries of life, as well as the amount of their wages, will regulate the measure of their welfare and comfort.

But the reduction of taxation demanded should be so measured as not to necessitate or justify either the loss of employment by the working man nor the lessening of his wages; and the profits still remaining to the manufacturer, after a necessary readjustment, should furnish no excuse for the sacrifice of the interests of his employés either in their opportunity to work or in the diminution of their compensation. Nor can the worker in manufactures fail to understand that while a high tariff is claimed to be necessary to allow the payment of remunerative wages, it certainly results in a very large increase in the price of nearly all sorts of manufactures, which, in almost countless forms, he needs for the use of himself and his family. He receives at the desk of his employer his wages, and perhaps before he reaches his home is obliged, in a purchase for family use of an article which embraces his own labor, to return in the payment of the increase in price which the tariff permits the hard-earned compensation of many days of toil.

I will give only one more extract, and I may say that the whole argument is so able, cogent, and condensed that it is almost impossible to select any portion of it without impairing the strength and marring the harmony of the whole. He, at least, will not be accused of evasion or cowardice in the presentation of his views and recommendations. If any President ever satisfied the American people that he subordinated private ends to public interests, and had the courage to express his convictions, regardless of personal consequences, President Cleveland in this message, in his veto of the dependent pension bill, and in his enforcement of absolute integrity in the conduct of public officials, high and low, has satisfied them that he is acting with an eye single to the public good. He can say, as the Marquis of Montrose said to those who urged temporizing measures on him as the safest:

He either fears his fate too much,
Or his desert's are small,
Who dares not put it to the touch,
And win or lose it all.

I have an abiding faith that the American people will indorse the closing paragraph of the message. It answers all the claptrap about protection and free trade, and nobody can deny the truth of it.

It is not apparent how such a change can have any injurious effect upon our manufacturers. On the contrary, it would appear to give them a better chance in foreign markets with the manufacturers of other countries, who cheapen their wares by free material. Thus our people might have the opportunity of extending their sales beyond the limits of home consumption—saving them from the depression, interruption in business, and loss caused by a glutted domestic market, and affording their employés more certain and steady labor, with its resulting quiet and contentment.

The question thus imperatively presented for solution should be approached in a spirit higher than partisanship and considered in the light of that regard for patriotic duty which should characterize the action of those intrusted with the weal of a confiding people. But the obligation to declared party policy and principle is not wanting to urge prompt and effective action. Both of the great political parties now represented in the Government have, by repeated and authoritative declarations, condemned the condition of our laws which permit the collection from the people of unnecessary revenue, and have, in the most solemn manner, promised its correction; and neither as citizens or partisans are our countrymen in a mood to condone the deliberate violation of these pledges.

Our progress toward a wise conclusion will not be improved by dwelling upon the theories of protection and free trade. This savors too much of bandying epithets. It is a *condition* which confronts us—not a theory. Relief from this condition may involve a slight reduction of the advantages which we award our home productions, but the entire withdrawal of such advantages should not be contemplated. The question of free trade is absolutely irrelevant; and the persistent claim made in certain quarters, that all efforts to relieve the people from unjust and unnecessary taxation are schemes of so-called free-traders, is mischievous and far removed from any consideration for the public good.

The simple and plain duty which we owe the people is to reduce taxation to the necessary expenses of an economical operation of the Government, and to restore to the business of the country the money which we hold in the Treasury through the perversion of governmental powers. These things can and should be done with safety to all our industries, without danger to the opportunity for remunerative labor which our workingmen need, and with benefit to them and all our people, by cheapening their means of subsistence and increasing the measure of their comforts.

I know that epithets are not arguments, and that denunciation on one side or the other does not establish either a principle or a fact. But the Supreme Court of the United States and the courts of the several States have denounced taxation in all its forms, when imposed to protect or build up manufacturing interests and industries, or for any purpose other than for public use in running the necessary machinery of the Government, as spoliation and legalized robbery. I can therefore afford to use the same language. I said, in a speech made in the Senate on the 20th of March, 1882:

In the case of the Loan Association *vs.* Topeka, in 20 Wallace, 657, Judge Miller, delivering the opinion of the court, stated the doctrine in language that has been repeated over and over again, but it will bear repetition. An attempt was made to tax the people of the city of Topeka under the authority given by an act of the Legislature so as to issue one hundred bonds of $1,000 each to establish the King Wrought Iron Bridge Manufacturing and Iron Works Company of Topeka, and to aid in encouraging that company in establishing and operating bridge shops in said city in pursuance of an act of the Legislature, which had plenary power, certainly as much power as the Congress of the United States has under the limited power given in the Constitution, which is to lay and collect taxes, duties, imposts, and excises, to pay the debts and provide for the common defense and general welfare of the United States. Certainly, the power of the Legislature that imposed the tax is as broad as the power we have, as all power not granted is reserved in the Constitution to the States and the people. The people of Topeka refused to pay the interest upon the bonds. Suit was brought. The case came to the Supreme Court of the United States, and Judge Miller in delivering the opinion of the court uses this language:

"The power to tax is, therefore, the strongest, the most pervading of all the powers of the Government, reaching directly or indirectly to all classes of the people. It was said by Chief-Justice Marshall, in the case of McCulloch *vs.* The State of Maryland, that the power to tax is the power to destroy. A striking instance of the truth of the proposition is seen in the fact that the existing tax of 10 per cent. imposed by the United States on the circulation of all other banks than the national banks drove out of existence every State bank of circulation

within a year or two after its passage. This power can as readily be employed against one class of individuals and in favor of another, so as to ruin the one class and give unlimited wealth and prosperity to the other, if there is no implied limitation of the uses for which the power may be exercised. To lay with one hand the power of the Government on the property of the citizen, and with the other to bestow it upon favored individuals to aid private enterprises and build up private fortunes, is none the less robbery because it is done under the forms of law and is called taxation. This is not legislation. It is a decree under legislative forms. Nor is it taxation.

"'A tax,' says Webster's Dictionary, 'is a rate or sum of money assessed on the person or property of a citizen by government for use of the nation or State.' 'Taxes are burdens or charges imposed by the legislature upon persons or property to raise money for public purposes.' Coulter, J., in Northern Liberties *vs.* St. John's Church, says very forcibly: 'I think the common mind has everywhere taken in the understanding that taxes are a public imposition, levied by authority of the Government for the purpose of carrying on the Government in all its machinery and operations—that they are imposed for a public purpose.'"

In that case he calls attention to a very large number of authorities. Judge Miller says further:

"If it be said that a benefit results to the local public of a town by establishing manufactures, the same may be said of any other business or pursuit which employs capital or labor. The merchant, the mechanic, the innkeeper, the banker, the builder, the steam-boat owner, are equally promoters of the public good, and equally deserving the aid of the citizens by forced contributions. No line can be drawn in favor of the manufacturer which would not open the coffers of the public treasury to the importunities of two-thirds of the business men of the city or town."

The supreme court refer with approbation to cases decided from the State of Maine, embracing exactly the same principle, that whether taxation is in the form of a direct tax or in any other form, it makes no difference; whenever property may be seized or levied on to enforce the payment of the burden imposed on property it is as much a tax in one form as in another, and all men whose opinions are entitled to any respect admit that the tariff is nothing but a tax. But when it is imposed for revenue purposes I agree that it is constitutional; when it is laid for subsidy or the protection of special interests, I insist it is unconstitutional, null, and void. In that I am fully sustained by the very able opinions by all the judges of the State of Maine, delivering opinions *seriatim* when questions were propounded to them by the State Legislature. (See 58 Maine Reports, page 590, etc.) The leading question was:

"Has the Legislature authority under the constitution to pass laws enabling towns, by gift of money or loan of bonds, to assist individuals or corporations to establish or carry on manufacturing of various kinds within or without the limits of said towns?"

The judges took up the question submitted to them. Among other things, the three judges who signed the first opinion, Chief-Justice Appleton, Judge Walton, and Judge Danforth, used language some of which I will read. They said:

"Taxes are the enforced proportional contribution of each citizen out of his estate, levied by authority of the state for the support of the government and for all public needs. They are the property of the citizen taken from the citizen by the government, and they are to be disposed of by it.

"There is nothing of a public nature any more entitling the manufacturer to public gifts than the sailor, the mechanic, the lumberman, or the farmer. Our Government is based upon equality of rights. All honest employments are honorable. The State can not rightfully discriminate among occupations, for a discrimination in favor of one branch of industry is a discrimination adverse to all other branches. The State is equally to protect all, giving no undue advantage or special and exclusive preference to any."

That opinion of the judges of Maine is a complete answer to the arguments made by leading Republican Senators, that if there was no revenue required, no pension list, no Army, no Navy, they would still protect manufactures, and would exact taxes by legislation from the mass of the people for the benefit of private parties, in order to enable them to sell goods at high prices so that they may carry on their business profitably. The judges of Maine proceed to say:

"No public exigency can require private spoliation for the private benefits of favored individuals. If the citizen is protected in his property by the Constitution against the public, much more is he against private rapacity."

Congress has only to make one more turn of the protection wheel and make the tax for the benefit of the now highly protective monopolies absolutely prohibitory. Will any Senator say that if the Congress of the United States shall pass an act providing that "in order to encourage Andrew Carnegie and his associates," who are already protected by patents against all the people of the United States, "we will prohibit the introduction of foreign Bessemer steel rails into the United States," that the courts would not declare that act unconstitutional? Yet we have very nearly done it. The chances are that it will soon become a prohibitory tax at $14 a ton. Again the court say, and I hope what they say may be carefully considered by the people:

"If it were proposed to pass an act enabling the inhabitants of the several towns by vote to transfer the farms or the horses or oxen, or a part thereof, from the rightful owners to some manufacturer whom the majority might select, the monstrousness of such proposed legislation would be transparent. But the mode by which property would be taken from one or many and given to another or others can make no difference in the underlying principle. It is the taking that constitutes the wrong, no matter how taken. Whether the cow or the ox be taken from the unwilling owner and given to a manufacturer, or the gift be of money obtained by a sale made by the collector, or by the payment of the tax to avoid such sale, does not and can not change the principle. In either case the cow or the ox or the value thereof is taken from the owner and is given away by others without the owner's consent. If a part of one's estate may be given away, another and another portion may, upon the same principle, be given away until all is gone. What is this but manifest and undisguised spoliation?"

Each of the other judges gave substantially the same opinion, in different language, of course; but each of them pronounced it legislative robbery, their language being quite as denunciatory as any used on this floor by any of us. Judge Dickerson uses this language:

"What claim has manufacturing to such preference over other branches of industry, commerce, trade, agriculture, and the mechanic arts? These are honorable and beneficial pursuits, and the constitution of this State will be searched in vain to find any powers given to the Legislature to authorize towns and cities to discriminate against these employments and in favor of manufacturing in the matter of taxation. If municipal corporations may assess a tax upon their citizens by authority of law to encourage one, it may each and all the branches of necessary industry, and the question is reduced to this: Has the Legislature the constitutional authority to authorize the towns and cities in this State to tax their inhabitants for the purpose of aiding, establishing, or carrying on, not only manufacturing properly so called, but also farming, ship-building, trading, innkeeping, printing, banking, insurance, and any other branch of beneficial industry?"

When another case came up afterwards, which is reported in 60 Maine, "Allen *vs.* Inhabitants of Jay," the chief-justice decided a similar question. The authorities, under an act of the Legislature, had attempted to grant aid to a manufacturing company, or to a saw-mill that was about to be established. The judge said in that case:

"Taxation, by the very meaning of the term, implies the raising of money for public uses, and excludes the raising if for private objects and purposes. 'I concede,' says Black, C. J., in Sharpless *vs.* Mayor, 21 Pennsylvania, 167, 'that a law authorizing taxation for any other than public purposes is void.' 'A tax,' remarks Green, C. J., in Camden *vs.* Allen, 2 Dutch., 839, 'is an impost levied by authority of government upon its citizens or subjects for the support of the state.'

"'No authority or even dictum can be found,' observes Dillon, C. J., in Hanson *vs.* Vernon, 27 Iowa, 28, 'which asserts that there can be any legitimate taxation when the money to be raised does not go into the public treasury, or is not destined for the use of the government or some of the governmental divisions of the state.'

"If there is any proposition about which there is an entire and uniform weight of judicial authority, it is that taxes are to be imposed for the use of the people of the state in the varied and manifold purposes of government, and not for private objects or the special benefit of individuals. Taxation originates from and is imposed by and for the state.

"The idea seems to be that thereby capital would be created. But such is not the case. Capital is the saving of past earnings ready for productive employment. The bonds of a town may enable the holder to obtain money by their transfer, as he might do by that of any good note. But no capital is thereby created. It is only a transfer of capital from one kind of business to another.

"The industry of each man and woman engaged in productive employment is of 'benefit' to the town in which such industry is employed. This can be predicated of all useful labor, of all productive industry. But because all useful labor, all productive industry, conduces to the public benefit, does it follow that the people are to be taxed for the benefit of one man or of one special kind of manufacturings?

"The sailor, the farmer, the mechanic, the lumberman, are equally entitled to the aid of coerced loans to enable them to carry on their business with Messrs. Hutchins & Lane. Our Government is based on equality of right. The state can not discriminate among occupations, for a discrimination in favor of one is a discrimination adverse to all others. While the state is bound to protect all, it ceases to give that just protection when it affords undue advantages, or gives special and exclusive preferences to particular individuals and particular and special industries at the cost and charge of the rest of the community.

"Where is the difference between the coerced contribution of the tax-gatherer to be loaned to individuals for their benefit and those of the conqueror from the inhabitants of the conquered country?"

I can add nothing to strengthen the emphatic condemnation pronounced by the highest judicial authorities of the land against all schemes of taxation and all devices and pretexts whereby either manufacturing or other favored interests are sought to be subsidized, protected from competition, or built up by taxation imposed upon the people for their benefit.

Every utterance applies with full force on the position now assumed by the Republican party in its platform on the measure before the Senate.

The leading statesmen of the country have always reprobated the taxation of all the people in the interests of favored classes. Mr. Webster, in the great debate in the House in 1824, said:

Gentlemen tell us that they are in favor of domestic industry; so am I. They would give it protection; so would I. But then all domestic industry is not confined to manufactures. The employments of agriculture, commerce, and navigation are all branches of the same industry; they all furnish employment for American capital and American labor. And when the question is, whether new duties shall be laid for the purpose of giving further encouragement to particular manufactures, every reasonable man must ask himself both whether the proposed new encouragement be necessary and whether it can be given without injustice to other branches of industry.

These are questions which the American people are at last beginning to consider very carefully.

Mr. Webster further said:

I will now proceed, sir, to state some objections in a more general nature to the course of Mr. Speaker's observations. He seems to me to argue the question as if all domestic industry were confined to the production of manufactured articles; as if the employment of our own capital and our own labor, in the occupations of commerce and navigation, were not as emphatically domestic industry as any other occupation. Some other gentlemen in the course of the debate have spoken of the price paid for every manufactured article as so much given for the encouragement of foreign labor to the prejudice of our own. But is not every article the product of our own labor as truly as if we had manufactured it ourselves? Our labor has earned it and paid the price for it. It is so much added to the stock of national wealth. If the commodity were dollars nobody would doubt the truth of this remark; and it is precisely as correct in its application to any other commodity as to silver.

One man makes a yard of cloth at home; another raises agricultural products and buys a yard of imported cloth. Both these are equally the earnings of domestic industry, and the only questions that arise in the case are two: The first is, which is the best mode, under all the circumstances, of obtaining the article? The second is, how far this question is proper to be decided by Government and how far it is proper to be left to individual discretion? There is no foundation for the distinction which attributes to certain employments the peculiar appellation of American industry; and it is, in my judgment, extremely unwise to attempt such discriminations.

We are asked, what nations have ever attained eminent prosperity without encouraging manufactures? I may ask, what nation ever reached the like prosperity without promoting foreign trade? I regard these interests as closely connected, and am of opinion that it should be our aim to cause them to flourish together. I know it would be very easy to promote manufactures at least for a time, but probably for a short time only, if we might act in disregard of other interests. We could cause a sudden transfer of capital and a violent change in the pursuits of men. We could exceedingly benefit some classes by these means. But what then becomes of the interests of others?

For my part I see very little relief to those who are likely to be deprived of their employments, or who find the prices of the commodities which they need, raised, in any of the alternatives which Mr. Speaker has presented. It is nothing to say that they may, if they choose, continue to buy the foreign article; the answer is, the price is augmented; nor that they may use the domestic article; the price of that is also increased. Nor can they supply themselves by the substitution of their own fabric. How can the agriculturist make his own iron? How can the ship-owner grow his own hemp?

These views are as applicable to the measures and propositions now pending as they were then, and the men of America will indorse and support them.

General Garfield, in a speech in the House of Representatives in 1870, describing the American industries that were entitled to protection, said:

We are limited in our tariff legislation by two things: first, the demands of the Treasury; and second, the wants and demands of American industry. I reject that narrow view which considers industry any one particular form of labor. I

object to any theory that treats the industries of the country as they were treated in the last census, when we had one schedule for agriculture and another for industry, as though agriculture was not an industry, as though commerce and trade and transportation were not industries. American industry is labor in any form which gives value to the raw materials or elements of nature, either by extracting them from the earth, the air, or the sea, or by modifying their forms, or transporting them through the channels of trade to the markets of the world, or in any way rendering them better fitted for the use of man. All these are parts of American industry, and deserve the careful and earnest attention of the Legislature of the nation. Wherever a ship plows the sea, or a plow furrows the field; wherever a mine yields its treasure; wherever a ship or a railroad train carries freight to market; wherever the smoke of a furnace rises, or the clang of the loom resounds; even in the lonely garret where the seamstress plies her busy needle—there is industry. (Volume 13, part 6, RECORD, July 14, 1882, page 6034.)

Volumes might be filled with extracts from the speeches and writings of every leading statesman of the country of all shades of political opinion condemning the policy now advocated by the Republican leaders, but I am content to stand on the decision of the courts and the opinions of the eminent men from whom I have quoted.

Turning to the discussion of the general proposition, it may be truthfully said that when the arguments of the ablest and fairest advocates of the protective-tariff system are analyzed, they are all based on the false assumption that the tax is paid by foreigners, or is imposed on goods imported to prevent foreigners from taking advantage of the cheap pauper labor employed by them in the production of their goods, and to protect American laborers, who receive higher wages here in the production of like articles, against such degrading competition.

The truth is, as the President very clearly shows, that the American consumer not only pays every dollar of the tariff tax imposed on goods imported, but he pays a price equal to the foreign price, with the tariff tax added, on all similar goods manufactured in this country; and, as four-fifths, on an average, of all such goods consumed here are made at home, and only one-fifth imported, the Government, which collects only the tax on goods imported, gets but one-fifth of the tax, while Congress requires all American consumers to pay the other four-fifths to their protected pets, many members of both Houses of Congress being the beneficiaries; and they patriotically call that protecting American industry.

I know that the leading advocates of protection, among them Senators in carefully prepared speeches, have denied that the price of the home-made product is enhanced to the extent of the tax on the imported goods, but their denial does not alter the fact. Indeed, the protectionists all insist that it is true, and prove it conclusively in their arguments before the committees of Congress when demanding protection on their manufactured goods. For example, wool is the raw material of the woolen manufacturer; pig-iron, of the various iron products; lead, of the paints; tin-plate, of many utensils; and so through the list.

In every instance the home manufacturer of more advanced fabrics of wool, iron, lead, and all else claims and obtains protection on the finished products, based on the assumption that his raw material is enhanced in price to him to an amount equal to its foreign price with the tariff tax added; and he proves it, as I said, conclusively, by showing that he buys a portion, often a large portion, of his raw materials abroad, and pays the tariff tax on it, in preference to buying it from the producer here, solely on the ground that the home producer asks him more than the foreign price of the same article with 50 per cent. tariff tax added.

Of course he asserts his right to buy where it costs him the least money; and if that is true of such purchases made by men who buy abroad what in their business is raw material, out of which to manufacture more finished products (and they all prove that it is)—and I may add that our tariff laws are all based on the assumption that it is—why, I ask, is it not equally true in regard to all purchases of imported goods, whether purchasers intend to consume them in the shape in which they are imported, or to change their character by additional labor after they obtain them? The purpose for which imported goods are bought cuts no figure in the argument; the fact is incontrovertible that each purchaser buys them for the sole reason that he can buy them and pay the tariff tax on them, and yet get them cheaper than he can buy goods of the same character produced here. If he could not, there would not be a dollar's worth of imported goods sold in this country.

If the advocates of the protective system would tell the truth and avow their purpose to be that no American citizen should be allowed to buy any manufactured article, at home or abroad, unless he pays to people who have no right to any of his money 47 per cent. more for it than it was worth, or more than any citizen of any other country who is allowed to buy like articles in the open markets of the world pays for it, they know that they would shock the people, and their demand to be restored to power to carry out such purposes would be indignantly frowned down. Therefore they adopt the specious and patriotic "rallying cry" of protection against foreign pauper labor, which has deceived thousands of their victims.

There are a few plain tests by which, when applied, the wayfaring man, though a fool, need not err in determining from whom the tariff tax is exacted. That tax is imposed only when goods brought from abroad enter the custom-houses in this country. They are all consumed here. No foreigner consumes a dollar's worth of them. He can get them at the price which the American citizen pays for them, less the 47 per cent. average tariff tax, with freight, insurance, and other costs added, and the importer would make just as much money by selling to the foreigner, before he starts from the foreign port, for 47 per cent. less than he sells to the American, because when he gets 47 per cent. and cost of the voyage more out of our people for the goods sold here he gets back only what he paid at the custom-house.

Every man who has sense enough to know anything knows that the home consumer of imported goods pays the tax, and that foreigners consume none of them; therefore, as the American citizens consume all of them, all the tax is paid by the American consumer. Why does he pay it? Nobody is obliged to buy imported goods when similar goods are manufactured in this country. There can be but one answer, and that I have before stated: the American consumer finds it cheaper to buy imported goods whose price has been increased 47 per cent. by a tax called a tariff than it would be to buy like articles manufactured in the United States at the price the home producer asks for them. He, of course, buys where he can buy cheapest.

Each purchase is an individual one. Neither the Federal Government nor the States, as such, engage in trade. Each man pays the money he has earned by labor of some sort for the things he buys. All limitations imposed on his right to buy what he needs in the cheapest markets are simply means devised, more or less honestly or dishonestly, by Congress, according to the purpose for which they are imposed, to take money out of the consumer's pocket.

The fact that he finds it cheaper and better for him to buy the highly taxed, imported goods than to buy like goods made at home is not only conclusive evidence, but "demonstration strong as proof of Holy Writ," that all goods manufactured here similar to those imported are advanced to the foreign price of the goods, with the American tariff tax and cost of importation added, because, I repeat, if it were not so, no goods could or would be imported.

As the home consumer always buys where he can buy cheapest, whether he uses them as raw materials for more advanced products or for consumption in the shape in which they are imported, his action determines that question, so that no sophistry, however plausible, can controvert the facts established by the purchases made of foreign goods, that the price of like home-made goods is advanced to the point of sharp competition with the foreign-made goods with the tariff tax and cost added, and as it is conceded that at least four-fifths of the goods consumed in this country, which are partly imported and partly made here, are of domestic manufacture, it follows, as the Government gets only the tax on the one-fifth imported, that the domestic manufacturer gets $4 of the enhanced price out of the consumer for every dollar that the Government receives.

The Treasury receives annually about $220,000,000 from tariff taxation. The protected pets of Congress, many of whom are in both Houses voting the people's money into their own pockets, are receiving at least $880,000,000. This is exclusive of all bounties on articles on which there is a high-tariff tax which prohibits importation or which home producers sell here for less than the foreign price with the tax added. In all that large class of products the tax is in fact prohibitory. The Government gets no revenue. The home producers, by trusts and combinations limiting production, forcing idleness or half-time work on their operatives, and maintaining prices a fraction below the foreign price, with the tariff tax and the cost added, pocket all that Congress authorizes them to compel the people to pay. This is the system which the Republican party pledges itself to perpetuate, regardless of revenue, regardless of governmental needs, under the plausible but false pretense that it is protecting American industry and the wages of American laborers.

As it must be obvious that no American consumer would purchase imported goods if they were not offered to him at a lower price than like goods of domestic manufacture are, it is equally obvious that no importer, whether he be a foreign manufacturer, an American merchant, or exporter who takes goods for what he sells abroad, will import goods and pay all charges and 47 per cent. tariff tax on them here unless he can sell them in this market for at least 50 per cent. more than he would be willing to take for them at the place of shipment. He would sell them abroad rather than take less, and he can only sell here by selling his tax-paid goods cheaper than the home producer of like articles sells his product. The markets of the world are open for the sale of foreign products.

There are twenty-five times as many people outside of the United States as there are inside of them. The goods on all markets are the private property of individuals. Foreign governments are not engaged in trade any more than ours. Individual self-interest determines the question where and to what market foreign as well as domestic products will be carried, and while mistakes in regard to prices will sometimes be made, they are reduced to a minimum by the telegraph and the other facilities for obtaining prompt and reliable information in regard to the markets of all countries.

The rule in all trade and mercantile transactions is that goods seek the market in which the seller can get the most money net for his property, after paying all tariff taxes, costs, and charges, just as the buyer buys what he needs, regardless of its place of production, where and from whom he gets it best and cheapest. I therefore insist that no

amount of sophistry can shake or weaken the plain, truthful statement of facts made by the President nor detract from the force of his earnest recommendation that our present vicious, inequitable, illogical, and unnecessary tariff laws ought at once to be revised and amended, because they needlessly, and therefore wrongfully, tax all the people, not only 47 per cent. on the average on all the imported goods they buy above their value in open market, but impose without furnishing any revenue an equal tax on all the goods produced in this country that compete with them in our markets for the exclusive benefit of a few protected manufacturers.

His argument was made overwhelmingly strong when he showed by the official reports of the last census—and the same proportion exists to-day—that out of 17,392,099 of our population engaged in all kinds of industries only 2,623,089 are employed in such manufacturing industries as are, or can be claimed to be, benefited by a high tariff, leaving 14,769,010 to be taxed 47 per cent. on the necessaries of life without any compensation or equivalent, except one dollar out of five paid into the Treasury for the use of the Government, under the pretense that they are thus helping to keep up the wages of about two and a half millions of other laborers, who have themselves to contribute more out of the enhanced price of the things they are compelled to buy, even when they help to make them, than all the enhanced wages they are assumed to receive under so-called protection amounts to.

In the last extract which I read from the President's message he points out with great vigor and clearness the importance of reducing tariff taxation, especially on raw materials, so that our manufactures may be exported to foreign markets and our workmen secure steady employment. I again quote his language:

> Thus our people might have the opportunity of extending their sales beyond the limit of home consumption, saving them from depression, interruption in business, and loss caused by a glutted domestic market, and affording their employés more certain and steady labor, with its resultant quiet and contentment.

That is the object which the President avows in his message he seeks above all things to promote. The additions to the free-list and reductions in rates of taxation in the Mills bill are efforts to bring about that result, and I believe the intelligent men of the country outside of the few interested protected combinations will sustain us, and denounce those who seek to delude them, instead of submitting longer to their extortions. The superior intelligence of our operatives will overcome great obstacles. They produce more for the pay they receive than the poorly paid and less intelligent operatives of Europe; and that is the true test of the cost of production to the man who has the products to sell. Three dollars a day to a man who cuts and binds with a machine 10 acres of wheat a day is to his employer cheap, low wages compared to $1 a day to a man who cuts and binds an acre, or 50 cents a day to a man who only cuts and binds half an acre.

The opening of the markets of the world has always been held up, even by those who urged temporary protection to infant industries, as an indispensable prerequisite to commercial prosperity, and by no one more earnestly or ably than the Senator from New York [Mr. EVARTS]. He made a most valuable report as Secretary of State on the "State of Labor in Europe" (see Executive Document No. 5, first session, Forty-sixth Congress), from which I read the following:

> There is something in the Republic which gives an individuality to the people of the United States possessed by no other people to such a degree. Our inventive genius in mechanical appliances is original, and at least twenty-five years ahead of Europe. Our people accept innovation; are prepared for it by anticipation. Europeans do not. One workman in the United States, as will be seen from the foregoing extracts, does as much as two workmen in most of the countries of Europe; even the immigrant from Europe attains this progressive spirit by a few years' association with American workmen. We have no oppressed and stupid peasantry, little more intelligent than the tools they handle. All are self-thinking, self-acting, and self-supporting.
>
> Within the last fifteen years we have demonstrated our ability by the brilliant development of our own resources to exclude by honest competition foreign manufactures, to a large extent, from our shores. The question which now peremptorily challenges all thinking minds is how to create a foreign demand for those manufactures which are left after supplying our home demands. We can not stand still, for the momentum of increase will soon become so great that it will push us outward anyway; to push us safely and profitably is of so much importance as to almost overtop all other questions of the hour. The question appeals equally to the selfishness and patriotism of all our citizens, but to the laborer it appeals with tenfold force; for without work he can not live, and unless we can extend the markets for our manufactures he can not expect steady work, and unless our manufacturers can undersell foreign manufacturers we can not enlarge our foreign market.
>
> The first great truth to be learned by the manufacturers and workingmen is that the days of sudden fortunes and double wages are gone. We must realize the fact that ocean steam communication has annihilated distance and brought the nations face to face. This drawing together of the nations means equalization in trade, profits, wages, etc., the advantage being with those who soonest accept the situation and show the most sensible continuity in the new paths of success.

What a contrast is presented between the broad, liberal, and just recommendations of the President, so well sustained and enforced by the report of Secretary Evarts, and the narrow Chinese policy urged by all the present Republican leaders, Senator EVARTS, I fear, included, as adopted by their party in its platform at Chicago. It hardly requires ordinary intelligence to understand that protection means taxation imposed on home consumers sufficient to secure the home market to home manufacturers at their own price, and is a confession that the American manufacturer does not propose to seek for foreign trade or compete with foreign goods in the world's markets.

It surrenders the trade in manufactured articles with all the people of Asia, Africa, Europe, and America, outside of the United States, to foreigners, on condition that the American Congress will prohibit all the people of the United States from buying with the money they worked for (much of which they obtained by selling their products of cotton, wheat, provisions, etc., in foreign unprotected markets in sharp competition with pauper labor), unless they pay to the Congressional bantlings 47 per cent. more than they were offered the same things for in the markets in which they were compelled to sell what they produced. Stripped of its gloss and varnish, this is the issue which the American people must settle next November at the polls. Mr. Evarts in that report sounded the key-note, and the President in his message has cleared away the brush under which the vampires who seek to suck the life-blood of the laboring poor tried to conceal themselves while their victims slept.

I think it will be difficult for the distinguished Senator from New York, or any of his political associates, to convince the Senate or the country that they propose to extend the markets for our manufactures to other countries, which Secretary Evarts justly regarded as so important as to overtop all other questions, and one in which the laborers have tenfold more interest than any other class for the reasons he gave. I quote from the Republican platform. It pledges the party to make—

> Such revisions of the tariff laws as will tend to check imports of such articles as are produced by our people, the production of which gives employment to our labor, and release from import duties those articles of foreign production (except luxuries) the like of which can not be produced at home. If there still shall remain a larger revenue than is requisite for the wants of the Government, we favor the entire repeal of the internal taxes rather than surrender of any part of our protective system.

With an average tariff tax now of over 47 per cent., which is up to the highest point of war taxation, when incomes, manufactures, professions, everything, were loaded down with internal-revenue taxes, all of which have been removed, tobacco and spirits alone being now taxed and they at greatly reduced rates, if that platform does not mean that they deliberately propose to surrender the markets of the world to foreign nations for all time to come in order to still further enhance the cost to the American consumers of the goods they produce, I am incapable of construing the English language. If it does not mean increased idleness, half-time employment to labor, encouragement to strikes, and closed factories, to prevent production of a surplus beyond the needs of home consumption, in the limited, high-priced markets which Congress creates and protects, I confess my inability to comprehend its meaning. Yet they profess it is all done in the interest of American labor.

Every man of sense must know that their professions are false. Their demand for protection is necessarily a confession that our manufacturers do not intend to sell their products in competition with other people outside of the United States. Their outside advocates and Congressional partners insist that they will be ruined, if our own people are not prohibited by Congress from buying at home, unless they pay an average tax of 47 per cent. more than they are offered for anywhere outside of the United States, on foreign goods which they would have to compete with in the world's markets without any protection. They have the audacity to assert that the President is a free-trader when he recommends a reduction of the tax upon our people to the amount required for public purposes, and that the Democratic party is banded together against American interests and in the interest of European nations when it demands a reduction of taxation, as it does in the Mills bill, from 47 to 42 per cent. beyond what the people of other countries have to pay.

Either their clamor for protection is false or the pretense that they ever expect to manufacture for other markets than our own is untrue, as wages always have been and always will be higher here than in Europe. Of course, they can sell at home cheaper than they can send abroad and sell. If they can not compete on equal terms with foreign goods at home, how can they do so abroad? When we propose to reduce the taxes on their raw materials, on iron, lead, copper, wool, dyestuffs, and machinery, etc., to enable them to reduce the cost of their products, so that our own people can buy what they need at lower rates, and, by such a reduction of cost, give them a chance to manufacture goods here in such quantities and at such prices that they can be sent abroad and sold in the world's markets, and thus give the labor they employ steady work by increased production for more extended markets, they meet in convention and denounce us as enemies of the country, conspirators with foreign nations against American interests, and demand still further restriction of imports, which means more exorbitant home prices for their goods, the absolute surrender of the American market to them, which, of course, is nothing less than an absolute surrender by them of all the other markets on earth to foreign nations who make similar goods, and to compensate the American people for the robbery they seek to legalize and perpetuate for all time, they generously offer them free whisky and free tobacco.

HOME MARKET.

General Harrison has probably given the Republican platform as careful consideration as any member of his party, and his utterances as to its meaning and as to his purposes in carrying it out, if elected, must be taken as the highest authority. He made a carefully-consid-

ered speech some time ago, which was reported in a friendly newspaper with all the applause which greeted it, a portion of which I read:

Our party stands unequivocally, without evasion or qualification, for the doctrine that the American market shall be preserved for our American producers. [Great applause.] We are not attracted by the suggestion that we should surrender to foreign producers the best market in the world. Our 60,000,000 of people are the best buyers in the world [applause]; and they are such because our working classes receive the best wages. [Applause.] But we do not mean to be content with our own market. We should seek to promote closer and more friendly commercial relations with the Central and South American states. [Applause.] And what is essential to that end? Regular mails are the first condition of commerce.

The merchant must know when his order will be received and when his consignment will be returned, or there can be no trade between distant communities. What we need, therefore, is the establishment of American steam-ship lines between our ports and the ports of Central and South America. [Applause.] Then it will be no longer necessary that an American minister, commissioned to an American state, shall take an English ship to Liverpool to find another English ship to carry him to his destination. [Applause.] We are not to be frightened by the use of that ugly word "subsidy." [Laughter.] We should pay to American steam-ship lines a liberal compensation for carrying our mails instead of turning them over to British tramp steam-ships.

Nothing illustrates more forcibly the desperate straits to which the Republican candidate for the Presidency is reduced in order to sustain the silly twaddle in his platform than the mass of absurd incongruities contained in the sentences I have read. He does not propose to restore tea or coffee to the tax-list. He would oppose a tax on incomes. He does not suggest any new objects of taxation, and stands with his party in favor of the entire repeal of internal-revenue taxes rather than surrender any part of the protective system. Yet he stands unequivocally, without evasion or qualification, for the doctrine that the American market shall be preserved for our American producers.

He must have sense enough to know that no revenue can be obtained from imports if the American market is reserved to American producers. The official reports show him that, independent of pensions and interest on bonds, which the internal taxes provide for, there remains over $200,000,000 to be provided for mainly by tariff taxation to meet the necessary annual expenses of the Government; therefore he is simply talking nonsense when he so emphatically resolved to exclude all competition from abroad with American manufacturers, and pledges himself hereafter to give them a monopoly of the American market.

General Harrison ought to know, and he does know, if he has read President Cleveland's message to Congress, that the men to whom he proposes to grant absolute control of the American markets constitute less than one-eighth of the American workmen who are engaged in honest industries, even when all their operatives are counted in the protected class, while the real beneficiaries are less than one-eighth of an eighth on the most liberal estimate. I will not do him the injustice to assume that he is ignorant of the fact, which intelligent men everywhere concede, that protection can not protect any product of this country which is raised or prepared for market here cheaper than it can be elsewhere, or is produced in such quantities that our own people can not consume it. Cotton, wheat, beef, pork, provisions, tobacco, oils, and dozens of other things illustrate this. Prohibitory tariff taxation might be imposed on all like products of foreign countries, and it would only injure home producers by preventing an exchange of seeds and crosses of breeds for improvement, except at a few points along our extended frontier.

Take cotton, which employs in its production a very large number of the colored race in nearly all the Southern States. In spite of protection 70 per cent. of that product is annually exported, and must be sold in Liverpool and other foreign markets in sharp competition with like products raised in all parts of the world by the cheapest and most degraded pauper labor. Of course the price of the surplus in the foreign market regulates the price of the whole crop at home as well as abroad. No intelligent man will venture to assert that protection protects the producers of cotton or wheat, yet they are both great legitimate and important American industries, employing more laborers in their production than all the factories in the land, and are, therefore, as much entitled to protection as the product of the furnace, the factory, or the loom. It is absurd to talk about protecting either cotton or wheat, and equally absurd to talk about increasing the consumption of either while the high prices of home manufacturers are maintained so as to limit their products substantially to home consumption.

It is impossible to conceive how any man who lives by farm labor, or the sales of products of the farm can support the Republican party in its crusade against all the industries of the country, except the comparatively few whose machines are engaged in manufacturing goods for home consumption; or how tradesmen, such as bricklayers, carpenters, blacksmiths, and other unprotected occupations, mainly dependent on the prosperity of farm industry, can do so. All intelligent men know that the whole farming industry of this country is, and under our system of taxation must continue to be, paralyzed. Farms covered by mortgages is the rule rather than the exception. Prices of products are regulated by foreign market rates.

Everything that must be sold, has to be sold without protection, while $147 has to be paid on the average to the protected favorites of Congress for every $100 worth of the kind of goods they produce, which the farmer has to buy and pay for with the money he gets in his competition with foreign producers. It is absurd to contend that manufacturers will or can extend the home markets for farm produce if protection is continued at the present or increased rates. Twenty-five years of experience has proved how false all such pretenses are, and every day makes the proof more conclusive.

GENERAL HARRISON ON SUBSIDY.

General Harrison's protected home market, which, he says, is the best in the world (of course it is to the few protected monopolists, but the worst for those who have to buy), means legalized robbery of the masses to enrich a favored class. I have shown that the Supreme Court of the United States and all the courts of the States have so characterized it in terms even stronger than I have used. But General Harrison says: "We do not mean to be content with our own markets," and he urges subsidies for steam-ship lines to Central and South America, so that orders for goods and consignments may be made, and so that American ministers shall not be humiliated by sailing under foreign flags, and British tramps may not handle our mails. All this is simply silly, and yet it was received with great applause.

I hope the question will be frequently asked, during the canvass, how American manufacturers, who declare that they will be ruined and driven out of the home market if the present protective tax of 47 per cent. against competition with like goods manufactured abroad is reduced to 42 per cent., as the House bill proposes, can send their goods to Central and South America, or anywhere else outside of the United States, and sell them in open market in competition with the foreign pauper-made goods against which they demand that a protective tax of 47 per cent. shall be retained in order to enable them to continue their business at home. Either the present tax is an outrageous one or the pretense that they propose to send their products to foreign countries and compete in open, unprotected markets is false. Subsidy, says the Republican platform, and their candidate, General Harrison, says that he is not to be frightened by the use of that ugly word, is the true principle by which our lost carrying trade and foreign commerce in manufactured goods is to be restored and made to flourish.

Let us look at the proposed panacea for a moment. Where is the subsidy to come from? Who is to pay it? Who is to receive it? And what equivalent are those who get it to give in return? Everybody knows that Congress has nothing to give except what it directs the tax-collector to take from the people, and everybody knows that it does not require the wealth of the country as such to contribute a dollar to the support of the Government or to any subsidy it grants. Incomes, bonds, palatial residences, all that the rich enjoy, and the poor only look at and wonder where they came from, are exempt from taxation. Only such things as all men, rich and poor, need and use are taxed. The coachman of the hundred times a millionaire, if he has a wife and family, pays more to support the Government than his employer, if he has no family. Tariff and internal-revenue taxation fills the Treasury. Out of the money so coerced out of the people the subsidies must be paid. Internal taxes are only paid by those who see fit to use whisky, beer, and tobacco, and they are paid by the consumers, rich or poor, in proportion to the quantity used. Every dollar so paid, less a small fraction over 3 per cent., the cost of collection, goes into the Treasury, to be used for subsidies or legitimate expenditures of the Government, as Congress may direct.

The internal-revenue taxes have become very odious lately to the Republican leaders, mainly because none of them go into their pockets; whereas under the system of tariff taxation they pocket at least $5 for every dollar that reaches the Treasury, as over five times as many of the goods consumed are produced here as are imported, and the Government only gets the tax on the one-fifth brought from abroad. Of course it only gets that much, as I have shown, because the individual purchaser finds on examination, and each man examines and decides on each purchase for himself, that it is cheaper for him to pay the foreign price and the tax than it is to pay the price the home manufacturer asks.

That system of taxation is held in high esteem by its beneficiaries and advocates, and General Harrison is so anxious to maintain it, that he proposes to abandon the collection of all internal revenue, because of the "anti-American" principle it contains of paying all the taxes collected into the Treasury. He advocates not only higher protective tariff taxation, but the establishment of a system of steam-ship subsidies, so as to require taxation to be maintained in that form high enough to provide not only for the ordinary expenses of the Government, but for all the subsidies to favored steam-ship lines that he can induce Congress to donate. All this is done in the interest of American labor! Their false pretenses are fully exposed when we see who the beneficiaries are, and ascertain what they propose to do with it.

When the proposition was before Congress in July last the Postmaster-General exposed the scheme so completely that I can not strengthen his presentation of the hollowness of the pretenses set up by General Harrison and his platform on the subsidy question, and will therefore quote what he said. I only desire to remark in advance that more than half, say 56 per cent., of the whole subsidy was to be given to two corporations, the Pacific Mail, of which Jay Gould is president, and the Brazilian Steam-ship Company, of which H. K. Thurber is president

and C. P. Huntington the principal owner, he having bought out the Roach interest.

I do not think the country will appreciate the wail of sympathy General Harrison raises for these poor, innocent, helpless infants or their industries. Plain people will rather assume that this munificent gift was intended to give Mr. Foster and his associates an excuse for frying "some of the fat out of them" for campaign purposes. I submit liberal extracts and the tables in regard to trades from the statement of the Postmaster-General. Nobody has answered it; nobody can successfully controvert it, and in my opinion the American people will approve it.

After showing conclusively that the postal service would be seriously damaged by the proposed subsidy of $800,000 a year, and that he is now paying American companies liberal compensation, he adds:

In the present conditions the proposed law might as well have named the few persons to whom this money is to be paid. Even the laws (Revised Statutes, sections 3976 and 4293) under which American ships might be compelled to carry the mails have been repealed (23 United States Statutes at Large, 58), and it goes without saying that the proposed legislation intends the Department to pay the maximum rate provided, *i. e.*, $1 per nautical mile for five years, to these few persons, without troubling them with any negotiations as to terms, and, indeed, as you will observe, without even the lodgment of discretion in the Department to designate from what ports of the United States the mails shall sail.

It may be said in passing that presumably the "terminal points" from which sailings will be made, if self-interest, as is usually the case, governs, will be those from which the greatest number of nautical miles may be computed, rather than from those at which the convenience and needs of the service would be suited. It may be noted also that the schedules of sailings are to be furnished by the contractors, and not by the Postmaster-General; altogether, from an analysis of the proposed legislation it would seem to exclude the exercise of any power of any representative of this Government to provide for this mail service in the interest of the people, except after contract, which must be on the carriers' own terms and after the carriers have fixed the schedules according to their ideas of what the mail service should be, to compel them to conform to their own expressed views and decision as to the public convenience and the public interests.

Herewith I furnish you two tables, marked "A" and "B." From them you will see that the mails of this country were carried to Central and South America and the West Indies for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1887, by foreign steamers at a cost of $7,936.27 at the single rate, and by steamers of American register at a cost of $39 381.57. The number of miles sailed by the foreign ships employed was 666,448; the miles sailed by ships of American register employed were 546,758. It will be seen on the plan of payment proposed, which is fixed without regard to the amount of mail carried, that the service, which costs us in the fiscal year 1887, $47,317.84, would have cost us, if paid for as proposed, $1,213,206. It is estimated that the weight of mails will be for the next fiscal year increased 20 per cent. over these figures, and from what I have before shown it will be seen that the number of sailings will be increased in about the same ratio over the figures given in Tables A and B. The total cost of the sailings under this bill predicated upon the business of 1887 can be but an approximate standard by which to estimate the cost under a provision of $1 for every nautical mile for each outward trip.

Again, it will not commend itself to our people if, with this enormous compensation, avowedly for the carriage of the mails, frequency of transmission shall be largely curtailed, even to ports touched by American ships, as must be the case where we pay one carrier about two hundred and fifty times as much as we offer for the same service to another. In my opinion the bill would not be advantageous to the service, but the disadvantages would be positive in so far as this Department is concerned, while if it shall become a law the Department will of course faithfully administer the fund in accordance with the spirit of the act. I feel confident that such administration will result only in a very great pecuniary benefit to a dozen individuals, at the expense and embarrassment of good service, and of inconvenience, injustice, and material injury to the great body of the people, whose money will be used in the purchase of those results.

"The question (mail subsidy service) can not be dealt with on commercial principles. * * * For the sake of keeping up such communication with the East as the nation requires they must set commercial principles at defiance, and cost what it may the nation must either pay them what they lose thereby or forego the communication."

Of course England may subsidize lines of ships to open up new markets for her surplus, because she freely exchanges commodities with such markets; and her policy is after establishing the commerce to steadily decrease the subsidy. If the policy of giving bounties to promote commercial relations with other countries be ever adopted again after the failures in our history, it would seem that its adoption should be deferred until closer commercial relations with those countries can be maintained, and are not antagonized by an opposing system of laws.

I hope that language will be considered carefully by gentlemen on the other side when they are quoting what other nations do in order to build up commerce. They met in Chicago lately, and in their platform declared that they are going to keep the American markets for themselves. They propose to build a Chinese wall around the United States to prevent our people from buying anything produced abroad which can be produced at home at any price, in order to protect home industries.

They propose to take no step in the direction that other nations are moving, in order to build up closer commercial relations with other countries, but they propose to antagonize trade with other people by an opposing system of exclusion and restriction which destroys the very idea of commerce with other countries.

The Postmaster-General continues:

Commerce, in the very essence of its meaning, is exchange. It is not to sell and never to buy.

Never to buy seems to be Republican policy in dealing with foreign nations, according to the Chicago platform, if somebody here has the same things to sell, even if he asks double price for them. He adds:

The individual or nation does not exist that will buy all one has to sell for cash with no reciprocal return in profitable exchange. Cargoes out and cargoes back are needed for the creation of a merchant marine. The cargo out will not be bought unless we buy in exchange, and it will be bought if we are willing to trade. Until these conditions come subsidies may maintain a line so long as the subsidy lasts, and then the line will go down for want of legitimate trade. If, however, the subsidy policy is to be pursued, I venture to suggest the Mexican method. When a ship arrives with a cargo the tariff tax is divided with the ship owner, the latter taking 50 per cent. of the duty on the goods he brings in payment on account of his subsidy.

The trading ship is thus enabled to remit to the consignor, if he will employ his ship, a portion of the Government duties, and thus the ship-owner is indeed enabled to promote trade with foreign countries directly. An improvement upon the Mexican method, in the interest of the promotion of trade and of the building of ships to conduct it, would be to enable the owners and the builders to receive at the port of consignment in that country a still greater proportion of the duties imposed by the Government upon the cargo.

In this way the Mexican ship would be enabled to get her cargo, charge a fair profit for carriage, and sell to the Mexican consumer at a price at which he could conveniently buy, take out a cargo for exchange, and repeat the process, to the cultivation of much closer commercial relations with foreign countries, and to the maintenance of Mexican shipping. Of course the Mexican method is somewhat cumbersome, and the same end might be reached without indirection and without the payment of a subsidy by the removal or reduction of the Mexican tariff on imports.

While on the subject of closer commercial relations with South and Central America, for the promotion of which the bill under consideration is doubtless intended, I call your attention to some interesting figures. Our total trade with Brazil for the year ended June 30, 1887, was as follows:

Total imports	$52,955,591
Our total exports to Brazil were	8,137,794
Of the imports we imposed no tariff upon	47,076,473
We did impose a tariff upon	5,876,703

Our total trade with Central America for the same period was as follows:

Total imports	$7,706,978
Total exports	3,006,714
Of the imports we imposed no tariff upon	7,196,705
We did impose a tariff upon	441,916

Our total trade with Venezuela was as follows:

Total imports	8,444,967
Total exports	5,504,215
Of the imports we imposed no tariff upon	8,248,450
We did impose a tariff upon	12,786

Our total trade with the United States of Colombia was as follows:

Total imports	4,771,303
Total exports	7,158,235
Of the imports we imposed no tariff upon	3,934,559
We did impose a tariff upon	16,594

Our total trade with the Argentine Republic was as follows:

Total imports	4,104,102
Total exports	6,364,545
Of the imports we imposed no tariff upon	3,347,936
We imposed a tariff upon	752,256

Our total trade with Chili was as follows:

Total imports	2,863,233
Total exports	2,099,138
Of the imports we imposed no tariff upon	2,634,396
We did impose a tariff upon	228,897

These illustrate the universal rule by which the limitations upon commercial relations and the carrying trade with all the countries of Central and South America may be measured. A comparison of the amount brought into the country free of tariff with what we send in exchange is instructive. It should be noted that of the Brazilian imports free of duty the large proportion value is the item of coffee, after deducting which the lesson on exchange of trade as bearing on closer relations with all these countries is the same and the universal one.

I have the honor to be, sir, your obedient servant.

DON M. DICKINSON,
Postmaster-General.

Hon. JAMES H. BLOUNT,
Chairman of the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads, House of Representatives.

I agree with the Postmaster-General that we must take what the people we seek to trade with have got to sell if we expect them to buy from us. That is what all the leading commercial countries of the world are doing to secure trade and cargoes for their ships both ways. Does any man suppose that the world will buy from us unless we buy something from them? Is it good policy to close our markets against the world? If so, is it not good policy for them to close their markets against us? Can we sell to everybody and buy from nobody? I think not. That, however, involves, as I said, other questions which we can discuss by and by.

All I have to add now is that the Postmaster-General demonstrates that from the time we began with the Garrison subsidy, followed by the Roach subsidy, and the subsidy to the Pacific Mail, that brought so much scandal, we have built up no trade of any consequence, except in goods admitted free of duty. We can build up none by subsidies. This subsidy will not build up trade, but it will seriously embarrass existing postal regulations by giving a subsidy to a few men at the public expense, to the detriment of the public service, and to the injury of every tax-payer in the country.

All I ask is that the American people will read the facts stated and the figures furnished by the Postmaster-General. When they do the clamor of General Harrison and his platform for subsidies will not only be repudiated, but the fact will be recognized that it is simply a desperate effort to secure partisan support and money subsidy from men of wealth and power in the political campaign now being waged against the tax-paying masses for the benefit of wealthy corporations and combinations. If it was not solemnly asserted in the Republican platform and announced by General Harrison that they propose to build up the American merchant marine and foster and promote our foreign commerce, the assertion would be treated as a broad farce or a ridiculous burlesque.

Protection necessarily exhausts itself when it passes beyond our borders. The monopoly of the coastwise trade is given by Congress to American-built ships. That is perhaps the most valuable franchise

that Congress has at its disposal. All the people who have no other means of getting their products to market, or what they need from other parts of the country, are prohibited from using or employing as carriers on our coasts, lakes, and rivers, anything but an American-built ship, no matter how extortionate a price the owner of the home-built vessel may ask. Foreign-built ships may offer to do the work for one-half or one-fourth of the price the home-ship owners ask.

Congress orders that the ship and cargo shall be confiscated if the cheaper offer is accepted. That tribute binds a powerful class of beneficiaries to the protective system, because they get a good share of the plunder. But the high seas are free. Congress can not interfere with the navigation of these God-given highways of the nations, but it prohibits any American citizen from raising the flag of the United States or from claiming the protection of our laws even against pirates or robbers if he dares to send his cotton, wheat, or anything else on a ship he has purchased in a foreign country.

Congress has taxed everything that is needed in building ships so high that ships for the foreign trade can not be built here and compete with foreign-built ships. All other nations buy their ships where they can get them cheapest, yet Congress will not allow our people to buy them elsewhere and hold them as American property. While treaties are now in existence with all other nations which authorize them to trade in all our ports upon the same terms that American-built ships can, we have bound ourselves not to impose on their ships or the cargoes they carry any other or higher taxes, duties, or burdens than we impose on our own ships and cargoes.

The result is, American ships are driven from the high seas. Our flag is not seen on a single steamer that carries our goods and passengers over the Atlantic Ocean. Our ministers to all the courts of Europe are compelled to sail under foreign flags. I wonder General Harrison did not think of that when he deplored the necessity of using foreign ships to carry them to South America. We pay an annual tribute of $160,000,000 to foreigners to haul our goods and transport our passengers. We feed, clothe, and keep employed at least 100,000 sailors for England, while we are prostrated at the feet of every third-class power. Our contests hereafter will not be on the land, but on the sea. In short, the old clap-trap that protection insured preparation for war in time of peace is another of the now thoroughly exploded humbugs, though it was once as potent as the present false pretense that protection is demanded solely in the interest of American labor.

These questions have all been so elaborately argued that it is needless to repeat the exposures that have been made. The country knows that protection and restriction of home markets means destruction to our shipping interests and to foreign trade and commerce, and it has in fact destroyed them. All efforts to restore either by subsidies will only add burdens to the people to enrich the least deserving class of lobbyists, without accomplishing or tending to accomplish any of the objects so ostentatiously paraded by the Republican platform and their Presidential candidate.

The present Secretary of the Treasury, in his last annual report to the present Congress, shows the folly of our adherence to antiquated navigation laws, under the pretense of protecting home industry, after all the world has abandoned them, in the following statement:

> A citizen of the United States may buy a foreign-built vessel in a foreign port; he may put the United States flag upon it, and trade with all the countries of the world except his own. Our Government will protect him with all its power in such trade; but if he brings his ship with our flag upon it to one of our ports, our Government will confiscate it or impose prohibitory duties. He may, however, put the flag of any other country on that same ship and bring it to his home without molestation by our Government. It is then protected by the power of a foreign country. It is difficult to understand why it would not be well to so change our navigation laws as to allow foreign-built ships owned by our citizens to come and go between this and other countries while bearing the flag of the country of their owners.

In *ante bellum* days, when the principles and policy of the Democratic party prevailed, more than three-fourths of the American commerce and a large portion of the commerce of the outside world was carried in American ships, officered and manned by American citizens. At that time, under the low revenue tariff inaugurated by Mr. Polk and maintained until 1861, from 70 to 85 per cent. of our carrying trade was carried in American bottoms. We had more shipping in 1860 than all the world combined, except England, and we were rapidly passing her. Less than 10 per cent. of our merchant marine was destroyed during the civil war, although that was made an excuse for years for the falling off of our carrying trade, until it was exposed so often by Democrats and Republicans that the men who made the charge were ashamed to make it any longer. But I do not need to rely upon my own assertions or those of any other Democrat to prove to what a deplorable condition our commerce and merchant marine have been brought by the Republican protective system.

On the 8th day of February, 1884, page 975 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, when Senator FRYE reported a bill from the Committee on Commerce to remove certain burdens on the American merchant marine and to encourage the foreign carrying trade, he opened his speech by saying:

> The first section of the bill touches the provision relating to officers of American ships. The law as it stands to-day requires that all officers of vessels of the United States shall be citizens of the United States, and provides a very heavy penalty of 50 cents a ton on a vessel for a violation of this law. It was a good law when it was enacted, when nearly all the sailors on board the ships were American sailors and many of them fit to be made officers; but to-day, when 95 per cent. of the sailors are foreigners, it is not a good law and works a great injustice very frequently. The bill reported by me provides that under certain circumstances the officers, other than the captain, may be foreign rather than American citizens.

On the 8th day of January, 1884, page 311 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Senator FRYE, in a discussion with Senator VEST, of Missouri, in regard to the time when the American tonnage engaged in the foreign trade was largest, said:

> I trust the Senator and I will both go into the subject. I stand by my statement that in 1861 the American tonnage in foreign commerce was larger than it was at any other period.
>
> Mr. VEST. The Senator is mistaken; it had begun to decline before that.
>
> Mr. FRYE. I stand by my statement. I said to-day Great Britain carried 85 per cent. of our exports and imports, and we carry but 15 per cent. ourselves.
>
> Mr. VEST. Does the Senator say that is Great Britain's proportion?
>
> Mr. FRYE. Eighty-five per cent. is carried in foreign ships. The gentleman must not be so hypercritical. I mean that in foreign ships 85 per cent. of our commerce is carried and our own ships 15 per cent. and a fraction. Now, from 1861—and I still adhere to that—down to the very moment I am talking, the course of the merchant marine of the United States has been the lobster's—backward—until it is down to 15 per cent. of our own exports and imports in the carrying trade.
>
> Why, Mr. President, if this is permitted to go on, in two or three years more, with the same decrease, there will be no American ships carrying our exports or bringing our imports. It will all be done in foreign bottoms.

During the debate on the fisheries treaty a few weeks ago the Senator from Massachusetts, Mr. HOAR, read a letter from Admiral Porter, of the United States Navy, which, while it was an exaggeration in some regards and a wanton insult to all men of Scandinavian nationality, still exhibited the condition to which our Navy and merchant marine are now reduced by the policy which the Republican party seeks to perpetuate. While Judge HOAR afterwards denied being responsible for the letter, he commended Admiral Porter and his statements as being worthy of the highest consideration.

> OFFICE OF THE ADMIRAL, *Washington, D. C., May 4*, 1888.
>
> MY DEAR SIR: I have the honor to acknowledge the receipt of your communication of May 4, asking my opinion of the value of our fisheries as a nursery for seamen for the present Navy, which is to be built of iron and propelled by steam.
>
> I beg leave to say that all our fisheries at the present moment are more valuable as nurseries for naval seamen than they ever were before, for our commercial marine has been almost obliterated from the ocean.
>
> In our last war with Great Britain our Navy was largely recruited from Massachusetts fishermen, who made the finest men-o'-war's men in the world, which was illustrated by their skill in seamanship and gunnery, which gave us such great success over our opponents.
>
> They not only furnished seamen to the Navy, but manned that immense fleet of privateers that swarmed the ocean, paralyzed the British commerce, and caused a large section of the British people, led by that great political writer, William Cobbett, to demand of the Government that peace should be secured on any terms.
>
> Notwithstanding the overwhelming naval power of Great Britain during the war, with heavy squadrons in every sea, we were indebted to the New England seamen and the brave officers who led them for a success unparalleled in history.
>
> If we had a war to-morrow we must depend almost altogether upon the fishermen of New England to man our naval vessels.

To show the importance of having trained seamen in time of war, I will mention the fact that the regiment of Marblehead fishermen under John Glover were employed to carry Washington's forces across the Delaware when he surprised and captured the Hessians. Without the aid of the fishermen it is doubtful if Washington would have undertaken the perilous enterprise, for the fishermen were the only ones who considered the project feasible.

The ships that will hereafter be built for the Navy will require as good and hardy sailors as have ever been required before, and it is to be regretted that we can not obtain the services of the fishermen in time of peace. Their present calling is more lucrative than any employment they can obtain in the Navy, and there are no sufficient inducements held out to them to enlist in the Government service.

In time of war with a maritime power the occupation of these fishermen would be gone, and they would flock to enlist in the Navy, as they did in the civil war, when the Confederate privateers made their appearance off our coast. The vessels of our Navy may be said at the present time to be manned almost entirely by foreigners, who have entered the service not from devotion to the flag. In case war should be suddenly declared against us, our ships abroad would be obliged to return home, discharge their crews, and ship American seamen. In a late inspection of the United States ship Trenton the board of inspectors reported to me as follows: "The crew is a fair one, considering their want of knowledge of the English language"—a pretty severe commentary on the class of seamen we enlist in the Navy.

It is very desirable that we should adopt some system by which we could obtain enough bona fide American seamen to leaven the crowd of foreigners now on board a United States vessel of war. The crews of our ships of war are generally made up of men from all parts of the world, largely from the Scandinavian race, who do not care what flag they serve under. There are the descendants of the Huns, Goths, and other barbarians who once overran Europe. They enlist in our Navy softened in character, but still free lances as of old. They serve for money, with no sentiment for flag or nationality, and, possibly, if it came to an action with a ship of their own or a neighboring nation, they would haul down the American flag and hoist that of their own country.

The same qualities required for the seamen of fifty years ago are required for the seamen of vessels of war to-day. The better the seaman the more easily he will learn the improvements in gunnery and seamanship, and the best seamen in the world are those who come from the New England fisheries. They are the strongest, hardiest class of men I know of. They are exposed to all weathers and bear the severest tempests. They are seamen all over, and I will merely add that in 1812 the old Constitution, whose career is familiar to every American, was manned almost altogether by Massachusetts fishermen.

As to any extra science being required to man our present and projected ships of war, I would remark that the management of a ship is easier than it used to

be, but we require the same good seamanship we had in days gone by. With a steam-capstan and steam-winch twenty men can get a large vessel under way. An officer on deck, a man at the wheel, and one at the lead, with the above number on deck for general purposes, and the ship can go to sea with the rest of the crew in their hammocks. But when the machinery is disabled and the ship must rely on her ponderous yards and sails, we want every man to understand English and be a seaman from the crown of his head to the sole of his foot.

The modern guns, it is true, are larger than of old; the machinery to work them is a little more intricate; but a week's good drilling would teach native-born seamen all that is essential, and a ship of war at the end of that period would be ready for inspection by the board of inspection. When the board of inspection finish their examination of a ship she must go to sea ready to meet any enemy of equal force, so that what happened previous to 1812, when the Chesapeake was disgraced by the British ship Leopard, can never again occur as long as the board of inspection exists.

If we can in a week drill a mongrel crew so that every man knows his various stations on shipboard, how much easier would it be for us to do the same thing with a crew of New England fishermen, hardy and active in their persons and intelligent beyond any set of foreign seamen.

The question of protection to the New England fisheries and their seamen does not admit of argument, and in my zeal on the subject I may have gone out of my way to prove to you that which you know already.

I inclose you some statistics which, if you have not already got them, will give you the status of our fisheries throughout the United States.

If there is anything bearing on this subject you would like me to hunt up, please let me know, and I will endeavor to obtain it.

The statistics I inclose show at a glance the immense money value of our fisheries and their importance to the country. If it had not been for the fisheries, New England would never have been settled, for on the first landing on those stormy shores it is likely the emigrants would have been forced to go elsewhere but for the quantities of fish, a most fortunate circumstance for the Union, to which New England has added so many true and loyal States.

I have the honor to be, very respectfully, your obedient servant,

DAVID D. PORTER, *Admiral.*

Hon. GEORGE F. HOAR,
United States Senate.

Men profess to wonder how England retains half the trade of the world in open, unprotected markets, while she pays her operatives more than double the wages paid by many of her competitors on the continent of Europe. The reason is obvious. She has better machinery and more skillful and intelligent labor. They produce more in proportion to the wages paid, and they produce on such an enormous scale to supply a world-wide market that they are employed all the year round. The cheapest raw material that can be found anywhere on the face of the earth is supplied untaxed to the manufacturers of England, and not a dollar of tax is levied to support the Government on anything needed for the comfort of a laboring man and his family except a small tax on tea and coffee. England once pursued relentlessly the restrictive policy we now adhere to till widespread ruin and starvation forced her reluctantly to reverse it.

The history of England while she clung to protection is too well known to need repetition. Squalid poverty was rampant over the land; labor was not only unrequited but unemployed; corn laws and other onerous burdens imposed for the protection of the landed aristocracy were enforced to secure home markets at high home prices as remorsely as the Republican party now propose to restrict and protect our home market in the interest of the combined manufacturers and their machinery. This policy brought starvation to the doors of all the workingmen of that country.

Bread riots and combinations of desperate, starving men, who threatened the overthrow of the government itself, forced Sir Robert Peel and his ministry to repeal the most odious and oppressive of the protective and restrictive laws which had so long enriched the English protected nobility and made paupers and serfs of the laboring masses. Hon. Edward Atkinson, of Boston, stated the situation forcibly in a very able article in the Fortnightly Review a few years ago. He said, after showing how prosperous England is now under her system of unrestricted trade compared to her condition under her protective-tariff system:

A very erroneous idea prevails to some extent in the United States as to the motive of these reforms; and it is often asserted that they were begun when great prosperity had been achieved by the system of tariff taxation that preceded them. How utterly at variance with the facts this view is has been overlooked even by many in England. The true state of the case has been recorded in these words: "It is impossible to convey by mere statistics of our exports any adequate picture of the condition of the nation when Sir Robert Peel took office in 1841. Every interest in the country was alike depressed. In the manufacturing districts mills and workshops were closed, and property daily depreciated in value; in the seaports shipping was laid up useless in harbor; agricultural laborers were eking out a miserable existence upon starvation wages and parochial relief; the revenue was insufficient to meet the national expenditure; the country was brought to the verge of national and universal bankruptcy. The protective system, which was supported with the view of rendering the country independent of foreign sources of supply, and thus, it was hoped, fostering the growth of a home trade, had most effectually destroyed that trade by reducing the entire population to beggary, destitution, and want. The masses of the population were unable to procure food, and had consequently nothing to spend on British manufactures."—*Noble's Fiscal Legislation of Great Britain.*

There is perhaps no man in England who takes a deeper interest in the welfare of the working classes than Hon. John Bright, and no man is better qualified to present the facts in regard to the effect produced by the change of policy from restricted to unrestricted trade, or, if you please, from protection to free trade in that country than Mr. Bright. A banquet was given to him at Rockdale, November 18, 1881, his seventieth birthday, at which he made a speech to the workingmen who had lived as he had under both conditions, in which, among other things, he said:

Now, touching upon this question, one is obliged to refer to a very curious fact that after so many years of experience there are some men who are disposed to call in question the policy of 1846; that is, that there are men of whom you never heard before, and if you would look down the record of all their political life, you would not find a single thing that they have done, and yet they call in question the policy of such men as Sir Robert Peel of 1846 [cheers], and Mr. Gladstone in the succeeding years [loud cheers], and of my lamented friend, Mr. Cobden [cheers], whose services every one acquainted with the recent history of this country must acknowledge. And yet these men—what I should call rather a feeble-minded class of men [laughter]—call in question all this policy, and they have the courage to believe, or the simple-mindedness to believe, that the great body of the people of this country, and especially of the working classes, are not in any degree cognizant of the enormous advantages which the new policy of 1846 has given to the country. [Cheers.]

Mr. Bright, after referring to the original opposition of Mr. Disraeli, and stating the facts in regard to the increase of wages since 1840, under the auspices of free trade, said:

There, according to his statement, was an actual doubling of the wages of the laborers in Lord Beaconsfield's own county of Buckingham. Perhaps some of you may recollect a letter which was published almost immediately after Lord Beaconsfield's death, which he wrote to a gentleman who had sent him a book about the condition of the population in the southwestern counties of England, and Lord Beaconsfield said he thought he underrated the improvement in the condition of farm laborers; that, according to his opinion, the rise in the wages of the farm laborers had been at least 40 per cent.; that is 10*s.* of wages per week had risen to 14*s.* per week.

I believe, indeed, that in many parts of the country the wages of farm laborers, taking into account the hours which they work and all particulars, are doubled since the free-trade policy was established. [Hear! Hear!] Now, take the other class of men. I walked down from the Reform Club through the park to the House of Commons one day in the past summer, three or four months ago, and a man—an intelligent, respectable-looking workingman—joined me and addressed me by name. I asked him how he knew me. He knew me because, he said, "I have been a good deal in Birmingham, and have attended your meetings there, and so I know you very well." [Laughter and cheers.] I talked to him a little about his business. He said he was then getting 7*s.* 6*d.* a day as a bricksetter, and he added, "Formerly I used to work for 4*s.* a day." There is a jump. From 4*s.* to 7*s.* 6*d.* is a considerable leap.

ADVANCE OF WAGES IN THE COTTON TRADE.

Now I should like to tell you of something that has happened nearer home, for I suspect there are many persons in this meeting who have not the least idea of the actual increase of wages that has taken place among the factory operatives in this neighborhood during the last forty years. I was looking the other day at one of our wages books for 1840 and 1841. I will tell you what I found in it and what I find in our wages book now. The figures are taken over an average of two months at that time and over an average of two months now, and therefore are a fair statement of what happened then and what happens to-day. Many persons here know, of course, all about the interior of a cotton factory, and therefore I shall speak as if we were in a mill and looking over the different people at work. I find that in 1839 the throstle-piecers—I need not explain who they are—were receiving 8*s.* a week and they were working twelve hours a day.

I find that now the same class of hands are receiving 13*s.* a week at ten hours a day. If they worked for twelve hours, and were paid at the same rate, it would be 16*s.* a week, or exactly double what they received in 1839, 1840, and 1841. [Cheers.] The young women who worked at the drawing frames at that time had 7*s.* 6*d.* a week; they have now 15*s.*, and that is without reckoning the fact that they are working two hours a day less. The rovers and slubbers got 8*s.* a week then, and they are getting 14*s.* a week now. The doffers [laughter] are considered a class whose wits are a little too sharp [laughter], and are sometimes not very manageable. They used to have 5*s.* 6*d.* a week, and they now have 9*s.* 6*d.*

The warpers in those days, as far as my recollection serves me—I am speaking of my own business—were all women. They earned on the average of the two months 17*s.* 6*d.* a week. The warpers now are all men, and they have earned in the two months an average of 35*s.* 6*d.* a week. [Cheers.] Well, at that time we had a very clever man as blacksmith, whom I used to like to see strike the sparks off; his wages were 22*s.* a week. Well, our blacksmith now has wages of 34*s.* a week, and that only for factory time, which is ten hours, whereas the man of 22*s.* a week worked the then factory time, which was twelve hours. Now you see the enormous change to the people in these factories. They have two hours' leisure which they had not before, and their wages are nearly double.

* * * * * * *

I think it is impossible to account for this extraordinary improvement in the wages of agricultural laborers, of brick-setters and carpenters, and all your factory operatives, and all your mechanics, upon any other theory than this, that the new policy with regard to trade, which has made your trade fourfold, has been the cause which has made this stupendous and unimagined improvement in the condition of the people. [Cheers.]

Mr. Bright could hardly have falsified the facts in the presence of these men. Again, Mr. Bright said, referring to the croakers who predicted ruin to England by free trade, and the prediction that their only hope was to leave their country:

Well, you did not go abroad, but you staid at home. The law was altered so that the bread could come here, and a great many things besides bread. Trade has extended and you have added, in Great Britain alone, more than 10,000,000 to your population in forty years.

* * * * * * *

And yet, with all that increase of population, you have had the demand for labor more steady, employment better paid, the time of labor shorter. The man must be absolutely blind or worse than blind who can not see and will not acknowledge that the great mass of the people, in physical condition, are enormously better off than they were forty years ago.

Again, Mr. Bright said, and that is all I care to quote:

What are the exports now? Instead of being £51,000,000, they amount to close upon, if not quite £200,000,000, so that the foreign trade of the county has increased fourfold within that time, and as a matter of course the home trade must have immensely increased at the same time, because so great an increase of foreign trade has brought so great wealth to the country that the home trade has increased probably in quite as great proportion as the foreign trade.

FREE TRADE A BOON GREATEST TO WORKINGMEN.

But there is another point, which is one of extraordinary interest, and it shows, I think, that no class in this country suffered so much by the ancient policy of protection as the working class, and that no other class in this country has gained so much as they have gained during the last forty years by the adoption of the new policy. [Cheers.]

The facts stated by Mr. Bright are conclusive on this question at least, and that is the main one, that the difference between wages in England and the United States is nothing like as great now as it was

forty years ago. Therefore American manufacturers do not need as much protection now to compensate them for the higher wages they pay as they did then, while they are demanding more than twice as much.

When Hon. James G. Blaine was Secretary of State, a few years ago, he made a very able report to Congress in regard to wages in this country and in Europe. He caused the consuls of the United States, all of them Republicans, to examine into the wages of operatives in the leading manufacturing cities of Great Britain and the continent. Consul Shaw made an elaborate report as to the wages of operatives in the cotton mills of Manchester, from all of which information the Secretary made a very valuable report to Congress, giving the American and European wages paid for similar work, in which he completely refutes all the hired slanderers of the present campaign of the Protective Tariff League in regard to the starvation wages paid to English workmen, and fully corroborates all that Mr. Bright said. His report ought to be read in answer to his own partisan political speeches now. On pages 98 and 99 of his official report he says:

Owing to the different arrangements of the English and American tables of wages, it is difficult to give comparative analysis thereof which would show at a glance the difference in the wages of the operatives of both countries.

The wages of spinners and weavers in Lancashire and in Massachusetts, according to the foregoing statements, were as follows, per week:

Spinners: English, $7.20 to $8.40 (master spinners running as high as $12); American, $7.07 to $10.30.

Weavers: English, $3.84 to $8.64, subject at the date on which these rates were given to a reduction of 10 per cent.; American, $4.82 to $8.73.

The average wages of employés in the Massachusetts mills is as follows, according to the official returns: Men, $8.30; women, $5.62; male children, $3.11; female children, $3.08. According to Consul Shaw's report, the average wages of the men employed in the Lancashire mills on the 1st of January, 1880, was about $8 per week, subject to a reduction of 10 per cent.; women, from $3.40 to $4.30, subject to a reduction of 10 per cent.

The hours of labor in the Lancashire mills are 56; in the Massachusetts mills, 60 per week. The hours of labor in the mills in the other New England States, where the wages are generally less than in Massachusetts, are usually 66 to 69 per week.

Undoubtedly the inequalities in the wages of English and American operatives are more than equalized by the greater efficiency of the latter and their longer hours of labor. If this should prove to be a fact in practice, as it seems to be proven from official statistics, it would be a very important element in the establishment of our ability to compete with England for our share of the cotton-goods trade of the world.

In the two prime factors which may be said to form the basis of the cotton manufacturing industry, namely, raw material and labor, we hold the advantage over England in the first, and stand upon an equality with her in the second.

Having the raw material at our doors, it follows that we should be able to convert it into manufactures, all things else being equal, with more economy and facility than can be done by England, which imports our cotton and then manufactures it in her mills. The expense of handling, transportation, and commission must be an important item in this regard as compared with our turning in the fiber from the cotton-fields to our mills and shipping it in the advanced form of manufactured goods. Add to this the secondary fact that it costs us no more to handle and manufacture the same than it costs in England, and we stand on an undoubted equality thus far in the race of competition.

In the face of official facts like these from as distinguished a partisan leader as Hon. James G. Blaine, and of the conceded fact that England pays 50 per cent. more to her workmen than most of the European continental nations, and yet controls more of the world's trade than all other nations combined, it is evident that the clamor that protection controls or increases the rate of wages paid is false. It is the proportion of goods produced to the human labor employed that settles the question of what wages the employer can afford to pay, and Secretary Evarts proved as well as asserted that the average American workman produced double what was produced by the average European workman, as has been already shown by his report.

It is absurd to talk about a people as being paupers who control in free competition more than half the trade and commerce of the world; and it is equally absurd to insist that protection and restriction which produced nothing but pauperism while maintained in England in the interests of their aristocracy will either develop trade or commerce between us and other countries, or add to the wages or comforts of our laborers in any broad sense, so long as we maintain it alone in the interest of the machinery owned by the manufacturers of this country, to the destruction of all other interests and industries.

If anything else is needed to show the value of trade and commerce to a people, the official statistics of England's progress prove it. They show that while her population has increased from 26,500,000 in 1841 to 35,000,000 in 1881, the able-bodied paupers who had to be supported by taxation in England and Wales decreased from 201,000 in 1849 to 111,000 in 1880, and the number of criminal convictions from 34,000 in 1840 to 15,600 in 1881. The taxable incomes of her people, excluding Ireland, increased from £251,000,000 in 1842 to £582,000,000 in 1880, an increase of 130 per cent., while her population increased only 33. The value of her annual exports was swollen from £51,000,000 in 1840 to £223,000,000 in 1880, an increase of 450 per cent.; while the annual savings of the working classes, leaving out of account the increased comfort and advantages afforded by cheap food and materials, are estimated to have increased from £24,500,000 in 1840 to £76,500,000 in 1880.

Mr. Gladstone, who is recognized by all men everywhere as an intelligent, far-seeing statesman, made a speech at Leeds, a few years ago, in which he contrasted our trade under protection in the neutral markets of the world with that of England, now and at the periods when our tariff was at the lowest and their protection was the highest and the most prohibitory. He said:

As for America and her system of protection, he pointed out that in those countries or markets where they met on comparatively equal footing the exports from America amounted to only £4,751,000, while those from the United Kingdom to the same quarter amounted to £78,140,000. "America," said Mr. Gladstone, "is a young country, with enormous vigor and enormous internal resources. She has committed—I say it, I hope, not with disrespect—I say it with strong and cordial sympathy, but with much regret—she is committing errors of which we set her an example. But from the enormous resources of her home market, the development of which internally is not touched by protection, she is able to commit those errors with less fatal consequences upon her people than we experienced when we committed them; and the enormous development of American resources within casts almost entirely into the shade the puny character of the exports of her manufactures to the neutral markets of the world."

He similarly contrasted the trade of Germany, France, Russia, and Holland, and proved that they as well were entirely thrown into the shade by the maligned free trade of Britain. Not only so, he pointed out that in 1842 America controlled four-fifths of her shipping trade with Britain, while now, in 1881, the scales were exactly reversed, and Britain did four-fifths of the business, and that the best, and America only picked up their leavings.

The statesmen of England who broke down the long-cherished protective policy of that country met with an opposition as determined as the monopolists of this country now present to any attempt to curtail or diminish their privileges, and on the same grounds. Joint debates were had before the people. There Mr. Cobden, Mr. Bright, and their adherents laid down the following proposition:

That in the opinion of this meeting the corn laws and every other law which protects one class at the expense of other classes must prove injurious to the national prosperity, and therefore all monopolies, whether passed under the pretext of benefiting the agricultural, colonial, or manufacturing interests, ought to be immediately abolished.

They were met by the advocates of the landed aristocracy and other protected interests with the following counter-proposition, which every protectionist in America repeats to-day as an answer to all propositions for relief:

That protection to native industry, particularly to the agriculture of the country, is essential to the well-being of the state, and any attempt, however plausible, to abolish that protection and further depreciate the productions of our own soil will only end in the spread of inevitable ruin throughout the rural districts, and ultimately deprive the manufacturers of their best and surest customers.

In this country, to-day, the protected combinations are struggling for the maintenance of their right to rob, through Congressional subsidies, all the consumers of this country as earnestly as the landed aristocracy of England struggled to maintain the right to force the mass of the people to pay double price for their products, and they base their demands on the same patriotic pretenses.

No higher evidence of the prosperity brought to a country by unrestricted trade and the reflected benefits derived by other countries from its enlarged commerce can be furnished than is exhibited by our own official reports of our exports and imports to and from foreign countries. So long as England maintained her high protective-tariff system her purchases from us outside of cotton amounted to comparatively nothing. Last year our total exports were, in round numbers, $703,000,000, of which England and her possessions bought $424,000,000, and all the balance of the world took only $279,000,000. Our imports from the British possessions were $244,000,000, so that they bought from us $180,000,000 more than we bought from them. Our imports from Great Britain proper were less than 13 per cent. of their exports, while they took over 50 per cent. of ours.

If protection to home markets is to be the international policy hereafter, and that is the demand now made by the Republican party, its ruinous effect upon all American industries outside of those protected or licensed by Congress to rob our own people must be apparent to all thinking men. Surely England with more than half of the world's trade and commerce in her hands, and with all the other nations of the world to trade with, can get clear of the 13 per cent. of her exports that we now take much easier than we can get rid of the 60 per cent. of our exports, nearly all of them the product of unprotected agricultural industry, which her people take, even if we give her no credit for buying our beef and pork and giving it character and standing in foreign markets as being sound and wholesome, when the leading continental nations of Europe are prohibiting its sale to their people on the ground that it is diseased and unfit for use.

Turning from these general questions, even if I have to be guilty of repetition, to a more careful examination of the effect of restricted markets on labor, it is hard to speak in respectful terms of the false pretenses by which the protected monopolists seek to delude the people.

I have read about Pharisees, hypocrites, and wolves in sheep's clothing, but history shows no such instance of unblushing and shameless effrontery as the Republican platform proposes. The proposition which the protected organizations make to the laboringmen of America, indeed to all the people, stripped of its varnish is, If you will enable us to exclude competition from abroad, give us control of the American market for home-made goods, and enable us to sell what we manufacture at our own prices, which we through trusts and combinations know how to maintain at satisfactory rates, by limiting production through

closed doors and strikes to the wants of the home market, we will agree that you shall have all the whisky, beer, and tobacco you want at the cheapest rates, free from all taxation.

The insincerity of the assumption that the Republican leaders propose to restrict the sales of manufactured goods to those they produce in the interest of American workmen, is intensified tenfold by the fact shown by the record, that they struggled for years to flood the country with the most degraded character of Chinese labor, and as soon as the war tariff gave them a monopoly of production on their own terms they passed laws which they maintained and enforced for over twenty years, authorizing the importation, free of duty, under contracts to be enforced by penalties and liens upon property acquired, the cheapest and most depraved class of pauper labor from all parts of the earth, in order to force American workmen under pressure from such competition to accept the lowest wages they could force them down to by this competition, or be driven out of their protected establishments. Yet they pose to-day before the country as the special champions of American labor.

Do they propose to secure or guaranty to the American laborers they employ, out of the bounty, subsidy, or protection they demand, that Congress shall force the tax-payers to give them either steady work or higher wages than they can get any foreign pauper imported, duty free, to do it for? Will this legislation they demand secure to American workmen any rights which they are bound to respect. Of course not.

They protest against his right to buy anything required for the comfort or want of himself and his family as cheaply as other people obtain them, because it would diminish their profits. They will cheerfully consent to let him have free cheap whisky and tobacco, because all the tax collected from them goes into the Treasury, which they regard as an outrage on them; and they thank God that they are too virtuous and patriotic to deal in such products, except in their "pluck-me stores," where most of their laborer's wages are swallowed up. They parade their contempt for cheap goods for workmen on all occasions.

The political biographers of General Harrison quote with pride and satisfaction the profound statesmanship and intense interest exhibited by him for the working classes, when he announced in what they call his great speech in March last:

> I am one of those uninstructed political economists that have an impression that some things may be too cheap, that I can not find myself in full sympathy with this demand for cheaper coats, which seems to me necessarily to involve a cheaper man and woman under the coat.

If that means anything it means that the man who gets a coat for 10 bushels of wheat, or the woman who gets a dress for 50 pounds of butter, is a cheap man or woman; while they would be highly respectable, in General Harrison's estimation, if they had paid 20 bushels of wheat and 100 pounds of butter for the same coat and dress to some protected pet of Congress, to whom they are compelled by law to pay double what the people to whom they are obliged to sell their wheat and butter offered them the same things for.

Machinery is, day by day, supplanting human factory labor. It neither eats, drinks, nor wears any product of human industry except coal, and needs no protection against any other like machine anywhere. As the proportion of machine work increases and human work decreases, the proportion of increase of price which protection gives goes in a like or greater ratio into the pockets of the machine-owners. The machine is the laborer in whose behalf the organized bands that fill our lobbies are so clamorous in their demand for protection. Of course, as the owners of the machinery control the work of both hands and machines, when demand for products is slack or the supply exceeds it, the owner drops the human labor first, as far as possible, and limits products, if he produces at all, to what the machines, aided by the least amount of human labor, can do, so that all, or the lion's share, of the high price which protection secures may be retained by him.

It will be a striking evidence of the power of employers over their workingmen, or of the credulity, not to say ignorance, of that class of men, if the organized lobbyists succeed in making them believe that their welfare, or the desire to keep up their wages, enters into the contest now being waged. The contract-labor laws under which they imported pauper labor during all the years they controlled the Government; the struggles made by their leaders, General Harrison included, to flood the country with Chinese, sending the money to China and importing ten thousand of them at a time, as the managers of the Central Pacific Railroad did, give the lie to all their professions of sympathy with high-priced American labor.

The records of the country show that while they require all the people to pay them 47 per cent. more for their goods than they could be bought for in the markets where cotton, wheat, and all other farm products have to be sold, they require Congress to maintain and enforce laws enabling them to import the cheapest and most degraded foreign labor, duty free, to run the machinery, and thus drive out the American workmen, or reduce their wages to starvation rates, and they do it all under the guise of philanthropy and patriotism, and in the name of the Lord.

The time has come when even the colored men who labor from January till December in the cotton fields owe it to themselves to ask General Harrison and his supporters what justice is there in forcing them to pay to a few American manufacturers 47 per cent. more for the clothes they wear and the things they must have than they were offered the same things for in the foreign markets in which they are compelled to sell the cotton they labored so hard to raise and prepare for market. The farmers of the North and West may well ask the same questions.

They know that they only receive for their products so much of the foreign open market prices as remains after deducting therefrom all costs of transportation, insurance, commission, interest, and the buyer's profit; and after all that they are to be forced for all time to come to pay $147 to home manufacturers for the same things they were offered at $100 where their products were sold, their only consolation being that the American home market is protected and a few hundred pets of Congress are made millionaires at their expense, and are thus enabled to contribute liberally to Republican campaign funds and literature, to buy the votes of all who are purchasable, and corrupt all who are corruptible, and through a venal hired press deceive the ignorant and denounce as enemies of their country all who oppose their schemes of plunder.

The machinery of the capitalist is the only laborer that is really protected. It has secured to its owners, by the aid of Congress, the colossal fortunes so many of them have built up. The free pauper labor of the world, which regulates the wages paid to the human labor employed here, on the universal principle of supply and demand, does not and can not compete with or diminish the profits Congress gives as a subsidy to protected machinery. The Republican party have for a long time secured the lion's share of the home market to the machine-owners.

They propose now, under the false pretense of protecting American human labor, to give them the absolute power to plunder the American consumers of the products of their machines to any extent they please by imposing stronger prohibition than ever against their right to buy elsewhere; yet they have the audacity to appeal to the laboring men of the country to help them to do it, while they openly threaten to cut down the wages of all their employés, and thus retain the protection to their own machine-work as high as it is now if the representatives of the people dare to curtail their present extortions. They have hundreds of millions at stake, and they will spend their money freely to win it.

The American Protective Tariff League boasted some months ago of having $100,000 on hand for "educational organizations," and Mr. Foster's "fat-frying" process will doubtless produce ample corruption funds, while some campaign secretary may again enlighten the country by publishing the correspondence of distinguished aspirants for Cabinet positions or foreign missions as to the amounts they agree to pay for public offices. Fortunately the great mass of the American people are not for sale, and neither Mr. Carnegie nor any of the subsidized band can either buy, delude, or frighten them. With the markets for protected products restricted to home consumption the employé whose daily bread is earned by his daily labor is at the mercy of his employer.

Trusts and combinations regulate production as well as prices. Shops, foundries, and factories may be, and often are, closed for months or worked on half time, and the owners make money while they are closed by the enhanced price of the product as the supply diminishes. The laborer gets no part of it. He is the victim of enforced idleness. The wages he earned while at work are consumed while he is idle. The protection of 47 per cent. only protects the goods. Every laboring man would rather contract for steady work all the year at $2 a day which he was assured of than take the chance of getting $3 a day while at work, with the risk of idleness or half work half the time.

If, added to steady work, he could buy all he needed for himself and family each day for a dollar and the same things now cost him a dollar and a half, he surely would be better off. While all these questions have been argued with great ability both in and out of Congress, and will doubtless be presented with much elaboration all over the country, no one has presented the false pretenses of the protected classes with more power, or shown more clearly by official statements the small proportion that labor bears to the value of protected manufactured products, than the distinguished Senator from Texas [Mr. COKE] in a speech made during the present session, from which I take the liberty to quote as follows:

> Of the 17,392,099 of our people engaged in all kinds of industry, only 2,623,089 are employed "in such manufacturing industries as are claimed to be benefited by a high tariff." The farmers, persons employed in professional and personal service, domestic servants and laborers, merchants and tradesmen, carpenters and joiners, masons and bricklayers, blacksmiths, tailors, butchers, bakers, plasterers, milliners, and people engaged in railroading, and other forms of transportation, and in other miscellaneous occupations, numbering altogether 14,769,010, the people who perform six-sevenths of the labor done in this country, are thoroughly skinned and fleeced under the operation of the tariff. They are taxed in everything they eat, drink, and wear; in everything that enters into the construction of their houses; in their furniture; in their tools and implements; in everything they handle or touch while living, and in their coffins and grave clothes after their death, they, American laboring people, not engaged in any protected industry and not benefited by the tariff, are thus taxed in all they consume in the name of protection to American labor.
>
> Six-sevenths of our American laborers, groaning and staggering under the burdens of a war tariff which enriches others but impoverishes them, after the war has been over for nearly twenty-five years, are solemnly informed that they must continue to bear the burden for the sake and good of American labor. The axioms of good government, which among other things demand such measures of policy as shall produce the greatest good for the greatest number,

have been reversed in the tariff legislation, which taxes oppressively the great mass of the people in order that a few may become inordinately rich, and all is done in the name and is alleged to be for the benefit of the American workingman, who in fact suffers more than all others from it, while his employers, the lords of the loom and of the foundries and furnaces, have become the richest people in America.

These self-constituted guardians of the laboring man, who have become so sleek and fat, while their wards, the laboring men, are thin and lean, the advocates of a high tariff from pure charity to the American workingman, as they would have us believe, inform the country that the sole purpose for which they desire a highly protective tariff is that they may be reimbursed the difference between the high wages paid American workingmen and the low wages paid European operatives. This, they say, is all they ask or desire. With the difference between American and European wages placed in the shape of a tariff tax on foreign goods brought into our markets, high protectionists tell us they have no fear of the competition of the foreign goods with their domestic products.

Always and every time their argument centers in and is based wholly on the interests of the workingman. Capital desires nothing and receives nothing through the tariff, and the workingman gets all, says the protection st. In order to show the utter falsity and groundlessness of this claim, I read a tabulated statement furnished me from the Bureau of Statistics, which throws a flood of light on this subject, as follows:

Table of specified manufactures, showing amount of capital, value of materials, amount of wages, and value of product, with the per cent. of material and wages, also the average ad valorem rate of duty on similar importations for the fiscal year 1887.

[Compiled from the United States census of 1880.]

Manufactures.	Capital.	Value of materials.	Total amount paid in wages during the year.	Value of products.	Per cent. of—		Ad valorem rate of duty on imports, 1887.
					Materials.	Wages.	
							Per ct.
Cotton manufactures	$219,504,794	$113,765,537	$45,514,419	$210,950,383	53.93	21.62	40.17
Cotton manufactures (specific)	208,280,346	102,206,347	42,040,510	192,090,110	53.21	21.88	*45.49
Glass	19,844,699	8,028,621	9,144,100	21,154,571	37.95	47.95	59.14
Iron and steel manufactures	230,971,884	191,271,150	55,476,785	296,557,685	64.50	18.77	40.92
Hosiery and knit goods	15,579,591	15,210,591	6,701,475	29,167,227	52.15	22.97	†62.80 ‡39.37
Silk and silk goods	19,125,300	22,467,701	9,146,705	40,033,045	56.12	22.84	50.00
Woolen goods	96,026,564	100,845,611	25,836,392	160,606,721	62.79	16.08	67.21
Worsted goods	20,374,043	23,012,628	5,683,027	33,549,942	68.59	16.94	
Mixed textiles	37,996,007	37,227,741	13,316,753	66,221,703	56.22	20.11	§54.20
Woolen and worsted goods	116,469,607	123,858,239	31,519,419	194,156,663	63.79	16.23	67.21
Woolen goods and mixed materials	134,091,621	138,073,352	36,153,145	226,828,424	60.87	17.27	§60.70
Woolen goods, mixed materials, and worsted goods	154,465,664	161,085,980	44,936,172	266,378,366	60.47	16.87	§61.31

*Cotton cloths. †Woolen hosiery. ‡Cotton hosiery. §Estimated.

TREASURY DEPARTMENT, BUREAU OF STATISTICS, *January* 25, 1888.

WM. F. SWITZLER, *Chief of Bureau.*

HON. RICHARD COKE,
United States Senate, Washington City, D. C.

It required either unparalleled impudence or profound contempt for the intelligence of the people, or a combination of both, for the Republicans to declare in their platform that the Mills bill is a free-trade scheme; that its promoters seek to serve the interests of Europe, while they propose to support the interests of America by maintaining uncompromisingly a high protective tariff still further restricting the importations of such necessaries of life as can be produced here at any price, and to get rid of the surplus revenue by an entire repeal of the taxes on whisky and tobacco rather than surrender any part of the protective system.

They know, and fortunately the people know, that every dollar of the tax collected on whisky, beer, and tobacco, less 3.20 per cent., the cost of collection, is paid into the Treasury of the United States; that every dollar of the $120,000,000 so collected is needed and used to pay pensions and interest on the war debt, and will be so needed for many years to come. Therefore, as all the ordinary expenses of the Government must be provided for by tariff taxation, and the Democratic party proposes so to provide for them in the Mills bill, it follows that the epithets so wantonly and foolishly applied, of free-traders and enemies of American interests, only prove the reckless disregard for truth and decency of the men who apply them.

Free trade would produce no revenue from imported goods any more than protection which prohibits imports in order to secure the home market to home producers would; but free trade is not legislative robbery. It would let home consumers buy out of their earnings or from the proceeds of their exports the things they need at the cheapest rates, while prohibitory protection is the worst form of legalized plunder, as it forces the people to buy the things they must have at the highest prices that home producers by trusts and combinations can coerce out of them. The readiness of the protectionists to give up the whisky and tobacco tax grows out of the fact that none of it goes into their pockets, and in their opinion it is not only an outrage but essentially "un-American" to collect taxes in any form unless they pocket the lion's share of them.

Every dollar of the tax on whisky and tobacco might be repealed, and it would not start a factory or a furnace in the land, and would not add a penny to the wages of any workingman. The demand for protection is a confession that those seeking it do not propose to compete in open market with those against whom they seek it, and the protestation so earnestly made that a reduction of tariff taxes from 47 to 42 per cent., as the Mills bill proposes, would be ruinous to the protected pets of Congress is not only an admission which they can not evade, that they are now charging American consumers 47 per cent. more than the foreign price of the goods they make and sell, but an assumption that if hereafter Congress does not authorize them to extort from home consumers more than 42 per cent. above the foreign price they will be ruined.

Whenever a party assumes that it embodies all the wisdom, patriotism, and integrity in the land, and denounces its opponents as enemies of their country, serving the interests of foreign nations, it is safe to assume that it is pharisaical and hypocritical. When the Republicans adopted the following false and scandalous declaration as part of their platform they merited the contempt of all decent people of all classes, because they knew it was a falsehood when they adopted it:

We are uncompromisingly in favor of the American system of protection; we protest against its destruction as proposed by the President and his party. They serve the interests of Europe; we will support the interests of America. We accept the issue, and confidently appeal to the people for their judgment.

Men sometimes say things in the heat of debate which do them no credit; but the deliberate charge in a carefully-prepared platform, reported by a committee of one from each State, and adopted by the representatives from all the States, that the President of the United States and the Democratic party are serving the interests of Europe, while they alone are moved by patriotic motives, is simply an atrocious calumny. Mr. Clay, in 1824, made use of an expression of that sort, to which Mr. Webster replied. I adopt his reply as the best answer to this infamous charge thus deliberately made. I must add, however, in justice to Mr. Clay, that he said:

Both classes are equally sincere in their respective opinions, equally honest, equally patriotic, and desirous of advancing the prosperity of the country.

The following is the extract from the speech of Mr. Webster, delivered on 1st and 2d of April, 1824, in the House of Representatives, to which I refer:

And allow me, sir, in the first place, to state my regret, if indeed I ought not to express a warmer sentiment, at the names or designations which, Mr. Speaker, Mr. Clay has seen fit to adopt for the purpose of describing the advocates and the opposers of the present bill. It is a question, he says, between the friends of an "American policy" and those of a "foreign policy." This, sir, is an assumption which I take the liberty most directly to deny. Mr. Speaker certainly intended nothing invidious or derogatory to any part of the House by his mode of denominating friends and enemies.

But there is power in names, and this manner of distinguishing those who favor and those who oppose particular measures may lead to inferences to which no member of the House can submit. It may imply that there is a more exclusive and peculiar regard to American interests in one class of opinions than in another. Such an implication is to be resisted and repelled. Every member has a right to the presumption that he pursues what he believes to be the interest of his country with as sincere a zeal as any other member. I claim this in my own case; and while I shall not, for any purpose of description or convenient arrangement, use terms which may imply any disrespect to other men's opinions, much less any imputation upon other men's motives, it is my duty to take care that the use of such terms by others be not, against the will of those who adopt them, made to produce a false impression.

Indeed, sir, it is a little astonishing, if it seems convenient to Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of distinction, to make use of the terms "American policy" and "foreign policy," that he should not have applied them in a manner precisely the reverse of that in which he has in fact used them. If names are thought necessary, it would be well enough, one would think, that the name should be in some measure descriptive of the thing; and since Mr. Speaker denominates the policy which he recommends "a new policy in this country;" since he speaks of the present measure as a new era in our legislation; since he proposes

to invite us to depart from our accustomed course, to instruct ourselves by the wisdom of others, and to adopt the policy of the most distinguished foreign states, one is a little curious to know with what propriety of speech this imitation of other nations is denominated an "American policy," while, on the contrary, a preference for our own established system, as it now actually exists, and always has existed, is called a "foreign policy."

This favorite American policy is what America has never tried; and this odious foreign policy is what, as we are told, foreign states have never pursued. Sir, that is the truest American policy which shall most usefully employ American capital and American labor, and best sustain the whole population. With me it is a fundamental axiom, it is interwoven with all my opinions, that the great interests of the country are united and inseparable; that agriculture, commerce, and manufactures will prosper together or languish together; and that all legislation is dangerous which proposes to benefit one of these without looking to consequences which may fall on the others.

The closing sentence embodies in eloquent words the leading ideas of President Cleveland's message, and expresses better than I can the true principles of the Democratic party; while the whole of this extract voices the sentiments and feelings of every honest man against the charges so wantonly and falsely made by our opponents. In behalf of the great party to which I have the honor to belong, I adopt and repeat his indignant utterances as the best answer to the miserable slander contained in the Republican platform.

One of the leading grievances against George III by the American colonies in the Declaration of Independence was "for cutting off our trade with all parts of the world." The Senator from Maine [Mr. FRYE], in a speech in the Senate in 1882, stated the grievances of the colonies against Great Britain in these words:

For centuries England was the most earnest, vigorous, and determined champion of protection the world ever saw, enforced the extremest doctrines by all the powers of war and all the arts of diplomacy. She destroyed the growing commerce of Ireland by one blow of her navigation laws, repressed her cattle-raising, her wool-growing, her manufactures, and made her the waste of to-day. She attempted the same rôle in America; forbade the exportation of her products to any country other than her own; forced all the carrying trade into English bottoms; repressed all manufactures of fabrics, and provided by law "that none of the American colonies should manufacture iron of any kind; that no smith should make a bolt, spike, or nail, bar, or rod iron; that no mill or other engine for rolling iron or furnace for making steel should be permitted;" finally drove us to revolution, and lost the brightest jewel from her diadem.

The American commissioners in 1783 made an earnest effort to secure free trade between the United States and the dominions of Great Britain. I quote from a letter written by Thomas Jefferson to Edmund Randolph, December 16, 1783, in which he says:

The definitive treaty had been received by the President some time and a joint letter from our ministers. This gave us an account of the various propositions and steps taken on both sides in the negotiation which preceded the definitive treaty. Mr. Hartley was the British negotiator with America. He was well disposed, but his zeal for systems friendly to us constantly exceeded his powers to agree to them.

Our ministers proposed a free intercourse between every part of the British dominions and the United States, having the rights of their chartered companies. Mr. Hartley approved of it, but his court declined assenting. He then proposed that the unmanufactured produce of the United States should be admitted into Great Britain and the manufactures of Great Britain into the United States, and that we should be allowed to carry our own produce to the West Indies. On being questioned, however, he had no authority to conclude upon these articles even if agreeable to us.

Hon. David A. Wells speaks thus of the principal causes which led to the American Revolution, and of the men who were leaders in it:

By the statute of 1650 the export and import trade of the English colonies was restricted to English or colony-built ships; but by the statute of 1663 nothing was allowed to be imported into a British plantation except in an English-built ship "whereof the master and three-fourths of the crew are English."

* * * * * * *

The enactment of arbitrary laws on the part of Great Britain to prevent her American colonists from freely participating in the carrying trade and commerce of the ocean was, however, a sore grievance, and ultimately, as is well known, constituted one of the prime causes of the American Revolution. They were, furthermore, from the very first either openly or secretly resisted and evaded, and under their influence the colonists became a nation of lawbreakers.

Nine-tenths of their merchants were smugglers. One-quarter of all the signers of the Declaration of Independence were bred to commerce, to the command of ships, and to contraband trade. Hancock, Trumbull (Brother Jonathan), and Hamilton were all known to be cognizant of contraband transactions and approved of them. Hancock was the prince of contraband traders, and with John Adams as his counsel was appointed for trial before the admiralty court in Boston, at the exact hour of the shedding of blood at Lexington, in a suit for $500,000 penalties, alleged to have been incurred by him as a smuggler.

* * * * * * *

Every evasion of such statutes was therefore, in their view, a blow in favor of liberty. Hence, also, the origin of that count in the indictment against the King of Great Britain, embodied in the Declaration of Independence, "of cutting off our trade with all parts of the world."

Such were the views of the men who a hundred years ago were accounted the wisest of American patriots and statesmen. But nowadays to adopt the principles of Hancock, Trumbull, and Hamilton, to advocate the free ownership and employment of ships, and to oppose the enactment of statutes the avowed purpose of which is to restrict or prevent the freedom of international trade and commerce is to invite the accusation of being enemies to the industry of the country and in league with foreign nations to impoverish our own people.

Mr. Wells adds:

In the treaty of commerce entered into between France and the United States in 1778 the commissioners of the two nations, Franklin, Deane, Lee, and Gerard, evidently determined to attempt to inaugurate a more generous policy and establish a precedent for freer and better commercial relations between different countries than had hitherto prevailed. It was accordingly agreed in the treaty in question to avoid "all those burdensome prejudices which are usually sources of debate, embarrassment, and discontent," and to take as the "basis of their agreement the most perfect equality and reciprocity." And they further stated the principle which they had adopted as a guide in their negotiations to be that of "founding the advantages of commerce solely upon reciprocal utility and the just rules of free intercourse."

In the face of facts like these it is absurd to pretend that there ever was an "American policy" that restricted trade and commerce or that looked to the closing of our markets against foreign products. All that was ever claimed was such an adjustment of duties, imposed for revenue, as would afford incidental protection to home manufacturers.

In 1815 Mr. Clay, who is constantly paraded before the country by the protectionists as their great champion, in the debate on the tariff then proposed to be increased in order to raise the money to pay off the war debt, only urged a tax on imports of 25 per cent. instead of 20 per cent.

"In three years," he said, "we could judge of the ability of our establishments to furnish these articles as cheaply as they were obtained from abroad, and could then legislate with the lights of experience." He believed that "three years would be sufficient to place our manufactures on this desirable footing."

Nearly seventy years have elapsed since then, yet 47 per cent. average tariff tax is maintained in time of profound peace, almost at the highest war rates, with over $100,000,000 of surplus annually flowing into the Treasury beyond even the present extravagant, not to say wasteful, expenditures, and all efforts to reduce these taxes to something like a revenue standard are denounced by protectionists as ruinous to American industries.

Mr. Clay had no such ideas as are now maintained by Senators on the other side of this Chamber. In the great debate in the Senate in 1842, while defending the compromise tariff in 1832, under which all duties were brought to a uniform rate of 20 per cent., Mr. Clay said:

If the compromise act had not been adopted the whole system of protection would have been swept by the board by the preponderating influence of the illustrious man then at the head of the Government (General Jackson) at the very next session after its enactment.

Yet General Jackson is sometimes quoted as a protectionist.

Again Mr. Clay said:

As to the compromise, he had already said that it was his purpose, as long as he should remain in the Senate, to maintain that the original principles of the act should be carried out faithfully and honestly; and if in providing for an adequate revenue for an economical administration of the Government they could at the same time afford incidental protection, he would be happy if both of these objects could be accomplished.

Again he said:

As far as he could go, he would; and that was not to lay duties for protection alone, but in laying duties for revenue to supply the Government with means, to so lay them as to afford incidental protection. He would, therefore, say to the friends of protection, lay aside all attempts beyond this standard and look to what is attainable and practicable.

The position taken by Mr. Clay is precisely the ground occupied by Mr. Cleveland, as all who read his message understand; yet Mr. Clay is lauded as the great apostle of protection, and Mr. Cleveland is denounced as an enemy of his country, working in the interests of foreign nations.

No argument is needed to show that the message of the President and the bill passed by the House are both eminently conservative. Following the recommendations of the message, the bill, while seeking to reduce the dangerous surplus so rapidly accumulating in the Treasury, seeks, mainly by cheapening raw material, to give our manufacturers a chance to cheapen their products, and thus reach a portion of the foreign markets, and at the same time reduce the cost to home consumers. "It deals with a condition, not a theory." It continues protection at rates much higher than the just claims of the manufacturers or the interest of the consumers calls for, but it recognizes the artificial and unnatural conditions on which our manufacturing establishments have been built up, and it carefully avoids such reductions as would give them even a semblance of just cause for complaint.

I will not go into the details of the measure now. It is sufficient to say that if it becomes a law the manufacturers will have protection against the right of our people to buy similar foreign-made goods of over 40 per cent., because that is what protection means and all it accomplishes, while all the wages they pay to their operatives does not exceed 25 per cent. on an average of the value of the home-made product, as shown by the census reports furnished by the manufacturers themselves, and as proved by the official tables heretofore referred to as part of the speech of Senator COKE.

The temptation is very great to comment upon the provisions of the Senate bill in detail, in the light of past legislation and of the concessions made by men of all parties as to the necessity of tariff reduction, especially to show how, in the woolen and cotton and other schedules, there is an unwarranted attempt made not only to increase the rate of taxation over existing law, but to do it in the form of compound and specific duties, so as to conceal the increases so artfully devised; but that would extend this statement to an unwarrantable length. I admit that it is too long already. The flagrant injustice of the proposition will, I hope, be fully exposed when the discussion of the items is taken up in the Senate.

The proposals in the Senate bill in regard to the cotton schedule, I only propose to say now, are simply outrageous, and can not be defended upon any principle of common decency.

No Senator will profess that manufactures, especially cotton manufactures, need any more protection now than they did ten, fifteen, or

twenty years ago. Improvements in machinery have cheapened production and diminished the number of operatives needed in these factories until Mr. Atkinson and all the authorities even in New England agree that one operative will produce as much now as five could with the machinery of twenty years since, which means a proportionate increase of protection to machinery. Yet as early as 1868 Hon. N. P. Banks, then a member of the House of Representatives, laid before Congress a proposition from the New England manufacturers consenting to a reduction on woolen and cotton goods of over 25 per cent. The RECORD of May 7, 1868, will show that Mr. Banks, after giving in detail the reductions to which the manufacturers agreed, said:

These papers which I hold in my hand bear the official signatures of the authorized representatives of one hundred and twelve manufacturing corporations and firms of New England, in which they themselves suggest and consent to reduction of duties upon an extended and complete list of articles of foreign manufacture which come actively and directly in competition with the industries in which they are engaged, rising from 10 to 20, 30, 40, and 50 per cent. upon the present schedule of duties upon such importations. More than a hundred and twelve corporations and firms of cotton and woolen manufacturers alone, of their own choice, and after repeated conferences, in which all the interests of the textile fabrics of this country were considered, high and low, made this proposition. * * * As it was with the cotton manufacturers, so it was with the woolen manufacturers. They consented to and in a certain sense recommended, as of their own accord, a reduction of duties of from 23 to 25 per cent.

* * * * * * * *

Mr. HOOKER. Will the gentleman allow me to ask him why these interests asked a diminution of the tariff?

Mr. BANKS. Because their attention had been called to the subject. It was their duty to make known to the Government what they desired. They found when they brought their representative men together from all parts of the country that the duties could be reduced and they could still pursue their vocations with more or less success, and like honest and honorable citizens they made that declaration to the Government. And so did the wool-growers from California to New England. They assembled in the State of New York for the same purpose, and after long and anxious conference one with another and with the woolen manufacturers they agreed, as did the silk manufacturers, to what extent they would recommend a reduction of the duty.

Yet in the face of these propositions and the changes that have occurred to cheapen the production by improved machinery, after the insertion of provisions—inserted I had almost said clandestinely, in the conference report of 1883—increasing the rate on the leading cotton products in which New England was specially interested, it is now proposed to still further largely increase taxation in the interest of a few New England manufacturers; and what is true in regard to them may be said with equal propriety in regard to all the increases proposed in the Senate bill; for, so far as the leading schedules are concerned—in short, it is a bill to increase taxation in the interest of combinations of wealth rather than to reduce it in the interest of the people. The bill, it is true, deals without mercy with the sugar schedule, mainly because nine-tenths of the money collected from the sugar tax is paid into the Treasury, and none of it reaches the pockets of the New England monopolists.

When we reduced the sugar tax in 1883 the clamor of all of these combinations then was that we were destroying an industry that employed a large number of American laborers, principally colored men, for whose welfare they expressed great solicitude. Then, as now, the Democrats agreed only to reductions which would not cripple or destroy home products. It is true that when a sugar plantation is once destroyed it is almost impossible ever to restore it. The plant costs nearly $100 an acre, and takes years to bring it back to a profitable condition after it is once abandoned. It differs from the land upon which hemp, tobacco, and other crops of that sort are produced. They can be changed to something else without loss; whereas the sugar and rice plantations, when once abandoned, can not be used for any other purpose without a sacrifice of all that had been expended upon them to fit them for sugar and rice production.

Therefore the Democratic party, while they cut these two products heavier than any other, wisely did it in such a way as not to seriously cripple or destroy the labor or the capital engaged in those products. Now, perhaps to punish the people of the South, or to raise the clamor that they are patriotically giving the people cheap sugar, the Republican majority have taken care to add the taxes on sugar which they have reduced because they could not pocket them or turn them over to the protectionists, as nine-tenths went into the Treasury, to the products of which the monopolists pocket four-fifths and the Government gets one-fifth, and they call that protecting American labor!

I am, however, glad that the Senate committee has gone to the extreme of protection, restriction, and destruction that it has. It makes the issue squarely before the people of the country, whether all the people are for all time to come to be treated as serfs of a few manufacturers, or whether they are to secure through a revenue tariff something like equal rights in the legislation of the country hereafter. The temptation is very great also to show the indignant protests heretofore made, particularly in 1883, by leading Republican Senators, notably Senators PLUMB, INGALLS, and ALLISON, against the tax on lumber, salt, and other things which the committee propose to perpetuate. That, however, can be done hereafter.

But I ought not to fail to state that the low revenue tariff of 1846 produced more general prosperity and progress in the development of all our industry than any protective system since devised has ever done. So satisfactory was its operation that when the parties met and adopted their platforms in 1856 neither party ventured to find any objection to it, and when the further reduction below 20 per cent. was made in 1857 it received the almost unanimous approval of the representatives from New England, nearly all of whom were opposed to the then administration; yet the taxation then imposed was less than half that now conceded by the so-called free-trade Mills bill, and very little over one-third of what is demanded by the bill of the Senate committee. On the 24th and 25th of March, 1870, Senator ALLISON, then a prominent member of the Ways and Means Committee of the House, spoke of that tariff as follows:

The tariff of 1846, although confessedly and professedly a tariff for revenue, was, so far as regards all the great interests of the country, as perfect a tariff as any that we have ever had. If any interest was depressed under the tariff of 1846, it was the iron interest. I do not believe that this interest, as compared with other interests, had sufficient advantage under that tariff; yet when we compare the growth of the country from 1840 to 1850 with the growth of the country from 1850 to 1860—the latter decade being entirely under the tariff of 1846 or the amended and greatly reduced tariff of 1857—we find that the increase in our wealth between 1850 and 1860 was equivalent to 126 per cent., while it was only 64 per cent. between 1840 and 1850, four years of which decade were under the tariff of 1842, known as a high protective tariff, but the average rate of which was about 70 per cent. below the existing rate, or 27 per cent. under the tariff of 1842 as against 44 per cent. upon all importations under the present tariff.

Our industries were generally prosperous in 1860, with the exception, possibly, of the iron interest. This was the statement of Mr. MORRILL, of Vermont, on this floor during the discussion of the tariff of 1864. With regard to the condition of the steel industry in 1860, the steel manufacturers in 1866, memorializing Congress for increase of duties on steel, stated that—

"It was reserved for Pittsburgh to bring about the first substantial and enduring success in the year of 1860; and encouraged by our example numerous establishments have sprung into existence, as already indicated in this paper. This shows that under the revenue tariff of 1857, which imposed only an ad valorem duty of 12 per cent. on steel, a substantial success was achieved in the steel manufacture in 1860." I have read the language of the memorial.

I regard that indorsement of the act of 1846 and of the principles of a revenue tariff as entitled to greater consideration than anything I could say. Hon. Robert J. Walker, Mr. Polk's Secretary of the Treasury, who framed the tariff of 1846, addressed a letter to the people of the United States on the 30th of November, 1867, in which he took occasion to refer to the tariff of 1846, and contrast its principles and provisions with those of the present system. After showing what amount he thought would be sufficient for the wants of the Government economically administered, he said:

This revenue of $244,000,000 a year, as a maximum, I would derive from three sources alone:

1. By a tariff for revenue.
2. By an excise on wines, malt and spirituous liquors, and tobacco; abolishing all other internal taxation.
3. By a tax on our national banks, based upon just and fair equivalents.

* * * * * * * *

A tariff for revenue, as experience has shown, instead of depressing improves all industrial pursuits, including manufactures, and vastly augments the wealth of the country. Under the tariff of 1846, as shown by the census, our wealth increased from 1850 to 1860, 126.45 per cent.; whereas from 1840 to 1850 the increase was only 64 per cent.; from 1830 to 1840, 42 per cent., and from 1820 to 1830, 41 per cent. So, also, from 1850 to 1860 our agricultural products increased 95 per cent. and our manufactures 87 per cent., being in both cases nearly double any preceding ratio of increase. So, also, our exports, imports, and revenues nearly tripled in the same period of time, and our domestic trade rose nearly in the same ratio.

This augmented ratio is not the result of increase of population, which from 1850 to 1860 was less than 36 per cent. The Irish famine was supposed by my opponents to account for the increase the first year, although the decreased price paid abroad that year for our cotton nearly equaled the additional sum paid by England for our breadstuffs and provisions. But the next year and the next, before any gold had reached here from California, our exports and revenue went on augmenting in a corresponding ratio, rising in eight years from $22,000,000 under the tariff of 1842 to $64,000,000 under the tariff of 1846.

I think Mr. Walker answers fully the boast of the great feat accomplished by the Morrill tariff, by "transforming ad valorem duties into specific," in the following sentence:

There is another insuperable objection to the specific system, namely, that it unnecessarily and invariably taxes labor vastly more than capital, and the poor in a much greater proportion than the rich, upon the goods consumed. Under the system of specific duties of so much per pound, or yard, or gallon, etc., the specific duty is the same. The rich, who purchase the costly article bearing only the same specific duty, pay, in proportion to value, less than one-half of what is paid by the poor, who purchase a cheaper and less costly article. If we take all the costly articles purchased by the rich bearing under the present tariff the same specific duty as the inferior article bought by the poor, we will find the difference against them exceeds $20,000,000 a year. Such is the immense additional tax exacted from labor under the system of specific duties.

Think of the injustice of a system under which the laboring man pays 90 per cent. tariff tax on the only kind of blankets he can afford to buy, while the wealthy pay less than 60 per cent. tax on such as they use, and in like proportion for all else. How long would a law stand in the State of New York that taxes the residence of Mr. Vanderbilt or Mr. Stewart, worth $2,000,000, no more than the residence of their coachman, worth $2,000? That is specific taxation. Ad valorem or a fair per cent. tax on each according to its value is the system adopted by the American people in all their State governmental affairs, and is the only just system. Mr. Walker but expresses the views of all disinterested intelligent men when he says:

Our present system of taxation is the most onerous ever imposed upon any people, and is utterly destructive of the prosperity of our country.

Our present tariff is most unequal, oppressive, and unjust. It is grievously onerous upon agriculture, commerce, navigation, ship-building, etc. * * * The present tariff, besides the tax of $150,000,000 a year upon imports, the duties

on which are paid by the people into the Treasury in gold, exacts another tax of at least $350,000,000 a year in the enhanced prices of rival protected domestic articles. This can be readily proved by comparing the prices current in gold of such domestic articles with the prices of similar articles produced in other countries. Thus, the tariff taxes the people of the United States to the extent of $500,000,000 a year, of which only $150,000,000 goes into the Treasury, and the remaining $350,000,000 goes into the pockets of the protected classes.

Mr. Walker understood too well the real purpose of the clamor about protection to American labor and the wages of operatives to be deceived by it. He knew that the $350,000,000 of taxes taken from the people which did not reach the Treasury went into the pockets of the protected classes and not into the pockets of their operatives. He made a great report to Congress on the 11th day of December, 1848, which I wish every laboring man in the United States could read, whether he works in a factory or on a farm. Even Senators would be benefited by its perusal.

On the subject of specific and ad valorem duties Mr. Walker says:

If the importation of protected articles would rapidly decrease when the foreign were high in price and specific duties operated as a protection, under the tariff of 1842 from 41 to 243 per cent. (per Table H, compiled from Treasury returns in 1844), what must not have been the decline of importation and revenue when the foreign article fell, as it has in many cases, 50 per cent., bringing up the specific duty from 41 to 82 and from 243 to 486 per cent.? This fact illustrates another objection to the specific duty, namely, that although it professes to be stationary, it is in fact constantly augmenting from reduced prices of foreign articles.

Experience proves that from improved machinery, new inventions, and reduced cost of production the foreign articles are constantly diminishing in price, while the specific duty remaining unchanged it is continually increasing in ratio as an equivalent ad valorem, and the protection augmenting every year. Thus, if the price of sugar was 6 cents a pound and the duty 3 cents, it would be equal to 50 per cent. ad valorem; but if the price of sugar fell to 3 cents, the duty would have risen to 100 per cent. ad valorem, thus doubling the protection and continually augmenting with decreasing foreign prices until the duty becomes prohibitory and the revenue on such articles disappears; whereas the ad valorem bears under all changes of price the same exact ratio to the cost of the foreign fabric, and therefore is the most just and equal, as also necessarily insuring a larger revenue.

In this aspect of the case, the objections to the specific duties as a permament system, with a view to revenue, are insuperable, while their unjust operation upon labor, in imposing so much higher duties as an equivalent ad valorem on the cheaper than the more costly qualities of goods, can not be successfully defended.

That is all I care to say at present on that subject.

One thousand one hundred and thirty-six pages of statements made upon all sorts of subjects before the Senate Finance Committee have been furnished to me. Even that mass of matter contains nothing taken since September 10, 1888. There may be 1,100 more pages that I have not yet seen, and perhaps the committee has not yet had it all printed, but I do not propose to analyze it, or to attempt to go over it in detail. In great part it consists of the demands of men for specific duties and increased or prohibitory taxation.

Perhaps Mr. Oliver's statement, on page 125, in regard to steel-wire rods, when he was demanding specific rates instead of ad valorem, and increases of duty which should amount to prohibition, illustrates the tone of all of them as well as any other. The following few lines, which I insert here, show what I mean:

Senator BECK. Therefore the specific duty at that time was somewhere about 63 to 65.

Mr. OLIVER. About that, I think.

Senator BECK. That is what I wanted you to guess at if you can not tell otherwise. Now you complain of a reduction from 60 per cent. down to 45 per cent.

Mr. OLIVER. We do most emphatically complain.

Senator BECK. You want to prohibit foreign competition, so as to control the home market yourselves?

Mr. OLIVER. That is our position, and we are not ashamed to say it. We want the home market to be supplied by the home manufacturers.

Senator BECK. I thought so.

While I do not propose now to go into the question of trusts or the effect of tariff taxation in their formation and maintenance, because that is before the Senate Finance Committee as a separate proposition and will doubtless be reported upon separately, at which time I may have an opportunity to express my views in regard to them and the encouragement that tariff taxation affords to them, still I can not forbear referring to the well-known and somewhat notorious cotton-bagging trust, which illustrates how the tariff sustains and protects all the others.

Congress having imposed prohibitory duties upon jute and the manufactures of jute used for cotton-bagging, all of the men who had by law secured a monopoly of the business and effectually excluded all competition conspired, or, if you please, combined and formed a trust, buying out the smaller concerns and leasing others, and thus through the trust controlled the whole product, because their machinery could produce in two years more than the country could consume in three, and the prohibitory duty had made foreign competition impossible, as the American market needed more than three-fourths of all the cotton-bagging produced in the world.

This combination, thus protected in its extortions by the operation of our tariff laws, almost doubled the price of the cotton-bagging product to the consumers, and the men who thus conspired, after concealing the facts as to their combination, came before the committee when brought back after their action had been exposed and admitted that they had done it because Congress, or at least the House of Representatives, seemed determined to interfere with their monopoly, and they proposed to make the most out of it while the power to do so remained in their own hands.

I do not know of any better commentary on the folly—I might perhaps use a stronger term—of such protective duties as destroy competition and enable men to combine and conspire so as to ruin the mass of the people who must buy from them, as the cotton-bagging monopolists admit they have done. A feeble pretense was made in committee, and it may be repeated, that it did not hurt the producer of cotton because the bale was weighed bagging and all, and the price was so much per pound for the whole weight, but when that suggestion or assertion came to be investigated it was so absurd that Mr. Murdoch, who was one of the men asking for an increase of duty on cotton bagging, agreed that all the tare was in effect a loss to the producer, as shown by the short extract from his statement which I make part hereof, correcting the work in a question from purchaser to producer:

Mr. MURDOCH. There is another point to be considered about the price of bagging. When this cotton is exported to Liverpool the purchaser of the cotton on the other side deducts 6 per cent. for tare; that is, he deducts from a 500-pound bale 30 pounds for tare, and for the little soiled cotton that may be next to the surface of the bale. So that the man who exports the cotton does not pay for the ties and bagging at all.

Senator BECK. Who pays for them? Somebody pays for them. There is 6 per cent. deducted for tare; who pays it?

Mr. MURDOCH. As you say, somebody pays it.

Senator BECK. Is it not deducted from the producer always? It must be. Everybody can tell that as well as you.

Mr. MURDOCH. It is the same way when they ship rice; they do not charge for the tierce.

Senator ALDRICH. In this country who pays the 40 cents if it is reduced?

Mr. MURDOCH. I suppose it would go to the planter.

Senator ALDRICH. How would it go to the planter? He sells his cotton for the same price.

Mr. MURDOCH. Yes; he gets the same price for his cotton. You can make a very nice argument about it, but it is so.

Senator HISCOCK. There is no doubt but it must affect the price of cotton?

Mr. MURDOCH. Every article of commerce is put up in packages, and nobody thinks of charging for the packing. Corn is put up in bags; meat is put up in boxes or hogsheads, as the case may be, and nobody charges for them; rice is put up in tierces, and nobody charges for the tierces; the same with cotton. When an article is sold it always carries the cost of the package. But when a planter puts 450 pounds of cotton into a bale, puts the bagging and ties on, and then has 475 pounds of stuff which he hauls 5 miles to market, and sells 475 pounds at 10 cents a pound, you can not persuade him that he is not being paid for his bagging and ties. You might argue with him for a year and it would not have the slightest effect on him.

Senator HISCOCK. He does not appreciate the fact that that is taken into consideration in establishing the price of the article?

Mr. MURDOCH. No; but of course that is so.

I desire to say further in regard to this question of trusts that while so much was being said about the whisky trust, especially in Kentucky, I sent a note to John M. Atherton, esq., of Louisville, Ky., who was the president of the Distillers' Association, asking him to advise me fully as to whatever trusts existed in regard to Kentucky whiskies, telling him that I desired to use his statement before the Senate Finance Committee, or to have him examined before that committee if necessary. He was at Saratoga, N. Y., at the time, and wrote out a full statement of the facts, which I tendered to the Subcommittee on Finance and requested its publication among the other statements which they were having printed. There were some expressions in it to which my attention was called, and as the Republican members of the committee thought that it contained matters they did not care to publish, it was handed back to me.

Mr. Atherton came to Washington on a summons to appear before the House committee. A few days afterwards I submitted it to him, and he modified some of the expressions which were objected to or were thought improper by the majority of the Finance Committee. I said to Senators ALDRICH and ALLISON that I would attend to having that communication printed myself, as there seemed to be some reluctance on their part to make it part of the general evidence. I now submit it as an appendix to this report, and ask that it may be printed along with it, as it is a full, fair, and complete statement of the truth by a very intelligent man, and one who is better informed in regard to all the doings and operations in distilled spirits in Kentucky than, perhaps, any other man in the State. The political suggestions that he saw fit to make are in entire accord with my views, and therefore I ask that the letter may be printed, just as it is written, as part of this statement.

JAS. B. BECK.

SARATOGA, N. Y., No. 98 CIRCULAR STREET, *July* 23, 1888.

DEAR SENATOR: The reports from Washington point to the passage of the Mills bill by the House. This sends the bill to the Senate, and in view of this probability, I take the liberty of submitting to you the facts and reflections contained in this communication. To avoid all confusion I will try to keep separate the facts and those observations and conclusions which in my judgment grow out of the facts, but which I know to be the views of an individual and nothing more.

As known to you, I am a distiller of and dealer in Kentucky whisky. In common with all self-respecting men engaged in the liquor traffic, I feel a deep interest in all legislation affecting my business. But apart from this purely selfish consideration, as a citizen of this country I again, in common with the members of my business, feel that interest in all that concerns this people which honest, law-abiding men should feel. Every decent man in the liquor trade, wholesale and retail, must experience a sense of regret that statements utterly at variance with the facts should be made on the floor of Congress. I will try to mention some of these statements, and in each case give you an honest and truthful recital of facts, evading nothing and concealing nothing.

The reports of debates in Congress, in both House and Senate, contain charges that there exists in Kentucky a "whisky ring"—a combination organized and

maintained for making money in any and every way, whether fair or foul, by defrauding the Government and by proposing and aiding legislation out of which money is to be made by this alleged ring. It is unpleasant enough to bear that part of such an accusation, made in Congress, circulated all over the country, and preserved in the Journals of both House and Senate, to be read by generations yet unborn, as fixes or tends to fix upon each individual distiller and dealer in Kentucky his share of the criminality contained in such a charge. But this mortification is deepened by the fact that our public men, our Representatives and Senators, our State officials, our citizens of eminence and influence, are made parties to this "ring," and presented to the public in the light of its agents or attorneys.

The answer to all this is that it is untrue. There is no whisky ring in Kentucky; there never has been. By the word "ring" I mean combination of any and all kinds, making or seeking to make money in any way except by the manufacture and sale of whisky in accordance with the laws of the United States and of Kentucky and in compliance with the methods of honest and honorable business pursuits. If this is true, if there is no whisky ring in Kentucky, it can have no agents and no part in originating or shaping legislation.

I embarked in this business in 1867, and have been continuously engaged in it to this time. I am intimately acquainted with nearly all the distillers and dealers of Kentucky. It is not possible that any ring could exist in Kentucky without my knowledge. But to go to the bottom of this matter, it was the wish of every distiller of Kentucky that the committee of the House investigating trusts would take up the whisky business, and, under the oath of witnesses, get the facts. Many years ago there was in Kentucky an association of Kentucky distillers of which the largest membership did not exceed fifty. Its object was to consider trade matters and to discuss such provisions of law and proposed legislation as affected the distilling business of Kentucky. But at no time was any scheme suggested or desired for evading any law, State or national, or for controlling the business by rings or combinations. The internal-revenue law, enacted mainly in 1869, was in many respects crude, and in not a few extremely technical.

It was designed to prevent the gross frauds on the revenue that existed prior to 1869, and to that end had the approval of every distiller in Kentucky. This association regulated storage and other purely commercial questions, and the only part undertaken by it, of any moment, in national legislation was in the effort to secure an extension of the bonded period, and, in State legislation, in framing a law by which whisky was taxed as other property in Kentucky. There was no pool, no trust, no interference by one distiller with the business, prices, or profits of another. It employed Colonel Wharton as an attorney in Washington in the interest of the bond-extension bill, but violated in that movement no law. That no ring existed, that nothing secret was attempted, that no effort was made to evade or violate law, is absolutely certain. In 1883 or 1884 this association was abandoned by the distillers, as the matters about which it had been mainly concerned were settled as far as any efforts such as described could avail.

This was followed by a movement to incorporate a company under the laws of Kentucky with a view solely to regulate production by fixing a maximum quantity to be made each year by the different distillers, each fixing his own price, selling his own product, and conducting his own business. But the movement failed and was virtually abandoned.

In the late spring of 1887 a majority of the distillers in Kentucky entered into an agreement to produce no whisky from July 1, 1887, to July 1, 1888. This agreement is in writing, in existence, and speaks its own scope and intent. A similar agreement is now under consideration in Kentucky, providing for a restriction of the production in Kentucky from July 1, 1888, to July 1, 1889. But the agreement, if made, is by the voluntary action of each distiller, contains no provision for pooling or consolidating, but leaves each to manage his own business in his own way.

All these movements have been open and honest, with no false, secret, or sinister purpose, and are fully set out in writing to speak for themselves. The records of the Internal Revenue Department show the arrests or seizures in Kentucky for violations of law. These records must disprove the charge of fraud attempted or accomplished by Kentucky distillers, and I most earnestly ask you to obtain a statement on this point from the honorable Commissioner of Internal Revenue. You will find numerous arrests, prosecutions, and convictions for "moonshining" in Kentucky and for selling liquor without license, and you will find a large sum expended by the Government in Kentucky for protecting the revenue from such violations. But you will find an exceedingly small list of offenses of any kind by the registered distillers of Kentucky.

No effort has ever been made in Kentucky to combine the liquor trade for political purposes. Many engaged in the trade as distillers and dealers are strong Republicans and vote the Republican ticket.

The trade of Kentucky differs in the matter of reducing or repealing the internal-revenue tax as other people differ. Many desire a reduction to 50 cents, and on this point there is not much difference of opinion, as less money would be required in the business and less apprehension felt about paying taxes.

If the trade of Kentucky differ in politics it can not be true that the whisky interest dominates or controls the politics of Kentucky, as has been charged in Congress.

May I not ask you, if these statements are true, why Senators and Representatives in Congress, why newspapers and public speakers repeat the charge that a whisky ring exists in Kentucky, and by its devilish schemes and dishonorable methods defrauds the revenue and shapes the politics of Kentucky? If the charge is made in good faith, it should be corrected, for the people of the United States are led to form very unfavorable opinions of the Kentucky distillers and dealers. While this faith may not disturb the public, it is unjust to the individuals assailed, and must degrade them in the eyes of the public. If done to impair the standing of our public men or to weaken an influence they may exert in the discussion of public questions, it is still unjust. Such tactics may be good politics, but the charges are false, nevertheless. But whatever may be the purpose—ignorance or politics—you will confer a favor on the whisky trade of Kentucky if you will at least flatly and positively deny the existence of any whisky ring in our State, past or present.

To give you such information as will explain all points and cover the entire question, I will state that there is a trust, composed of distillers mainly north of the Ohio River, and of a few distillers in Kentucky, who produce spirits and non-aging whisky. The office of this trust is in Peoria, Ill. It is needless for me to explain the difference between spirits and Kentucky bourbon, or what is meant by whisky for aging by storage and spirits made for immediate use. You doubtless know all these distinctions, and while it is interesting enough as either a scientific or commercial question, it is foreign to my purpose. Nor is it my wish to lead you into any reflections on the moral questions involved in the liquor traffic. If the business is immoral, and on this point each must form his own conclusions from what he has himself done or seen his neighbors do, it is quite enough to bear that burden. But in addition to this charge, be it true or false, there need not be preferred in high places the further accusation of theft and conspiracy and all that is implied in the usual term of whisky ring. All the statements on this subject in the foregoing you can accept as true.

Now, it may be said in support of the whisky-ring charge, in the face of the foregoing facts, that nothing of a criminal or semi-criminal meaning is intended, and the intent may be to charge that Kentucky whisky (and, for that matter, all domestic whisky) is protected by the internal revenue, and enabled by that protection to exist and grow rich, and the charge has been made that a whisky trust had sprung up under the internal-revenue law and the tariff duties on imported liquors.

As before stated in this communication, there is north of the Ohio River a whisky trust, which embraces all the distillers of spirits and cheap domestic whisky, except two houses, one at Cincinnati and one at Chicago; but I am unable to find how or in what way the internal tax or tariff duties has contributed to the formation of this trust.

1. Spirits and their kindred products made by the trusts are used as soon as made, and certainly do not remain in bond for any considerable period of time. These spirits are never tax-paid and stored as tax-paid whisky. So the tax is paid by the trust houses as the spirits are made and withdrawn for consumption. The buyer and consumer speedily pay this tax, and it is in nowise a burden to the trust houses; nor can it be a benefit. If the spirits were stored for age, and unfit for use until aged, a strong combination, able to pay the heavy tax of 90 cents and carry the tax-paid stock, would likely, or at least theoretically, have an advantage over their weaker competitors. But such is not the case, and men or firms of small means, of means enough to build a distillery and buy grain enough to operate it on, can make and sell spirits so far as the tax money is involved, as it is always covered by a draft on shipments made generally as soon as the spirits are barreled.

There is no advantage from the internal-revenue law to spirit distillers in a trust or out of it, and any house, no matter how small, can as readily obey the requirements of the law as the largest one. There is the same commercial advantage in favor of a large spirit distillery that exists in favor of a large manufactory of any kind over a small one, less expense per unit of products in the large one than the small one. I mean business expense with which the law can have nothing to do. This statement applies to Kentucky whisky, but in a modified way; the tax of 90 cents is paid at the end of the three years' bonded period on all whisky not previously withdrawn. This tax thus becomes a heavy burden on the Kentucky products (and also on all whisky carried for age beyond the three years).

And this burden certainly outweighs any advantages that can ever result from combinations in the fine whisky business. So instead of a benefit even to fine whisky, the tax of 90 cents is such a burden to fine whisky that the great majority of distillers and dealers would be glad to have the tax reduced to 50 cents. The records of the internal revenue will show the number of distillers in existence in the United States, and this record will further show the large number of very small distilleries that certainly exist under the present law. The distillers of fine whisky, or at least very many of them, would regret to see the internal-revenue law repealed in full so far as it applies to distilled spirits, for the reason that the marks affixed under the law serve to identify the goods, and is a guaranty to the buyer and ultimately to the consumer of the quality.

Many distillers, also, of all grades of distilled spirits can not understand how a tax inuring to the benefit of the whole people can be collected by the States. Kentucky could impose a gallon tax of 25 cents if the United States tax of 90 cents was repealed, and thus support the State government, provided other grain-growing States imposed the same tax. But Texas, for instance, would object to enriching Kentucky in this way. To this it may be said that the local license would be increased, and thus each State gets its full share of this tax. But to this the reply must be made that there is nothing to indicate any more uniformity in license than in the gallon tax. I state, then, objections that many whisky people have to the entire repeal of the whisky tax as the real and honest objections from a trade standpoint. And it is better that real and honest objections should be stated than that the trade be charged with secret if not dishonest motives for their position on this subject.

On the broader question of taxation, and apart from the selfish interest each has in his own business, the whisky trade differ, as do other people—some for tariff reform and some for protection—some indorse the St. Louis platform, while others indorse the Chicago doctrine.

2. Do tariff duties as now laid benefit the whisky business in any way and aid in the formation of trusts? Most certainly not, for the very simple reason that the United States is the greatest grain-growing country in the world, and furnishes the cheapest grain of all kinds for all purposes. If there were no tariff duties and no internal tax on liquors (distilled) there could be no interference with American products by imported goods. In Europe potatoes are used to a large extent for whisky or spirit making, but the product is not good, and could not at a less price compete with grain product. This is too plain and too well known to permit of argument.

On the other hand, if the tariff duties were reduced or repealed and the internal revenue repealed there would be a large export trade in alcohol and spirits. This trade is now greatly restricted through the legislation of foreign countries, as you know. So whatever may be said about the influence of the tariff in fostering trusts in a general way, there is and can be no connection between the internal revenue or the tariff and the formation of trusts in whisky. Nor does either the tariff or internal revenue give any advantages to the whisky trade or to the large over the small distilleries. It is true that the internal tax induces people residing in mountain regions to engage in moonshining, but it does not and can not benefit the registered distiller who pays his tax.

The price of grain, which is fully two-thirds of the cost of spirits or whisky when made, the character of the water, the price of coal or fuel, the price of staves or barrels, the cost of transportation to market—these facts locate the places where distilling will exist to any extent.

This is no defense of trusts, whisky or otherwise. It is simply a statement of fact intended to show the relation, if any, that exists between the internal-revenue law and the tariff and the manufacture of distilled spirits. (By distilled spirits I mean grain product, for the entire repeal of the tariff on liquors would affect grape brandy, I expect, but never bring it in competition with grain products.)

In the discussion of tariff as a political or financial question the whisky tax is an important factor. It is so because of the large sum collected annually from that tax, and which renders less taxation on other things practicable. If the assertion is made that the tariff now in force encourages trusts or combinations, it is no sufficient answer to say: "Look at the Kentucky whisky trusts," waiving, in view of the foregoing facts, that Kentucky has no trust nor any combination akin to trusts, and never had. And admitting, as there is a Western whisky trust, the answer is yet totally insufficient. If the country was full of whisky trusts, their existence does not and can not depend on the tariff nor on the internal tax. There is and can be no competition with American grain spirits in United States by imported spirits. Two or more wrongs do not make a right; if trusts are wrong and injurious, and if they exist in the manufacture of articles strictly domestic, the fewer of them the better. If the tariff encourages trusts in articles made abroad, and competitive, if admitted at a lower range of prices, the remedy can not be found in pointing to trusts not affected by the tariff.

All trusts resting upon the tariff must be reached through the tariff, while the trusts in domestic goods not affected by the tariff must be reached by entirely different legislation. This legislation must, by the rate of tariff or internal tax, widen the field of competition if trusts are to be controlled or rendered, by commercial values, impossible or harmless. This must be done unless there can be enacted and enforced a statute prohibiting trusts of all kinds. The latter remedy is one full of complications, and possibly of restrictions, in directions where no evil can result. It is safer and more in accord with our Governmental doctrines to let commercial laws regulate trade than make the attempt by statute. You once stated in the Senate that the tariff fostered trusts, and the force of the charge

was met by referring to whisky trusts, etc. Does the tariff foster trusts was the question you raised. It does just so far as it restricts competition. A trust is an agreement among competitors by which competition is suspended, and so far as law works this result it aids and abets the purposes of a trust.

Then, is it not possible for all the manufacturers of the world of a certain article to form a trust? It is possible, but not probable, for the number adds to the difficulty, and a difference of conditions renders the agreement well-nigh impossible. The farmers of the United States can not form a trust because of their numbers and the difference in their conditions. Then, again, it will be said the only remedy for the total extinction of trusts effected by the tariff is in free-trade, and a suggestion to fight the tariff trusts by reducing the duty will be charged, if carried to its logical results, as leading to free trade in all competitive articles and in collecting all tariff dues from articles not produced in this country. But, however sound this charge may appear in theory, it is not sound in practice, for if the markets of this country in competitive force are turned over to another country, the same danger of trusts would at once arise in that country.

This is true if one country needs protection against another country; that is, if the principle of protection is a true one and based on facts, to destroy the industries kept alive by it is to again abridge competition. The only result that would follow would be a transfer of the trusts from one field to another. Or instead of a manufacturer's trust in this country we would have an agent's trust, representing foreign manufacturers. The point to be reached is to induce competition, and to do this the largest number of factories should be encouraged—the tariff so reduced as to accomplish this result. If the tariff is so laid as to equalize costs of production, protect labor and the capital invested—for one is useless without the other—then the best result has been obtained that is possible through the force of competitive laws.

A policy of restriction, as proposed in the Chicago platform, leads unerringly to the encouragement of trusts, and if that doctrine is applied it will have the Government actively engaged in three directions: Collecting revenue until the prohibitory point is reached, to be given back to the people or spent in extravagant ways; levying a tariff on articles not produced in this country when the prohibitory point is reached, such as tea and coffee; and thirdly, in enacting and enforcing a law to squelch the trusts and monopolies built up under the restrictive system.

As I understand the St. Louis platform, it contemplates the maintenance of our factories and the protection of our labor upon such basis as will hinder trusts, if not destroy them, and give to the people the money unjustly made by combinations, in addition to that now collected by the Government in excess of its requirements. This will induce competition and give new life to business, while it at least curtails the bounties of the trusts and combinations.

Does not the United States census give the increase in workingmen as well as the increase in population? My belief is, if this country is restricted to the home market, as proposed by the Republicans, the labor element will increase in greater ratio than consumption and the existing evils will be augmented year by year. We must consider the increasing difficulties in the way of establishing new industries or of making money rapidly in our country. This will add to the working element, which, with the aid of machinery, must vastly outgrow the consuming ability of the people other than workingmen, for the latter is a large consumer of the product of his own labor, and can not be benefited by taxing himself directly or indirectly. Then our public lands will soon be occupied and this outlet largely curtailed. So all the agencies at work conspire to increase the manufacturing working force at a greater ratio than the consuming force outside this working force.

If this is true, a policy of such restriction as the Republicans propose will bring this country like unto a great steam-boiler without a safety-valve and in which the steam is made faster than used, and a destructive explosion must follow. This constantly-increasing supply of muscle must compete with itself and lower its own value if pent up in this country. The true policy is, keep all of our markets not for trusts and monopolies to rob, but for the great body of the people, and at the same time get all the outlet we can. To this end let in raw material, for on this there has been little labor expended, and of all manner of wealth none can lie still until future generations need it, with so little expense and so little detriment to the people as raw material. God made it, or makes it every day, and even in the case of wool, the grass furnished by rain and sunshine does the work, and in it is but little of human sweat, toil, or risk.

And, as I once before wrote you, it is no answer to the demand for tariff reform to point to the increased wealth of the country. The country has wonderful resources, and has increased despite our civil war and its enormous taxation. As long as the country was thinly populated, lands at our doors to be fenced and cultivated at will, and our immense trunk lines of railroad to build, we were bound to grow. But we are rapidly, born as our nation was in the full glory of the nineteenth century with all Europe to fill up with, becoming an advanced people. We had no boyhood, and our years of middle life will be comparatively few. We must look quickly to all the ailments that beset the maturer age of a nation. We must continue to grow rich and honestly distribute that increase as far as law and justice can go.

Yours, truly,

J. M. ATHERTON.

Hon. JAMES B. BECK,
United States Senate.

Mr. ALDRICH. I offer a resolution to be referred to the Committee on Printing:

Resolved, That the report of the Committee on Finance, with the views of the minority, on the bill H. R. 9051 be printed, and that 6,000 extra copies be printed to be deposited in the document-room of the Senate.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. Is that to include the views submitted by the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BECK]?

Mr. ALDRICH. Certainly.

Mr. EDMUNDS. With the views of the minority.

Mr. HARRIS. The Senator from Kentucky is part of the minority and his paper is part of the report.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The resolution will be referred to the Committee on Printing.

Mr. MANDERSON. I am directed by the Committee on Printing to report back favorably the Senate resolution which I send to the desk, and I will state that the investigation as to the cost of the 6,000 copies has been made by the committee, and that it will cost less than $500 to print the 6,000 copies.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The resolution reported by the Senator from Nebraska will be read.

The Secretary read as follows:

Resolved, That the report of the Committee on Finance, with the views of the minority, on the bill H. R. 9051 be printed, and that 6,000 extra copies be printed to be deposited in the document-room of the Senate.

The resolution was considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to.

G. W. M'ADAMS.

Mr. WILSON, of Iowa. I ask the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. CHANDLER] to yield to me that I may request the Senate to take up for present consideration Order of Business 2068, being the bill (H. R. 4765) for the relief of G. W. McAdams.

By unanimous consent, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill. It authorizes the Postmaster-General to release and relieve George W. McAdams, postmaster at Mount Pleasant, Iowa, and his sureties, of all responsibility and liability to the Government for funds and property of the Government stolen from the post-office on the night of July —, 1885, by burglars, if he shall, upon examination, find that the loss was without negligence, fault, or blame on the part of the postmaster.

Mr. EDMUNDS. Is there a report in that case?

Mr. WILSON, of Iowa. There is a favorable report.

Mr. EDMUNDS. I ask the Senator from Iowa to tell us why this case does not fall under the general law provided for such cases.

Mr. WILSON, of Iowa. For the reason that the key-deposit fund, which is a small amount, $72, and also the postal notes which were stolen, are not embraced in the general law.

Mr. EDMUNDS. Let us hear the report.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The report will be read.

The Secretary read the following report, submitted by Mr. SAWYER August 9, 1888:

The Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 4765) for the relief of G. W. McAdams, have examined the same, and report:

The report upon which this bill passed the House is approved, and is as follows:

"Your committee, being satisfied that no danger can arise to the Government under the provisions of the bill submitting the question of negligence, fault, and blame to the Postmaster-General for his determination, recommend the passage of the bill."

The bill is reported favorably, with a recommendation that it do pass.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

THE LOUISIANA ELECTION CASE.

Mr. EDMUNDS. Regular order, Mr. President.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. CHANDLER] is entitled to the floor on the resolution submitted by him in relation to the Louisiana election.

Mr. DAVIS. Mr. President——

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The Senator from Vermont calls for the regular order.

Mr. COCKRELL. Pending that, I think we had better have a short executive session.

Mr. CHANDLER. Mr. President, I was not prepared for the——

Mr. HARRIS. Will the Senator from New Hampshire allow me?

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. Does the Senator from New Hampshire yield to the Senator from Tennessee?

Mr. CHANDLER. I do.

Mr. HARRIS. I was simply going to suggest to the Senator from New Hampshire, as the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. GIBSON], who has heretofore conducted the debate in respect to this resolution and evinced a good deal of interest in it, is detained from the Senate, as I understand, by indisposition, whether he will not consent to let this resolution go over until Monday when we may hope that the senior Senator from Louisiana may be present.

Mr. CHANDLER. I was about to state that I had not expected that opposition would be made to the passage of the resolution from anything that had been said by the senior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. GIBSON]. The junior Senator from that State [Mr. EUSTIS] has, however, called for the yeas and nays on the passage of the resolution, and under those circumstances I yield to the suggestion of the Senator from Tennessee and allow the resolution to go over until Monday in the hope that by that time the senior Senator from Louisiana will be here and indicate his opposition to the passage of the resolution, if he intends to make such opposition, as I have not understood that he did.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The resolution will resume its place on the Calendar.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. CLARK, its Clerk, announced that the House had disagreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 10896) making appropriations to supply deficiencies in the appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1888, and for prior years, and for other purposes; asked a further conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and had appointed Mr. BURNES, Mr. SAYERS, and Mr. RYAN managers at the further conference on the part of the House.

DEFICIENCY IN APPROPRIATIONS.

Mr. COCKRELL. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

Mr. HALE. Will the Senator withdraw the motion for a moment that the action of the House of Representatives on the deficiency bill may be laid before the Senate?

Mr. COCKRELL. I withdraw the motion for that purpose.

Mr. HALE. I desire to call up the deficiency bill that has just come from the House of Representatives.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore* laid before the Senate the action of the House of Representatives non-concurring in the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 10896) making appropriations to supply deficiencies in the appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1888, and for prior years, and for other purposes, and asking a further conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon.

Mr. HALE. I move that the Senate further insist on its amendments, and agree to the request of the House for a further conference.

The motion was agreed to.

By unanimous consent the President *pro tempore* was authorized to appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate, and Mr. HALE, Mr. ALLISON, and Mr. COCKRELL were appointed.

REDUCTION OF LETTER POSTAGE.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The Senator from Missouri [Mr. COCKRELL] moves that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

Mr. COCKRELL. I yield to the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MITCHELL] for a moment.

Mr. MITCHELL. Yesterday I gave notice that in the event that the Senate should be in session to-morrow I would ask the courtesy of the Senate to allow me to submit some remarks on the bill introduced by myself looking to the reduction of letter postage to 1 cent per ounce. As the Senate has agreed to adjourn over, I now give notice that on Monday next, at some convenient time which will not interfere with the discussson of the tariff measure I shall ask the courtesy of the Senate to permit me to submit a few remarks on that bill. At the suggestion of the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations [Mr. ALLISON], who has charge of the tariff bill, I will give notice that immediately after the morning business on Monday I shall ask leave to proceed with my remarks.

Mr. ALLISON. I desire to give notice in that connection that at the earliest possible moment on Monday morning I shall ask for the consideration of the tariff bill.

EXECUTIVE SESSION.

Mr. COCKRELL. I now renew my motion.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The Senator from Missouri moves that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business. After five minutes spent in executive session the doors were reopened, and (at 4 o'clock and 36 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until Monday, October 8, 1888, at 12 o'clock m.

NOMINATIONS.

Executive nominations received by the Senate October 4, 1888.

COLLECTOR OF CUSTOMS.

E. D. Lynn, of Texas, to be collector of customs for the district of Saluria, Tex., *vice* Otto L. Threlkeld, deceased.

PROMOTION IN THE ARMY.

Fourth Regiment of Cavalry.

First Lieut. James Parker, regimental quartermaster, to be captain, October 2, 1888, *vice* Lawton, who resigns his line commission only.

CONFIRMATIONS.

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate October 1, 1888.

INDIAN AGENT.

Beal Gaither, to be agent for the Indians of the Siletz agency, in Oregon.

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate October 2, 1888.

ASSAYER.

Van Court Yantis, of Missouri, to be assayer-in-charge of the United States assay office at St. Louis, Mo.

POSTMASTERS.

Charles H. Tracey, to be postmaster at Anaconda, in the county of Deer Lodge, Territory of Montana.

John P. Gasper, to be postmaster at Kingsley, in the county of Plymouth and State of Iowa.

INDIAN AGENT.

Samuel S. Sears, of Elko County, Nevada, to be agent for the Indians of the Nevada agency in Nevada.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

THURSDAY, *October* 4, 1888.

The House met at 12 o'clock m. Prayer by Rev. J. H. CUTHBERT, D. D.

The Journal of yesterday's proceedings was read and approved.

REFERENCE OF SENATE RESOLUTIONS.

The SPEAKER laid before the House the joint resolution (S. R. 104) to print additional copies of the United States map, of the edition of 1887, prepared by the Commissioner of Public Lands; which was read a first and second time, and referred to the Committee on Printing.

The SPEAKER also laid before the House the concurrent resolution of the Senate providing for the printing of 10,000 additional copies of the work known as The Growth of Industrial Art; which was referred to the Committee on Printing.

ABANDONED HOMESTEAD ENTRIES.

The SPEAKER also laid before the House the bill (S. 3559) to amend section 5304 of the Revised Statutes of the United States, to allow persons who have abandoned or relinquished their homestead entries to make another entry; with House amendments disagreed to by the Senate.

The SPEAKER. This bill has reached the stage where it is privileged, and if there be no objection, the House will insist upon its amendments, and agree to the conference.

There was no objection, and it was so ordered.

DR. JOHN B. READ.

The SPEAKER also laid before the House the request of the Senat. for the return of the bill (H. R. 10633) for the relief of Dr. John B. Read.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will state that on yesterday morning the House concurred in the Senate amendments to this bill; and if there be no objection the action of the House in that respect will be reconsidered, and the request of the Senate complied with.

There was no objection, and it was so ordered.

Some time subsequently,

The SPEAKER said: With reference to the bill, the return of which has been requested by the Senate, the Chair has ascertained that this bill was enrolled and signed by the Speaker on yesterday. If there be no objection, the Chair will direct an order to be made instructing the Clerk of the House to inform the Senate of the fact that before the request of the Senate was received the bill had been enrolled and signed by the Speaker.

Mr. HOOKER. What is the bill?

The SPEAKER. It is a House bill for the relief of Dr. John B. Read.

Mr. ROGERS. What is the present status of the bill?

The SPEAKER. It is in that position now, where, in order to secure its recall, it will be necessary that a concurrent resolution be passed by the two Houses.

If there be no objection, the order suggested by the Chair will be made.

There was no objection, and it was so ordered.

ADDITIONAL CLERK, COMMITTEE ON ENROLLED BILLS.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. KILGORE], a member of the Committee on Enrolled Bills, asks the consideration of the resolution which was objected to by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. EZRA B. TAYLOR] on yesterday, who subsequently informed the Chair that he withdrew his objection. The Chair will state that this resolution has been changed a little since it was offered on yesterday, and calls the attention of the gentleman from Ohio to that fact.

The Clerk will report the resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Enrolled Bills be authorized to employ one additional clerk at the rate of $6 per day for the remainder of this session of Congress, to be paid out of the contingent fund of the House, the compensation to commence on the 27th day of September last.

Mr. KILGORE. I suppose I should make a statement in regard to the resolution. It is perhaps not generally known to the House that there is no other member of the Committee on Enrolled Bills present except myself, and within the last three or four days there have been as many as two hundred bills reported by the committee. To each of these there must be appended four separate reports. They are short, it is true; but they must all be written, and it takes considerable time. The regular clerk has been on duty continuously almost night and day except when he was sick, and then he employed a man himself to take his place. In addition to that he has employed an assistant for the last two weeks to aid him in the work. There is a great accumulation of business, and it is impossible for the clerk and myself to do it without additional help.

Mr. EZRA B. TAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, under a misapprehension of the facts on yesterday morning I objected to this resolution; but on inquiry I found I was mistaken and sought to withdraw the objection then. I think undoubtedly it ought to pass, and I hope there will be no objection.

The resolution was considered and agreed to.

Mr. KILGORE moved to reconsider the vote by which the resolution was agreed to; and also moved that the motion to reconsider be laid on the table.

The latter motion was agreed to.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

A message from the Senate, by Mr. MCCOOK, its Secretary, announced that the Senate had agreed to the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 3573) granting the right of way to the Pensacola and Memphis Railroad Company over and through the public lands of the United States in the States of Florida, Alabama, Mississippi, and Tennessee, and granting the right of way to said railroad company over and through the United States naval and military reservations near Pensacola, in the State of Florida.

The message also communicated to the House the following order adopted by the Senate:

Ordered, That the Secretary return to the House of Representatives House enrolled bill No. 10633, entitled "An act for the relief of Dr. John Read," with the message that before the delivery of said enrolled bill to the Senate a motion had been made in the Senate pursuant to its rules to reconsider the vote of the Senate passing said original bill, and the Senate had ordered that the House of Representatives be requested to return said bill to the Senate.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. CARUTH, indefinitely, on account of important business.

Mr. BAKER, of New York. I desire to request leave of absence for my colleague, Mr. WEBER.

There was no objection, and leave was granted.

ORDER OF BUSINESS.

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Speaker, on last evening, while temporarily occupying the chair, the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. WHEELER] laid a request upon the desk asking leave to have some matter printed, I do not now remember what, which I inadvertently overlooked.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will be in during the day, and the Chair will call the attention of the House to it.

Mr. ROGERS. Very well.

MARITIME CANAL COMPANY, NICARAGUA.

Mr. DUNN. Mr. Speaker, I ask consideration of Senate bill 1305. I ask unanimous consent to discharge the Calendar and take up the bill at this time for consideration.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the title of the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 1305) to incorporate the Maritime Canal Company of Nicaragua.

Mr. DUNN. This bill was read on Monday last and printed in the RECORD, and I suppose the formal reading of the bill may now be dispensed with.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will submit the request of the gentleman from Arkansas to dispense with the reading of the bill.

Mr. DUNN. I desire to make this additional statement. I hope the bill will be taken up, and if so I shall allow all fair and reasonable time for its full discussion. I do not desire to hurry it through. It is a bill of great importance, one which has engaged national interest for years, and I trust no gentleman will object to its full and fair consideration.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill.

Mr. WASHINGTON. I dislike, of course, to object to any man's pet measure, but this is a bill of too great importance to be considered in a House like this though I would not object to its consideration in a full House. I know there are a great many members who desire to offer amendments and debate the bill, who are not present.

Mr. DUNN. I desire to say to the gentleman from Tennessee that the fullest opportunity will be given to offer amendments. We could at least go on and debate the bill.

Mr. WASHINGTON. The members who desire to offer the amendments are not present.

Mr. BAYNE. I would suggest to the gentleman from Tennessee, if the bill be taken up and considered, he could at any time intercept its progress by making the point of no quorum.

Mr. DUNN. I hope the gentleman from Tennessee will allow the bill to be considered, and then after hearing and participating in the consideration, if he sees proper to do so, he can make the point of no quorum on the final passage of the bill, and so let it go over until a quorum appears.

Mr. BURNES. I would like to suggest to my friend from Arkansas [Mr. DUNN] that I could not consent to the bill being considered at length until after the House shall have acted on the conference report.

Mr. DUNN. I thought that was disposed of.

Mr. BURNES. It has not been, but will take but a short time this morning.

Mr. DUNN. I was not present at the close of the House yesterday, but I thought final action had been taken on the conference report.

The SPEAKER. Does the Chair understand that the gentleman from Tennessee objects?

Mr. WASHINGTON. I do.

Mr. DUNN. I hope the gentleman from Tennessee will withdraw his objection and make the point of no quorum on the final passage.

Mr. BAYNE. By that means the gentleman from Tennessee will have control of the bill.

Mr. WASHINGTON. I would state in reply to the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. DUNN] that were we to go on with the consideration of the bill it would merely entangle the House in a call of the House from the mere fact that there is no quorum present.

Mr. DUNN. That could be obviated by having consideration of the bill, and then on the final passage the point of no quorum could be made and the consideration of the bill could be abandoned and go over until a quorum appears hereafter.

Mr. BAYNE. We could arrive at a satisfactory conclusion with reference to that.

Mr. WASHINGTON. I do not withdraw my objection for the present.

ORDER OF BUSINESS.

Mr. HOOKER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent——

The SPEAKER. The Chair has recognized the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. DUNN], and under the practice will now recognize a gentleman on the other side of the House.

PETROLEUM AS FUEL ON STEAMERS.

Mr. VANDEVER. I ask unanimous consent to discharge the Committee on the Revision of the Laws from the further consideration of the bill (S. 3427) to amend section 4474 of the Revised Statutes of the United States.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will read the bill, after which the Chair will ask for objections.

The bill was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 4474 of the Revised Statutes of the United States be, and the same is hereby, amended by adding thereto the following: *Provided, however*, That the Secretary of the Treasury may permit the use of petroleum as fuel on steamers not carrying passengers without the certificate of the supervising inspector of the district where the vessel is to be used, subject to such conditions and safeguards as the Secretary of the Treasury in his judgment shall provide. For a violation of any of the conditions imposed by the Secretary of the Treasury a penalty of $500 shall be imposed, which penalty shall be a lien upon the vessel, but a bond may, as provided in other cases, be given to secure the satisfaction of the judgment.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection. [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. OATES. Mr. Speaker, I desire to say that the bill having been referred to a committee of which I am a member I have examined the subject. I can see no objection to the passage of the bill and I hope no objection will be interposed. It is simply to enable vessels not carrying passengers to use petroleum as fuel, and has the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury.

The SPEAKER. If there be no objection the committee will be discharged from the further consideration of the bill and it will be considered at this time.

There was no objection.

The bill was ordered to a third reading; and it was accordingly read the third time, and passed.

Mr. VANDEVER moved to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed; and also moved that the motion to reconsider be laid on the table.

The latter motion was agreed to.

ORDER OF BUSINESS.

Mr. PEEL. I ask unanimous consent to take up for consideration the bill which I send to the Clerk's desk.

Mr. KILGORE. I demand the regular order.

APPOINTMENT OF CONFEREES.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will appoint as managers of the conference on the part of the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the bill (S. 3559) to amend section 2304 of the Revised Statutes of the United States, to allow honorably discharged soldiers and sailors of the late war who have abandoned or relinquished their homestead entries before the expiration of the six months allowed by section 2304 of the Revised Statutes to make another entry, the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. MCRAE], the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. WHEELER], and the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. HERMANN].

The regular order is the call of committees for reports.

GENERAL DEFICIENCY BILL.

Mr. BURNES. As a matter of privilege, I ask for the further consideration of the report of the committee of conference on the general deficiency bill.

Mr. WHITTHORNE. Will the gentleman yield to me for one moment?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. KILGORE] has demanded the regular order.

Mr. WHITTHORNE. But the gentleman from Missouri has the floor.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas has demanded the regular order.

Mr. WHITTHORNE. I wanted to ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of a bill to relieve certain citizens of Nevada.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas has demanded the regular order, and the Chair has no discretion but to proceed under that order.

Mr. BURNES. I ask the Clerk to read amendments 112 and 113.

The Clerk read as follows:

Industrial Christian Home Association of Utah Territory: To further aid the Industrial Christian Home Association of Utah Territory, under its articles of incorporation, in the establishment and maintenance of an industrial and educational institution in Salt Lake City for the benefit of the dependent women and children of Utah and Idaho Territories who desire to sever their allegiance to the Mormon Church, $75,000; and for contingent expenses of the association, $5,000; in all, $80,000.

The money hereby appropriated shall be disbursed by the treasurer of said association, who shall give such bonds for the faithful performance of his duties as may be deemed requisite by the Secretary of the Interior. All accounts of expenditures under this appropriation shall be audited by the Utah Commission, which shall hereafter act as the board of control for said institution, and shall make an annual report to Congress covering the work of said institution and its expenditures.

Mr. ROGERS. Will the gentleman from Missouri yield to me a moment for a suggestion? Reverting to the aqueduct investigation here, in view of the fact that this conference report will go back to the committee of conference, it has occurred to me since that matter was up here yesterday that if there was any doubt at all about the resolution as it now stands being broad enough in its scope to authorize the committee to have engineers from civil life employed to make further investigation into the character of the work, it ought to be made sufficiently broad to accomplish that purpose; because in a matter of so much importance, involving a couple of million of dollars—it will probably involve that amount before we get through with it—and where the derelictions seem to lie at the door of the Engineer Department of the Government, it may not be safe for the committee to rely exclusively upon investigations made by that department. If, on the other hand, the committee should find that it will not be necessary to employ civil engineers to look into the matter further, then of course the expense need not be incurred. But we can not tell in what direction or in what line an investigation of this kind may extend, and I think the resolution should be made broad enough to enable the committee to call in engineers from civil life, if they shall find it necessary or important to do so.

Mr. BURNES. I think the resolution is broad enough to cover the suggestion of the gentleman from Arkansas. That part of the resolution which provides that the committee shall have power to employ experts would, I think, cover the point.

Mr. ROGERS. If so, of course my suggestion is not necessary.

Mr. BURNES. But the committee will consider the matter carefully and thoroughly. The object of the committee—and if we do not accomplish it we shall fail only in ability—is to have a full and thorough investigation, so that all the information upon the subject that can possibly be of any value may be obtained and communicated to the House. But if the resolution shall be found insufficient it will be enlarged in conference.

Mr. Speaker, the Senate amendments which have just been read are to my mind exceedingly——

Mr. ROGERS. Novel.

Mr. BURNES. I was about to say ridiculous. It is difficult to select a proper word to describe them. They are, thanks to my friend from Arkansas, most novel, unique, unparalleled, and unprecedented. They do not express a high order of business judgment or discretion, nor that practical common sense which we usually expect from a Congressman, even if he serves elsewhere than in this House.

I wish to call particular attention to the language of these amendments. The first proposition is that $80,000, including $5,000 for contingent expenses, shall now be appropriated and placed in the hands of the treasurer of the Industrial Christian Home Association of Utah Territory to further aid that institution, under its articles of incorporation, in the establishment and maintenance of an industrial and educational institution in Salt Lake City, for the benefit of the dependent women and children of Utah and Idaho Territories who desire to "sever their allegiance to the Mormon Church."

The second amendment provides, substantially, that this money shall be used by this private corporation, without limitation or restriction, upon a mere sentimentality which underlies the whole proposition.

In order to have before the House all the law bearing upon the subject I will commence with the commencement.

The first provision with regard to the matter will be found in the sundry civil appropriation bill for the year ending June 30, 1887. It was an amendment put upon that bill by the Senate (and in the conference the House was compelled to yield, or did yield, to it at the time), and was intended merely to aid in the support of indigent women and children whom the rigors of Federal laws against polygamy had made homeless and husbandless and fatherless. It is as follows:

INDUSTRIAL HOME IN UTAH TERRITORY.

That is not the name of the private corporation now figuring in our deliberations.

To aid in the establishment of an industrial home in the Territory of Utah to provide employment and means of self-support for the dependent women who renounce polygamy, and the children of such women, of tender age, in said Territory, with a view to aid in the suppression of polygamy therein, $40,000; said sum to be expended upon requisition of and under the management of a board of control, to consist of the governor, the justices of the supreme court, and the district attorney of said Territory; and the said board shall duly and properly expend said sum, or so much thereof as may be necessary for the purpose herein indicated, and shall, from time to time, report to the President their acts and doings and expenditures hereunder for transmission to Congress.

I ought perhaps to say in this connection that the Senate amendment was for $50,000; but in conference the Senate submitted to a reduction of $10,000, making the amount $40,000.

Under the provision of law just read the board of management proceeded to rent a private residence in the city of Salt Lake, for which they agreed to pay $45 per month; and at an expense of some $2,000 they furnished this house, and placed it in charge of some ladies representing this private corporation. For ten months the institution thus established was carried on by them, when for some reason or other the representatives of the corporation alluded to came to Congress, and, as we learned from a speech made the other day in another body, and through a distinguished gentleman from the State of Vermont, prepared an amendment to the general deficiency bill, and had it incorporated therein. That Senate amendment on the general deficiency bill, at the last session of the Forty-ninth Congress, was acquiesced in by the conferees on the part of the House. It is a very peculiar amendment. Another peculiar feature of the proceedings which have been had in reference to this matter——

Mr. STRUBLE. Will the gentleman permit an interruption?

Mr. BURNES. Yes, sir.

Mr. STRUBLE. In order that I may clearly understand this matter, I wish to ask whether the gentleman is now referring to the first appropriation made by the Forty-ninth Congress.

Mr. BURNES. I have just referred to the first appropriation, and am now referring to the second.

Mr. STRUBLE. Was not the first appropriation made by the Forty-ninth Congress?

Mr. BURNES. The first was made at the first session of the Forty-ninth Congress; and the second was attempted to be made at the second session of the Forty-ninth Congress.

Mr. STRUBLE. And that is the one you are now referring to?

Mr. BURNES. It is. It will be remembered that at the second session of the Forty-ninth Congress the general deficiency bill failed for want of time, as alleged, on the part of the Senate. In consequence of that failure the provision of course did not take effect; but in the agreement between the representatives of the two Houses upon these questions, the general deficiency bill, which failed at the closing session of the Forty-ninth Congress, was made a special deficiency bill at this session of Congress; that is to say, all that had been agreed upon in conference was made the subject of a special deficiency bill except where circumstances had demonstrated that an appropriation was unnecessary.

This was done in order to remedy promptly the evils which the failure of the bill had caused. The bill, thus framed, contained this second amendment of the Senate, which I will now proceed to consider; and I want to call the attention of gentlemen particularly to the growing desire therein manifest, to take the expenditure of this money out of proper hands and place it in unofficial hands, and hands perhaps but poorly qualified for the business-like disposition of large sums of money:

Industrial Christian Home: To aid the Industrial Christian Home Association of Utah—

There, for the first time, we strike the corporate name of this private corporation organized under the laws of the Territory of Utah—

in carrying on under its articles of incorporation the work of providing employment and means of self-support for the dependent women who shall have renounced polygamy, and their children of tender age, $40,000.

That is $40,000 in addition to the first appropriation.

But the unexpended balance of the appropriation for aiding in the establishment of an industrial home in the Territory of Utah contained in the act of Congress approved August 4, 1886, entitled "An act making appropriations for sundry civil expenses of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1887, and for other purposes," shall be deemed a part of this appropriation; and the board of control mentioned in said former appropriation shall audit the expenditures under this appropriation and report yearly to the Secretary of the Interior."

I want gentlemen to observe particularly that in this attempt to change the responsibility, and I may say official management in the expenditure of this money, insufficient language was used, for it says, "the board of control mentioned in said former appropriation shall audit the expenditures." It was an added duty on the board. It did not repeal the law making them a board of control in the expenditure of the money. It was an attempt to reduce the board of control to the position of mere auditing officers with reference to the expenditures to be made, as was hoped by this private corporation. But fortunately the Secretary of the Treasury, and perhaps others, took the view that this language did not effect the object desired, that the board of management was not displaced by reason of this provision; and consequently that the board of management remained the same under the second law as under the first, and lawfully controlled the expenditure of all the money appropriated. It has been claimed, however, by the corporation authorities, and by gentlemen who control this project in the other end of the Capitol, that the second law vested the right of expending these appropriations in the private corporation called the

"Industrial Christian Home Association of Utah;" but notwithstanding the law, that corporation, it is said, has consented that Governor West shall hold the money, but allow the corporation to expend it as it pleases.

Contrast the pending propositions with the preceding legislation and you will find that what was not even intimated in the first proposition, but which was attempted in the second provision of legislation, is now boldly attempted by this third effort on the part of gentlemen, and to take this appropriation from the control of legitimate officials and place it in the hands of private persons or a private corporation. I do not know how far I can make allusion to speeches made in the other end of the Capitol or language used in conference, but I feel authorized to go as far as gentlemen have gone in discussing this proposition in the Senate. Therefore I say in the conference, we were told distinctly that the language used severing "allegiance from the Mormon Church" was absolutely and indispensably necessary and would not be yielded under any circumstances.

It was regarded by your conferees as a proposition in the nature of offering a home and provisions—in short a bribe under pretense of charity—to poor deluded women, as we think, to induce them to "sever their allegiance to a church." In such an affair as that we can not consent to be a party. We seek to avoid all interference in matters ecclesiastic, and have nothing to do, in making appropriations, with severing church allegiance.

No member of this House will be accused of any relationship to this church I trust, because he is of opinion that it is not the province of our Government to enter the field of churchmen as a proselyte, although it has been said in another place than this that the Mormon Church is actively opposed to the legislation under consideration. I presume gentlemen who make such a statement have some information in support of it and have not recklessly made the hazard of an assertion that they ought to be prepared to maintain as a fact.

The House Committee on Appropriations have seen nothing tending to justify the remarks to which I have alluded. No member of that committee has been advised by the Mormon Church or any of its representatives, if any such are here. If they have given their confidences to members of another body it was their right, and we do not complain.

We take notice of the laws of the country and learn from them that polygamy is forbidden; that it is under the ban of Congressional legislation, and ought to be eradicated, even if a constitutional amendment were required to accomplish the work. But our work ends with polygamy and does not reach over into the realm of church allegiance, or into the moral consciences of men or women. The fact of polygamy is to be assailed. We attack its practices as a crime, and punish those who commit it. But we punish the body and not the soul of a criminal. We punish for acts not thoughts—for words, sometimes, but never for sentiments entertained.

A distinguished gentleman said elsewhere on Tuesday:

> Whatever lapses there have been on the part of Congress and the Executive in dealing with the monstrous evil of polygamy in Utah and the adjacent Territories of the United States; however delinquent the Government may have been in dealing with that evil, and however much the Mormon hierarchy may have profited by these lapses and delinquencies, no part of the fault for all this can be laid at the door of the women of America.

What "lapses" on the part of the Executive have occurred? Have gentlemen so soon forgotten the noble words of the President in behalf of the sanctity of the home and of the institution of marriage? Have they no remembrance of the grand results of his administration, which have almost destroyed polygamy from the face of our land? It seems that one gentleman at least has the courage of insinuation, if he lacks the courage to make a direct statement. He intimates that there have been lapses in dealing with polygamy on the part of the President.

I do not wish to say one word which would be unpleasant to my friends on my right, not a word. But it is due to the President of the United States. I should say that thirty years ago the Republican party denominated the institution of polygamy as the twin relic of barbarism and promised the country to destroy it; but like many other promises made in the past concerning great national questions it has not been redeemed. Nor was any practical progress made by administrative or executive action until the present administration of Grover Cleveland came into power.

True, there was some legislation prior, some feeble efforts from time to time; but for twenty-four years of Republican administration we had no results in the destruction of this great evil by administrative effort and practically none by legislation. But in four years of this Administration polygamy has been practically destroyed.

Criticism should have been avoided by the gentleman, as it has made necessary a contrast between the results of twenty-four years of Republican administration with four years of Democratic administration, and by such contrast there are gentlemen who will be put to an open shame, much to my regret.

Mr. Speaker, what this House through its conferees offered to do in order to harmonize with the Senate on these amendments——

Mr. DINGLEY. Will the gentleman pardon me for interrupting him just there in order that I may understand exactly the position of this matter? Do I understand the gentleman to state that the Senate conferees refused to take from amendment No. 112 the words to which he has referred—"who desire to sever their allegiance to the Mormon Church?"

Mr. BURNES. Yes, sir. When the conferees of the House reached these amendments they were told that the words quoted by the distinguished gentleman from Maine would not be surrendered under any circumstances, and it was not until the second day of the conference we were told that if we could agree upon the other conditions they, the Senate conferees, would waive the language "sever their allegiance to the Mormon Church."

Mr. DINGLEY. Because I understood that the Senate conferees took the position that they were entirely willing to surrender these words; that they were not essential.

Mr. BURNES. That was done at the last moment, and not until near the expiration of the conference, but we now make no issue upon that. It may be considered as yielded by the Senate conferees. But it is still in the Senate amendment and is before the House.

Now, what is the pending proposition? It is a proposition, as it stands, to take $135,000, with six or eight or ten thousand dollars (we know not how much) of it expended, $40,000 of which are now in the hands of the governor of Utah Territory, and place it all in the hands of a private corporation controlled by individual people living, some in Salt Lake City, some in one place, and some in another, mainly, I may say, married women whose business qualifications have never been successfully demonstrated, so far as I know, upon any field of business activity or in any branch of business enterprise. Their respectability is not called in question; their business capacities and experience are, perhaps, practically untried.

Mr. STRUBLE. Will the gentleman pardon me for a moment to ask whether or not it is true that there are gentlemen of respectability residing in the city of Salt Lake who are connected with the institution as members of the board of directors, or in some such capacity?

Mr. BURNES. There are names appearing in the articles of incorporation that indicate that there are men connected with it; but I can say that the life and the soul and the body of the whole institution is the creation of a lady of rare mental and moral endowments—Mrs. Newman—who has represented its interests here from the beginning. Whatever names may be used, and whatever gentlemen may be in the background, this institution is one of women.

Mr. DINGLEY. Just as in the case of many other beneficial and reformatory institutions, I suppose.

Mr. BURNES. Certainly. I have no objection to make to that; but that, as you will see when I come to state the ground upon which we offer to harmonize, has a direct bearing on the suggestion made by the House conferees, and I think you will see and admit that the proposition of the House conferees was just, fair, and even liberal. We say to the Senate conferees, you want a home, a permanent home, if you please, into which can be received the destitute women and children who have abandoned or proposed to abandon polygamy. You want a new house on a new lot, and you want that house furnished, and you want annual supplies from the Government, almost exclusively. A little is expected, perhaps from private contributions or private charity, but it is practically admitted in the papers here that the institution must rest upon the Government of the United States for yearly maintenance. We say we will let this institution be established, we will build you a house that will cost $50,000—that is, the house they want—we will build this house and furnish it and provide all the money necessary to accomplish these ends.

When we shall have built you this house and furnished it we will place it under the control and in the hands of the corporation represented by Mrs. Newman and her associates for management as a public institution of the United States. They shall manage it. We will define simply by law or regulation the classes of people who shall be admitted into the institution; and in that respect I will say that we offered and again offer to make these classes embrace all the people who it is claimed have been rejected under the management of Governor West; that is to say, in the report of the commission and of the corporation it appears that certain classes of women were not allowed to be admitted into the home, such, for instance, as first wives and girls who had been introduced into the Territory, not knowing that polygamy was one of the institutions of the church.

Now, so far as the classes are concerned, we propose, after we shall have built this house on business principles, and after we shall have furnished it to their heart's content, to place it under the control of this private corporation and make an appropriation for its support which that corporation will expend. Five thousand dollars are asked for contingent expenses.

This private corporation has some contingent expenses. For what? It is alleged that it is to pay traveling expenses of parties who will have to go East or elsewhere in search of teachers, in search of people who are to take charge of the interests of the institution, etc.; and also to pay the expenses of indigent females who want to enter the home, but who can not get from their places of residence to the city of Salt Lake where the home is to be located. We are disposed to recognize the great work of Mrs. Newman as justifying a proper payment to her for

expenses incurred and to be incurred in behalf of the enterprise, whatever of success or non-success may result; and for that purpose, and that alone, we would probably agree to one-half the sum proposed for contingent expenses.

Mr. STRUBLE. Will the gentleman permit me to interrupt him before he passes from that to the discussion of other points? I would like to inquire what the conferees propose in regard to who shall decide upon the admissions to this home? I understand that up to this time the authority to decide that question rested with the governor of Utah; and I would like to hear if the matter has been discussed, and, if it is proper to disclose it, what the conferees of the House proposed to the conferees of the Senate on that point.

Mr. BURNES. I have stated, and will state again, that these ladies claim that there were certain classes of applicants for admission into the home which were rejected by Governor West, in consequence of which some forty or fifty destitute women and children were deprived of the benefits of this home. That is the claim that has been made.

Mr. STRUBLE. That much I remember.

Mr. BURNES. I have seen the statement of this corporation as to the classes that it alleges have been denied admission by Governor West, and also the claim of the corporation as to the classes it desires to have admitted, and if I am not mistaken as to its suggestions, we are willing to recognize those classes as proper objects for admission into the institution.

Mr. STRUBLE. And the authority of deciding upon that rests still with the Government?

Mr. BURNES. Not at all.

Mr. STRUBLE. Then I would like to know in whom the conferees propose to repose this authority.

Mr. BURNES. It was reposed wholly by law. We prefer to define the classes by law, but it can be done by regulations from time to time by the Interior Department. In view of the fact that other and new classes may be presented in the future for admission, we think in some respects the giving of the power to the Secretary of the Interior to make from time to time regulations as to these classes of people to be admitted will prove convenient and advantageous.

But, if it is objected that the Secretary of the Interior ought not to be allowed from time to time to make regulations defining the classes of people who are to be admitted to a Government institution, which the Government has to pay for and support, and the subject should not be settled by law, but left to the will of this corporation, then, indeed, we can not too quickly abandon the whole business and employ some one by contract to take care of and maintain all the poor of Utah Territory.

Mr. STRUBLE. The reason I asked the question was that I had an intimation that it was the fault of the conferees to suggest, or to provide, or to endeavor to provide, that the Secretary of the Interior should be authorized to decide upon certain classes or upon all classes not distinctly provided for in the law that should be admitted to the home.

Mr. BURNES. We suggested to the conferees on the part of the Senate that in our judgment vesting this power in the Secretary of the Interior would give an elasticity to the powers of the corporation that would not exist if we put the regulations in the law. But upon that provision the Senatorial conferees can take their choice. They can either embrace all these classes in the law or they can allow the Secretary of the Interior from time to time to define the classes that shall be admitted.

When this new building is finished and furnished it goes into the hands of this corporation without limitation or restraint as to the domestic management. They should be required to make report as to how they expend the money, and be required to expend it in the support of the classes of people nominated in the law or nominated in the regulations of the Secretary of the Interior. That certainly is not an unreasonable requirement.

As for Governor West and the judges of the supreme court, they have established this home and have managed its affairs for nearly two years. They have not failed to act in accord with the representatives of the corporation so far as the law allowed; and the success of the management can be understood in view of the fact that the highest number of inmates in the home at any one time was twenty-seven, and the average of such inmates has not been more than seven.

Mr. DINGLEY. I would like to ask the gentleman whether the reason for that does not lie in the fact that the governor rejected a large proportion of those whom the institution was intended to benefit—somewhat over one hundred, for example, in ten months.

Mr. BURNES. A claim of that sort is made by the representatives of the corporation, but after two years of effort, two years of advertisement, and an extraordinary appropriation almost without restraint or restriction in its expenditure, the inmates of the home to-day are one woman and five children.

It has been reported to us officially that $6,900 were expended for the first ten months in and about the institution. The expenditures since have not been reported officially, but in one of the papers I find it stated by the corporation that the amount expended up to August last is $13,500. At this point I want to call the attention of the House to a business fact. The gentlemen who discussed this question with us in conference, and one of them who has addressed another legislative body upon it, have labored under the delusion that only $40,000 had been appropriated for this institution. By telegraphing to the Treasury Department I have learned that during the first ten months of the existence of the institution there was drawn from the Treasury $10,000 in four equal installments, and in July last $40,000 was drawn; making $50,000 in all that passed from the Treasury into the hands of this board of management and control.

I find in the reports made here no mention by any of the parties out in Salt Lake City of more than $40,000. It is not stated in any paper or report that the amount is more than $40,000; yet the fact is that they have received $50,000. I ought to say, however, that they have paid back about $1,100, leaving $48,800, or thereabouts, in the hands of these people, or some of them, I presume in the hands of the governor. What use he could have had for the last $40,000 is not explained.

In his hands for what? To support one women and five children! Now, my friend from Maine [Mr. DINGLEY] asks me whether there would not have been inmates of this home if Governor West had been more liberal in admissions.

Mr. DINGLEY. Before the gentleman leaves that point, I would like to ask whether there is not a building in course of construction, upon which there has been a considerable amount expended apart from the mere expenses of carrying on the institution, which is rented?

Mr. BURNES. I heard a speech the other day in another place, and in that speech I heard the statement that our proposition was to build this home through the agency of the Treasury Department, and that on that plan it would require three years to finish it; but that already the foundations were laid and the work was rapidly progressing on the central part of the building. That was the first time I had ever heard the statement that work had been commenced on the new building.

I believe that if any contract were made, it was without authority of law, even conditioned to take effect upon a further appropriation by Congress. I do not believe the work is in progress, but I do not know; I do not assert it as a fact that it is not, but I have no information that would justify me in believing that it is.

Mr. DINGLEY. Having suggested the statement by my question, I now wish to name my informant. I learned from Mrs. Newman, who has been more prominent, perhaps, than any other lady in this matter, that a building is in process of construction, and that the walls are up, or nearly up; at any rate, that some $18,000 has been expended upon the building.

Mr. BURNES. All I need say in reply to that is that I have very great respect for Mrs. Newman and for any statement she makes. Mrs. Newman, however, has not been there for some time, and I am quite certain that if she makes that statement she is mistaken. At least I have had no such information from Mrs. Newman, and I have conferred with her upon the subject. I need not repeat what I have already said, that I have great respect for her statements and great respect for her, but I can not believe that this work is in progress, as has been stated by the gentleman from Maine.

I find in these papers before me, coming from this corporation, that a lot was bought and a contract let for the erection of a building by the corporation, to cost $18,000; that the corporation has done this under the provisions of the second law which I read. I call attention to the fact that there is no power given to this corporation to make any such contract, there is no power given to it to spend one dollar in the erection of a new building or in the purchase of ground. Indeed I may say there is no power given to the corporation to handle one dollar of this money except at the discretion of the board of control, of which the governor is chairman.

This sum of $40,000 is now in the hands of the governor out there. It is said that $10,500 have been paid for a lot. But I will not stand upon the fact that neither the corporation nor the board of control had any more power to buy that lot than I had. They say they have bought a lot for $10,500. I am willing the Government shall take the lot, shall recognize the transaction, irregular as it is, recognize the expenditure, and have the title of the lot made to the Government. Then they say that there is a contract to build on that lot an $18,000 house, and that the plan contemplates ultimately its extension. Now, I will go further and say that if there be such a contract, I am willing, in the spirit of healing the business judgment of the corporation managers, to have a provision made which shall take care of any such contract, if one has been made. If in good faith there has been a contract made and the work is progressing, I am willing that we shall recognize it, and carry it on to completion under the contract.

Mr. RYAN. Let me ask my colleague on the committee a question at this point. Suppose it be true that there is a contract for the construction of this building—the entire building—a portion of it contingent upon further appropriations, how is it practicable under such circumstances to turn the work over to the Treasury Department?

Mr. BURNES. I answer my friend and associate in just this way: So far as that alleged contract is concerned, we will ascertain its condi-

tion; and if there be a valid contract, a contract entitled to the respectful consideration of any gentleman on this floor, we will take care of that in its order and according to the necessities of the case.

Mr. RYAN. Ah, but that does not answer my question. I assume that there is a contract for the construction of a building, that it provides for constructing a building according to certain plans and specifications. Now the question I ask is this: If you are to carry out that contract in good faith, how are you to turn the work over to the Secretary of the Treasury?

Mr. BURNES. I was going to say further, in answer to my colleague, that if the work is in that condition we will set apart the $18,000 contracted to be paid for it and let the work be finished. But the additional work, the work on the wings or extensions, is not under contract; that is not pretended by anybody.

Mr. RYAN. It is pretended that it is under contract, subject only to the contingency of Congress making appropriation to pay for the work?

Mr. BURNES. Then, if that contingency exists, we are not bound to recognize the contract as extending to the wings, because in making the appropriation we can provide that we will not ratify the contract to that extent.

The Secretary of the Treasury can, through his agents and instrumentalities, extend this building, erect the additional buildings; and I call the attention of my colleague on the committee to the fact that in the estimates sent in here by this corporation it is expressly stated that they want $50,000 for the purpose of putting another story upon this building now under contract. That is business for you with a vengeance—they contract for the erection of a building with ample means under their control, and then ask more money to put another story upon it! I give this as a sample of the business wisdom with which this money will be expended if placed under the control of this corporation.

It is said the treasurer of this private corporation is to give a bond for the faithful distribution of this money; and it is also said that we have used the word "he" in the law, and that this necessarily implies that the treasurer must be a male, although at present I understand the treasurer is a female, under disability with regard to making bonds in consequence of being a married woman. What sort of a bond would a married woman make as treasurer for the disbursement of United States funds?

Away with all that! I am perfectly willing for this money to be expended as all other moneys of the United States are expended—by a proper disbursing officer to be appointed under existing law. If those who ask this appropriation object to accepting the money in that way, then it is not so much the institution that they want, it is not so much the suppression of polygamy that they are after, as it is the cash in the hands of irresponsible parties who are not officially authorized to receive it.

Mr. STRUBLE. Has the gentleman examined the statutes of Utah sufficiently to be able to state that under those statutes a woman can not give bond in a case like this?

Mr. BURNES. I have not; it may be that she can.

Mr. STRUBLE. I understand the laws are very liberal out there. I did not know but that in this respect the law might be as it is in the State of Iowa. In our State a woman can give bonds.

Mr. BURNES. I will ask to have printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks some of the documents to which I have alluded, so that this whole matter may be made of record for subsequent legislators who may be called to consider it.

I close by saying that we are perfectly willing to give to this institution the control of the building and its management. We are perfectly willing to define by law the classes of inmates, or to give the Secretary of the Interior authority to regulate from time to time what classes shall be admitted, with a view of extirpating polygamy. We are willing that the purchase of the lot shall be recognized and the lot turned over to the Government. If there has been a contract made in good faith and work done under it, if the foundations have been laid as alleged, we are willing to recognize that work. It was never claimed until yesterday that any more work had been done than the laying of the foundations; now we are told that the work is already finished, or nearly so.

We are willing to recognize this thing in good faith. We are willing to create a great charitable institution. We are willing to do anything to suppress polygamy, We are willing this private corporation shall have control of it. We are willing to take this contingent fund and make provision for the payment of the services of Mrs. Newman, who has represented it from its inception and who ought to be paid something for her services if we recognize this institution at all. We are willing to do this, and the only thing between the inclination of our minds and gentlemen on the part of the Senate is that we will not allow this money to be transferred from the hands of Governor West to the less responsible hands of the treasurer of a private corporation, but insist that the money shall be placed in the hands of a disbursing officer under the United States. And that is all there is between us to-day.

It is simply a question who shall expend this money for the building of this new house. The old house is there. They are occupying it. Let them continue to occupy it. They have properly the control of it. They have properly the right to operate it until we build this new building. Let us build it as rapidly as possible. Let us make it as complete as possible; but when we do it we say we will do it in our own way, and that the expenditure shall be under the control of the disbursing officer of the United States. We want to do it in the right way.

Mr. STRUBLE. What way is the right way? The Senate amendment contemplates the expenditure under the appropriation made shall be audited by the Utah Commission, which shall hereafter, in the language of the amendment, act as a board of control for such institution and shall make an annual report, etc. If I understand the gentleman from Missouri correctly, he has argued against any authority being reposed in this private corporation or industrial home organized under the laws of Utah.

Mr. BURNES. No, sir.

Mr. STRUBLE. You have argued against giving them any such power.

Mr. BURNES. Only as relates to the building of this house.

Mr. STRUBLE. What objection has the gentleman to giving the power which the language of the amendment confers upon the Utah Commission?

Mr. BURNES. What objection can the gentleman urge against placing the expenditure of this money in the hands of the proper disbursing officer of the United States?

Mr. STRUBLE. I have no objection to that, but it seems to me as made the proposition is liable to change the power of control from the governor, judges, and district attorney and establish another board with power and responsibility connected with it, and that is objectionable.

Mr. BURNES. I have two objections. In the first place, it is legislating still further on an appropriation bill; and in the second place, the Utah Commission can be no better prepared to attend to this than the present board of control. But your amendment proposes to take it away so far as the expenditure of the money is concerned from the board you allude to.

Mr. STRUBLE. Permit me a single question. The governor of Utah in his report recommends the governor, judges, and district attorney shall be relieved from these duties.

Mr. BURNES. I know the gentleman wants to be fair.

Mr. STRUBLE. I do, certainly.

Mr. BURNES. The governor of course realizes, as we all do, there is a manifest impropriety or inconvenience in his having the control of the expenditure of the money for the ordinary current expenses of the institution; but the governor has never yet intimated, if his duty were to build or furnish a building under the direction of the Secretary of the Treasury, he would not have time to attend to that. The Senate gives the management away from the Government and gives the general management to the corporation. We are trying to put this money in a safe, business-like channel, and that is all.

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, I can scarcely comprehend the motive of my estimable colleague [Mr. BURNES] in trying to give a partisan character to this discussion. It will strike those who are familiar with the legislation of Congress for the suppression of polygamy, and those Christian people, men and women, throughout the United States who have been engaged for years in efforts to suppress polygamy in the Territory, as somewhat remarkable that a member should stand on the floor of this House and declare that until Grover Cleveland raised his strong arm against polygamy nothing was done in this country to eradicate it.

Mr. SAYERS. Allow me a question right here.

Mr. RYAN. To all those familiar with that legislation, to all those who have been engaged in efforts to suppress polygamy in the Territory——

Mr. SAYERS. Will the gentleman permit a question?

Mr. RYAN. If the gentleman will wait a moment until I conclude the sentence. I say to all those familiar with that legislation, and engaged in efforts to suppress polygamy, that statement of the gentleman will appear somewhat remarkable, and they will be disposed, at least, to give my colleague the full measure of credit for originality.

Mr. EZRA B. TAYLOR. And the Mormons themselves seem to misunderstand the position.

Mr. RYAN. The suggestion just made by my friend from Ohio will strike the country with great force. There must be a low degree of intelligence among the Mormons, they must grossly misapprehend the situation, if it be really true that the Democratic party and this Administration are such terrible enemies of their pet institution. So far as I remember, no Representative has ever been sent to this House by Mormon votes who has occupied a seat on the Republican side of it. They have always been politically associated upon the floor of the House with the Democratic side, and with my colleague who has just lauded Grover Cleveland and the Democratic party for completely eradicating this evil from the Territory of Utah. Why, sir, when a gentleman stands on this floor and declares that polygamy has been to any considerable degree suppressed in the Territory of Utah he talks that about which he knows evidently but little. It exists there to-day in well-nigh all its

former proportions; and the most that can be said is that honest efforts are being made to suppress it.

Mr. SAYERS. Will the gentleman now yield for a question?

Mr. RYAN. I will, with pleasure.

Mr. SAYERS. In 1862 and 1882 Congress passed two acts, highly penal in their character, against polygamy. Will the gentleman inform us how many prosecutions under Republican administrations were instituted and conducted under those two acts? Will the gentleman please answer that question?

Mr. RYAN. I have not investigated the subject.

Mr. SAYERS. I will tell you——

Mr. RYAN. The gentleman can take his own time; I decline to be interrupted for the purpose of having injected a speech in my remarks.

Mr. SAYERS. I will take my own time.

Mr. RYAN. This I will say, that so far as I know all measures that have originated in Congress for the suppression of polygamy have originated on the Republican side of the House or in a Republican Senate; and if there has ever been a voice raised or a vote cast against legislation of this character, it has not come from the Republican side of either House.

Mr. FARQUHAR. The House has followed the initiative of the Senate always.

Mr. RYAN. Always, I believe.

Now, sir, I do do not care much about this feature of the question. I did not come here this morning with any idea that anything of a partisan nature would arise in this discussion. I thought we would discuss the subject before the House and nothing else, and to that I propose for a moment to address myself.

The organized Christian women of this country, represented very largely by the National Women's Christian Temperance Union and the National Women's Home Missionary Society, representing over 300,000 women of America, have had for years their attention turned towards this great evil. Mrs. Newman, one of the noblest women in this country, has devoted her energies, her ability, and great heart to the suppression of this evil for years—for a long time she represented one or the other, if not both, of these associations in missionary work in Utah Territory. She and her associates found that as a means of eradicating this wrong some provision must be made for the dependent women who desired to discontinue their polygamous relations, and for their dependent children, or otherwise they must remain in their polygamous condition. Consequently these Christian women, under the laws of Utah, incorporated themselves into an association called the Industrial Christian Home Association of Utah.

The object of this association was to make temporary provision for the care of women who desired to abandon their polygamous relations, and also for the care and maintenance of their dependent children. They appealed to Congress for help. They wanted to establish an institution where they could give temporary work to such women, and take temporary care of such children and provide for their education. They appealed, I say, therefore to Congress for assistance. The result of the appeal was the enactment of the first law to which my colleague has called attention. That law provided an appropriation of $40,000 for that purpose. But it provided also that the expenditure should be made under a board of control, as it was called, consisting of the governor of Utah, the chief-justice, and the United States district attorney for that Territory.

But what was done? Practically nothing. Those to whom it was intended to extend the benefits of the law were denied admission. I do not say they were improperly denied; but I do say that the governor gave such an interpretation to the law as excluded, in the short space of ten months, over one hundred of such people who sought admission. Did he attempt to establish a home or to construct one? Did he even purchase ground for the building? Not at all. What did he do? He simply leased a building, wholly inadequate for the purpose, wholly unsuited to carry out the objects of the law, which was to provide industrial training and education for the class of people referred to. Nothing of that kind was attempted. He made no provision for industrial training whatever.

The provisions made were wholly inadequate; and what was the result? These philanthropic ladies at once saw that the very object they had in view in securing the appropriation was being thwarted, and they applied to Congress, not surreptitiously, but openly, by a petition, which appears here in the RECORD, explaining why it was that they wanted further action from Congress.

I will read part of it. I will read a small portion of the petition which is pertinent. This is a petition by Angie F. Newman, addressed to the Senate Committee on Appropriations, and must have been on their files when my friend [Mr. BURNES] considered the proposition which became the second law and to which allusion has been made. Now let me read that:

> At a joint meeting of the board of control and the association I was met by the ruling of the chairman of the board of control, Governor West, that the appropriation was made to the board of control; that the work of the association ended when the appropriation was secured.
>
> Under this ruling the chairman of the board of control rented and furnished a temporary home.
>
> Determined to do what was possible under existing conditions, the association met monthly and attempted—
>
> Mark the language—
>
> to win the board of control to the recognition of the provisions of the law for industrial education and to the purchase of property and the erection of buildings. We attempted the impossible. To this date both the spirit and letter of the law and intent of the association have been violated by the board of control in that neither industrial nor mechanical arts have been taught in the home.

This is a petition from the lady who has been so justly lauded by my colleague [Mr. BURNES]. This is a petition that was addressed to the Appropriations Committee of the Senate, asking for the enactment of the second law, to which attention has been called—the last law upon the subject. This was a petition which my estimable colleague could have been furnished, and I doubt not was furnished at the time of the consideration of the Senate amendment which resulted in the second law. That amendment was upon a bill of which he had charge. He himself tells us that it was after considerable negotiation and discussion that it was agreed to.

It is customary on the part of the conferees of this body, when the House disagrees to amendments made by the Senate, to ascertain in conference all the facts, as far as possible, moving the Senate to make the amendments in dispute; and I doubt not, with that diligence that I know characterizes my friend, he sought out that information and must have been aware at the time of the reason which impelled the Senate to insert the provision which took away from the board of control the expenditure of this money and left it with the benevolent corporation to which he has referred and the one to which I have referred, namely, the Industrial Christian Home Association of Utah.

Now, my friend says that notwithstanding that law the board of control has always drawn the money and disbursed it.

Well, I am inclined to think that is true; but it is also true that that was for reasons which justified or appeared to justify the Department in allowing the board of control to have it.

The board of control took the money only because there seemed to be, as I understand it, no bonded officer of this corporation to receive it; and under such circumstances it was suggested, I believe by the Secretary of the Treasury, that the board of control, being Federal officials, should still retain charge of the money by consent and authority of the association, and the association accordingly gave their consent and authority.

Mr. BURNES. I wish to call the attention of my colleague to the fact that the second law does not make the change of control. It was probably intended to do so, but failed.

Mr. RYAN. I do not think it has failed. That is a matter of construction. I understand the Department held the second law authorized such change of control. That is implied by its requiring authority of the association to turn over the appropriation to the board of control.

Anyhow it is apparent that the object of Congress, by the second law, was to give to this benevolent corporation the control and management of this charitable and benevolent work. Now, what has been done? As I understand, a contract has been made for the construction of this home. This corporation has caused plans and specifications to be made of a building which they deem entirely suitable to their purposes. I understand that they have let the contract to construct the central portion of the building.

The contract goes still further and provides for the construction of the entire building. But the remainder is contingent on appropriations to be made by Congress. Now it is in this condition, and I want to say to my friend when he says nothing has been done, and when he expresses a doubt as to the existence of such a contract, if my information is correct he does himself an injustice. There is such a contract if I am reliably informed, and I believe I am. The work has been commenced, the foundations laid, and the construction is in progress.

Now, having thus devised plans and specifications for a building, having made a contract for the purpose of constructing the central portion of it, and also for the wings, but these latter contingent upon further appropriations, what wisdom is there in taking the work out of the hands of this benevolent association and putting it into the hands of the Treasury Department? Are you to change the plan? Are you to provide some new building? Is an architect of the Treasury better qualified to devise plans for such a home than those who are in charge of the work and to whom it is purely a labor of love?

Is it wise, then, to go on and construct the central portion of this building, adapted to certain other plans which are provided for in a given contingency? My friend [Mr. BURNES] says he would not annul the contract; he would go on and build this central structure under the existing contract, and then he would let the Secretary of the Treasury do the rest under the supervision of the Architect. Do what; carry out these same plans or provide new plans; build this same structure or build a new one? It seems to me that the proposed change is quite unnecessary.

Another reason which operates against it is this, and it is a reason that strikes my mind with force. So far as I am informed, and so far as the conferees are informed, there has been no maladministration on the part of this corporation. The contract is not alleged to be an improvident one. It is not pretended that the building is not suitable

for the purposes for which it is designed, and yet it is proposed to transfer this work to the Treasury Department under the direction of the Supervising Architect.

Now, what would be the effect of that? The effect would be simply to go on and carry out the contract for the central portion of this building and then allow the Supervising Architect to make plans for additions thereto. How would that result? Do we not all know the delays that occur in the completion of public buildings constructed in that way? This proposition means that nothing shall be done for this great charity, that the building shall not be put in condition to carry out the laudable purposes of the association for three or four years to come.

My friend, Mr. BURNES, very well knows that even in constructing a two hundred thousand dollar building four or five years are often occupied by the Treasury Department. There has never been a system of building construction devised so expensive, so extravagant, and so wasteful as that employed by the Government. Therefore, sir, I do not believe it is wise in any aspect of the case to adopt the change suggested by my colleague. I believe it would result in disastrous delay, greatly to the prejudice of this great work.

While I agree with my friend that there has been, so far as I know, no influence from the polygamous portion of the Mormon Territory operating in this Hall against this measure, still, the object of it being the suppression of polygamy, it is to be presumed that all the power they can bring to bear will be brought to bear against its execution.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the only difference, as I understand it—and this I regard as the vital point of this whole discussion—the only difference between the conferees on the part of the Senate and those on the part of the House is as to whether this work shall be continued under this benevolent corporation or shall be transferred to the Treasury Department. As to other details, there is nothing but what can, I think, be easily adjusted. May I ask my colleague on the committee [Mr. BURNES] whether I am correct in this?

Mr. BURNES. Substantially.

Mr. RYAN. My colleague says I am substantially correct.

My information is that the other objections urged by my colleague, some of them with a great deal of force, were met by concessions made by the conferees on the part of the Senate. My colleague [Mr. BURNES] said, with regard to the point to which his attention was called by my friend from Maine [Mr. DINGLEY], that it was finally assented to, out of conference as I understood him; that is to say, that after the conference was ended there was an intimation from some of the Senate conferees that they would yield that point. I wish to correct my friend by saying that my recollection is that after the first few moments of discussion there was no difficulty in arriving at a conclusion upon that point, because in the conference committee itself the conferees on the part of the Senate yielded the point readily.

Now, I agree with my friend as to some things. In the first place, I think the Senate amendment should be modified in some particulars. I believe that this work should be permitted to go on under the management of these Christian women, and I believe in that way it would be more wisely and efficiently done than it has been under the management of the board of control, which largely wasted the money that was placed in their hands by the first law.

But I think the amendment is too vague. It should be more specific. I think that in providing appropriations of any character it is the duty of Congress to make them as nearly specific as practicable. I think, therefore, that we ought to provide a specific sum for contingent expenses, a specific sum for furnishing this establishment, and a specific sum for the construction of the building. Then I think we ought to provide carefully that whoever draws this money shall give ample bonds for its proper expenditure. Then I believe, further, that there ought to be competent Federal authority for the auditing of the accounts so that the Government may know that the money spent is expended for the objects and purposes authorized by law.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I have explained the situation of this amendment in conference, as I understand it, and I repeat that the only material difference, the only difference that seems to be vital between the conferees of the House and the conferees of the Senate, is that the conferees on the part of the House insist that this whole matter of the construction of this building shall be transferred to the Treasury Department and taken entirely out of the hands of this benevolent association, while the Senate conferees insist that the work shall go on in accordance with the theory of the last law upon the subject.

Mr. SAYERS. Mr. Speaker, I think the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. RYAN] puts his proposition a little too broadly. If my recollection of the relative positions occupied by the conferees on the part of the Senate and those of the House be correct, the proposition enunciated by my colleague on the committee, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BURNES], was presented merely as a compromise; but neither he nor I thought it a legitimate or constitutional duty for the Government of the United States to embark in a scheme like the one involved in this amendment.

Mr. RYAN. Do I understand my friend to say that he and our colleague on the committee [Mr. BURNES] regarded this appropriation as being in violation of the Constitution?

Mr. SAYERS. I will speak for myself only, and will say I do not believe that under the Constitution the Congress of the United States has the right to appropriate public money and intrust it to the hands of private individuals for disbursement in the promotion of any scheme like this, and in the manner contemplated by the amendment. At any rate it would be a very bad policy.

Mr. RYAN. I want to say to my friend——

Mr. SAYERS. Now, the gentleman would not permit me to interrupt him.

Mr. RYAN. I only want to call my friend's attention to one fact——

The SPEAKER *pro tempore* (Mr. DUNN). The gentleman from Texas declines to be interrupted.

Mr. SAYERS. I will let the gentleman interrupt me in a moment. Since both the gentleman from Missouri and the gentleman from Kansas have referred to what occurred in the committee of conference, I may be permitted to go a little further in that direction. The leading member of the conferees on the part of the Senate stated before the conference committee adjourned that it appeared the real differences between the House conferees and the Senate conferees were of a vital and radical character—not merely in reference to detail. But I do not wish to discuss the amendment, as my colleagues upon the committee have explained it sufficiently well.

The gentleman from Missouri, Mr. Speaker, was correct in stating that until Grover Cleveland became President of the United States nothing practical was done toward the extirpation of polygamy in the Territory of Utah. It is true that in 1862 and 1882 acts were passed highly penal in their character. From 1862 to 1885, twenty-three long years, during which the Republican party had control of every Department of this Government, there were, as the records show, only six prosecutions under those two acts. One prosecution was had in 1875, another in 1881, and four in 1884. This is the sum total of what was done during those years by the executive and judicial departments of the Government in regard to the enforcement of these laws.

Now, what did the present Administration do as soon as it came into power? The records show that since March 4, 1885, five hundred and eighty-nine persons have been separately tried and convicted under those two acts. Is not this quite a difference in favor of Mr. Cleveland's administration? In addition, $73,000 of fines and forfeitures have been collected, and more than one hundred and fifty criminal prosecutions are still pending.

But this is not all. In 1887 another act on this subject was passed, an act for the purpose of forfeiting the franchise of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-Day Saints and the Perpetual Immigration Fund Company. In less than three months after the passage of that act a suit was instituted and a receiver appointed; $800,000 is now in the hands of the receiver; and final decree will be made before the 1st day of January next. Such is the contrast between the administration of the two parties in reference to the enforcement of these laws against polygamy; and I call upon my Republican friends to deny the record if they can.

Mr. SPINOLA. Mr. Speaker, I have listened with much attention to the discussion of this subject. The debate thus far seems to turn upon the question whether the Government of the United States through its officials shall make certain donations to one religious denomination to persecute another—whether one class of Christians shall be armed with the great power of the American Government to crush out another class, who also claim to be Christians, whether they are or not. A precedent of this character is, in my judgment, a dangerous one for the American Republic to establish; for when this society, organized in Utah, to which reference has been made, shall triumph in the undertaking which they now have upon their hands, and shall drive Mormonism from the limits of the Republic, then in all probability their attention may be turned to some other and weaker denomination; they may come here again and ask the Government to stretch out its strong arm to aid them in carrying on the same class of work in another direction.

Mr. FARQUHAR. Let me suggest to the gentleman that this is simply an appropriation to carry out the Edmunds-Tucker law, and to remedy the harm done by the destruction of homes which the execution of that law brought upon the people. It is the Government of the United States that is driving out Mormonism.

Mr. SPINOLA. And under a Democratic administration we will crush that enormity.

Mr. FARQUHAR. I care not under what party it may be done.

Mr. SPINOLA. I do not yield further; wait till your turn comes. The medicine, I know, is bitter, and you do not like to take it; but you must swallow it whether it be agreeable or not.

There seems to be a dispute as to who shall spend the public money in Utah—whether it shall be spent by one wing of this organization or the other, by the board of control or by a committee of the society. Sir, what right had they to make a contract for the construction of a building at the expense of the United States?

Mr. RYAN. They were authorized by law to do it.

Mr. SPINOLA. There seems to be no law upon the statute-book of the sort indicated by gentlemen, or if there is any such law it has not yet been pointed out by either gentleman. Therefore we have the

right to conclude that it does not exist. Without law a contract has been made for the construction of this building. And now, after that contract has been made without law, they come here to this House and ask us to donate out of the public Treasury money to carry out that contract and erect that building.

Now, Mr. Speaker, that side of the House commenced its career in this country bearing a banner blazoned with the expression of a determination when they came into power in the General Government to destroy the twin relics of barbarism, slavery and polygamy. That relic of slavery died at its own hands.

Mr. FARQUHAR. No, it died by proclamation.

Mr. SPINOLA. I beg your pardon; it perished by its own act.

Mr. FARQUHAR. It was extinguished by the proclamation of Abraham Lincoln.

Mr. SPINOLA. It died because it was odious to the civilization of the world. It died, sir, because certain gentlemen tried to force it into sections of the country where the people said it should not go.

Mr. FARQUHAR. It died because you and I, general, faced it.

Mr. SPINOLA. That is true to a certain extent, but it fell of its own weight.

Now what has become of the other relic of barbarism? Where is it to-day? Its roots have extended and strengthened for a quarter of a century and under the Republican party it has flourished like a green bay tree.

Mr. BAKER, of New York. You mean a green bay horse. [Laughter.]

Mr. SPINOLA. No; I do not mean a green bay horse or a woolly horse. [Renewed laughter]. I mean just what I say. For a quarter of a century it flourished like a green bay tree under a Republican administration. My friend from Texas [Mr. SAYERS] has exposed the record of your party and you can not get away from it.

That record shows the fact that for twenty-four long years of Republican rule there were six cases carried into the courts, and of those six cases there was not one successfully prosecuted, while under the present Administration in a little over three years' duration nearly six hundred of the Mormon saints are now living in the prisons and penitentiaries of Utah, and their chief leaders have fled from the justice that threatened them. The whole band of these immoral wretches are now packing their kits to move across the border into Mexico. This Democratic Administration has made it too warm for them, and we intend to keep up the fire until we fry the fat out of the very last one of them. [Laughter.] You may fry the fat out of the manufacturers of the country, but we will fry the fat out of these immoralists of the country.

Mr. Speaker, I take this ground, that the United States has no right or authority to construct a home for the purpose indicated by the bill pending in the House. It is one of the most dangerous innovations ever attempted by this or any other Congress. I care not how respectable this lady may be, or how strong the appeal she may make to the feelings of the community, we have as members of this House a duty to discharge under the Constitution of the United States to the people of the country. I think if we attempt in this or any other Congress to step across the rules which control our action no man can predict how far the precedent may go or to what disasters it may lead.

If it is made a party question, let it be so. We will be ready to meet you here or before the people. We have done our duty, and the Democratic administrator of the country to-day has done his duty as an upright and moral man in connection with this question. When Grover Cleveland has been re-elected to the Presidency next November, as he certainly will be, with a good Democratic majority in this House behind him, we will drive polygamy from the borders of the Republic for all time. [Applause.]

[Mr. STRUBLE withholds his remarks for revision. See APPENDIX.]

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. BURNES. Mr. Speaker, I will detain the House but a moment. I wish to say to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. STRUBLE] in reply to his statement that I have no enthusiasm in regard to this legislation, judging from the number of objections I make to it, that he does me injustice. I am not making objections to the merits of this institution, and I am not debating the merits or demerits of the proposition.

We are committed to some work for these dependent women and children in Utah, and I am perfectly willing to go on. The only objection I have made is to the loose and imperfect restrictions defining how the money shall be expended and the work conducted. The money appropriated and unexpended and that we may now appropriate should be put in the hands of some responsible disbursing agent of the United States to be applied to the purposes for which Congress shall direct.

A word in reply to my friend from Kansas [Mr. RYAN]. Sir, whenever a suggestion is made on the other side of the House or in another body, who are of kindred political faith, reflecting upon the President of the United States or upon the party of which I am an humble member, and any Demoorat here takes notice of it, he is charged with bringing into the consideration of an appropriation bill political debate.

I beg to state to the gentlemen who have made such statements on that side of the House that it has never been my intention to bring into the discussion of appropriation bills political questions. But in this case I submit to the candid consideration of every member of this House that I was justified in taking notice of the covert insinuation which I have read from remarks of a prominent Republican—an insinuation that on the part of the present Executive, the present President of the United States, there has been some lapse in his administration in neglecting to repress polygamy. In consequence of that assertion I felt it to be my duty to call the attention of the House to it and to refute it; and I call the attention of the House to the further fact that during his administration and only through his administration has this evil been brought to bay and practically extinguished, and now, sir——

Mr. DINGLEY. At that point I desire to ask the gentleman if the fact is not simply that Congress had not got up to the point of passing legislation to repress this evil until that time?

Mr. BURNES. But Congress failed to pass any effective law, and it was the failure of the Republicans, because the Democratic House with 40 majority passed the bill which has made the effective law under which the President is now extirpating this evil.

Mr. DINGLEY. If my friend had been in the Forty-seventh Congress and had witnessed the long contest in securing the passage of the first law for the suppression of polygamy and had noticed where the opposition to it was he would not have made the remarks he has.

Mr. BURNES. If the Democrats had had the majority in the House of the Forty-seventh Congress they might then have passed the bill which was subsequently passed and which is known as the bill of Mr. Tucker, of Virginia. But unfortunately for my friend the Republicans are responsible for that Congress.

Mr. DINGLEY. I regret exceedingly that any allusion should have been made to party in this matter, because I think it is the sentiment and feeling of both parties and of all the people of this country that this great evil of polygamy shall be extirpated. I think we are all agreed upon that.

Mr. BURNES. The gentleman is right, and if another gentleman in another place had shared in that feeling and that sentiment of fairness there would have been no occasion for the remarks which I have been compelled to make.

Mr. STRUBLE. Will the gentleman from Missouri yield to me for a request?

Mr. BURNES. Pardon me. I want to ask that the Clerk shall read the letter of the Attorney-General in regard to the prompt and efficient enforcement in Utah of the law against polygamy by a Democratic administration.

The Clerk read as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE, *Washington, September* 13, 1888.

SIR: In reply to the resolution of the 25th ultimo of the House of Representatives, in relation to convictions for polygamy in the Territories of Utah and Idaho, I have the honor to transmit the accompanying information. The records of the Department show that under the provisions of the anti-polygamy law of 1882 and the act of 1882 amendatory thereof, and the act of March 3, 1887, there have been in the Territory of Utah 470 convictions for polygamy, adultery, and unlawful cohabitation with fines imposed, and 30 convictions where the sentence was imprisonment without fine, making a total for that Territory of 500. There have been in the Territory of Idaho 48 convictions for polygamy, adultery, and unlawful cohabitation with fines imposed, and 41 convictions where the sentence was imprisonment without fine, making a total for that Territory of 89.

The accompanying lists, marked, respectively, Exhibits A and B, show the cases in the Territories of Utah and Idaho in which fines were imposed, with the date of the judgment in each case and the amount, if any, collected. There have been fourteen pardons granted by the President of the United States to persons convicted under the above acts in the Territories of Utah and Idaho, and the accompanying list, marked Exhibit C, shows the name, date of sentence, sentence, date of pardon, and the reasons for granting the same in each case.

There was 1 conviction in Utah in March, 1875, and 1 in April, 1881: in October and November, 1884, 1 in Idaho and 3 in Utah; in 1885, beginning with the March term, 39 in Utah and 16 in Idaho; in 1886, 112 in Utah and 20 in Idaho; in 1887, 214 in Utah and 6 in Idaho, and in 1888, 100 in Utah and 5 in Idaho—in all 589 convictions. There have been collected in Utah fines and costs in the above cases to the amount of $45,956.90, and in Idaho to the amount of $2,251.10—in all $48,208 of fines and costs, and in Utah in April, 1886, a forfeiture of $25,000.

Very respectfully,

G. A. JENKS,
Acting Attorney-General.

THE SPEAKER OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

Mr. BURNES (before the completion of the reading). I will not insist upon the Clerk reading further, but I will embody the statement in my remarks.

Mr. Speaker, I wish now to call the attention of the House to a fact which will show that I am not entirely partisan in this matter. In a recital made elsewhere I find the indorsement of a report by Mrs. Newman to this effect:

I found in one cell (meaning a cell of the penitentiary in Utah) 10 by 12½ feet, without a floor, six women, three of whom had babies under six months of age, who were incarcerated for contempt of court in refusing to acknowledge the paternity of their children. When I plead with them to answer the court and be released, they said: "If we do, there are many wives and children to suffer the loss of a father."

This most excellent woman failed to go to the judicial authorities and ask relief for them, but was content to advise them to gain freedom otherwise. I think, sir, that these women ought not to be confined in the penitentiary for contempt of court under such circumstances.

But the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. STRUBLE] has demanded of me

the presentation of facts which I had not intended to present. I find here, sir, a financial statement made by the Industrial Christain Home Association of Utah Territory as follows:

August 6, 1888, Congressional appropriation, $40,000.

Expended in temporary home	$13,500
June, 1888, paid for building lots	10,500
Total	24,000

Twenty-four thousand dollars subtracted from $40,000 leaves a balance of $16,000.

August 16, last contract let for main building, three stories high, $18,000.

That is $2,000 more than the balance on hand. Now, Mr. Speaker, seeing this discrepancy, seeing the amount of money received placed at $40,000, and then the deduction of expenditures, as made, I sent an inquiry to the Treasury Department and received this answer:

There were four advances of $2,500 each made in December, 1886, and March, August, and December, 1887, to Caleb W. West, of which $1,168.95 have since been repaid to the Treasury, making a net expenditure of $8,831.05 in addition to the $40,000 paid in July last.

Therefore, instead of there being a total of $40,000, there is a total of $48,000 to be accounted for; and while I express and reiterate my confidence in the honor and honesty of those in charge of this institution I may be permitted, I think, to present these facts as an evidence that in a business matter, in a business proposition for building this home, we ought to observe ordinary business principles and not intrust it entirely to the discrimination and skill of the ladies of this association.

Mr. Speaker, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. DOUGHERTY].

Mr. DOUGHERTY. Mr. Speaker, all legislation which touches at all upon the religion of men in this country should be carefully considered. Religion is a subject which never should be legislated upon in this country at all, unless where the exercise of the religion is violative of the law of the land. Polygamy, under all the laws of all the States of this Union and the laws of the land as passed by the Congress of the United States, was a crime before the Book of Mormon was alleged to have been found, and certainly before the Mormon Church was ever established in this country. In the past appropriations have been made for this work which is now proposed to be taken in hand, and those appropriations were said to have become necessary because of the destitution of women and children in Utah.

That destitution grew out of the violation of the laws of this country. The gentleman from Iowa [Mr. STRUBLE] speaks of the condition of the place in which it is proposed to house these people. Sir, in this matter I have no sympathy except for the children. The women, when they went into this polygamous relation, knew that they were violating the laws of the land of which they could not but be cognizant. The gentleman calls special attention to the condition of the place in which it is proposed to put them. Does he propose to house them in palaces, as are housed the nobility and the royalty of the older countries? Does he propose to put them upon the body-politic of this country as an incubus like that system of aristocracy and royalty in the monarchical governments?

If they are to be objects of charity at all that charity should be exercised somewhat with a view to economy in the expenditure of the money which has to be taken from the law-abiding element in this country. I believe that means can be devised, and if they can be devised they certainly should be adopted and put into operation, to place the burden of the support of these unfortunate people upon the shoulders of the men who have degraded them in Utah and in other portions of this country.

If the precedent had not been set, I should be opposed to this appropriation *in toto*. How comes it that these persons are objects of charity before the American people, relying on support from the labor of the law-abiding citizens of this country? It is because they have, no matter under whose leadership, pursued a policy of resistance to all the laws of this country and the laws of all the States from the establishment of the Mormon Church to the present time.

They have carried that policy of resistance and open disobedience and defiance of the law-making power of this country and its executive officers to the extent of intimidation and assassination of public officials in the attempted discharge of their duty. Such action upon the part of those people, under the ministry of the priests of the Mormon Church, is just what has put them in the condition in which they are to-day. They have steadily undertaken to resist and violate the laws until they were confronted by the gentleman at the other end of the avenue, the present President of the United States, who was determined to see that the laws should be promptly and thoroughly enforced. It is proposed now to make objects of charity of a number of people whose only claim to the exercise of charity in their behalf is that the deplorable condition which they occupy is the result of their violation of the laws of the land.

It is not my purpose to address myself further to that portion of the bill. There is an amendment proposed by the Senate to pay a small sum of money to the widow of a revenue officer who died of yellow fever in the city of Jacksonville while engaged in the discharge of his duty in the office of the collector of internal revenue. He was the only person in the office at the time. He was stricken down and died before he could be removed from the rooms of that office.

[Here the hammer fell.]

Mr. DOUGHERTY. I hope the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BURNES] will yield to me a few moments more.

Mr. BURNES. Go on.

Mr. DOUGHERTY. Now, let me refer to the difference between such a case as this and that presented in behalf of those Mormon women. The gentleman from Missouri in speaking of the amendment for the relief of the widow and children of this unfortunate deputy collector of internal revenue, said that the appropriation was simply for an object of charity, for which he could find no precedent. Sir, is it claimed that the appropriation in this bill, enormous as it is, for expenditure in the Territory of Utah, and the other appropriations which have been made in the past for the benefit of sufferers from the evils of Mormonism, are anything else than charity?

Every gentleman who has spoken on this subject admits that the proposition under discussion here to-day is nothing more nor less than a charity, yet the charitable expenditure for those unfortunate people in Utah is dignified as a most worthy appropriation, while the appeal for charity in behalf of this widow and her children in the State of Florida is not considered a matter of any importance. Does this House propose to take the stand that people who become objects of charity through the violation of law are proper subjects for the solicitude and support of the Government, but that a man who dies in the discharge of his duty as a Government officer is not a suitable object of charity? Most assuredly that position can not be maintained by any gentleman on this floor. This man died in the discharge of his duty, while acting under the orders of his superior. If he had left that office to escape the danger of the fever, I have no information which leads me to know that the funds of the Government in the custody of that office would have been safe from robbery.

It has been said that there is no precedent for this action. Did not the House of Representatives—I will mention only instances which I think I remember correctly—did not the House of Representatives appropriate for the father of a deceased door-keeper a year's pay, or certainly the balance of a year's pay, which should have gone to the door-keeper? Not long since did not this House, upon the motion of the gentleman from Pennsylvania, appropriate public money to pay the salary of a man who had died in the employ of this House as a messenger, or in some other capacity? I think precedents of this kind could be enumerated *ad libitum*. Certainly if we do not grant to this widow the amount of her husband's salary for a year, she should have the balance which would have accrued to him if he had lived till the expiration of the year.

Let me make now a remark in reply to a suggestion of the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. HOOKER]. It has been said that the appropriation proposed in this case is an indefinite amount. Sir, the amendment provides for the payment of one year's salary; and on page 9786 of the RECORD will be found a letter from the Commissioner of Internal Revenue, making to the Senate the statement that this man's salary was $1,400 a year. Therefore there can be nothing indefinite as to the amount.

I ask this House, even if there is no precedent, to give to the widow of this unfortunate employé of the Government, under the peculiar circumstances here presented, the amount of her husband's salary for one year, or to give her at least the balance which would have accrued to him, had he lived till the expiration of the year. I ask the Clerk to read the letter of the Commissioner of Internal Revenue on this subject, to which I have referred.

The Clerk read as follows:

TREASURY DEPARTMENT, OFFICE OF INTERNAL REVENUE,
Washington, September 21, 1888.

SIR: I inclose herewith a copy of letter from Collector Whitfield Walker, district of Florida, dated August 28, 1888, in regard to Deputy Collector L. E. Dancy. Before this letter reached here (August 31) the death of Mr. Dancy was announced by telegram. Mr. Dancy was chief deputy to Collector Walker, at a salary of $1,400 per annum, and an allowance of $125 for his traveling expenses. He was a faithful, zealous officer, and of high standing in the service, and the circumstances under which he performed his duties at the last during the epidemic of yellow fever rendered them singularly meritorious.

Respectfully yours,

JOS. S. MILLER, *Commissioner.*

Hon. WILKINSON CALL,
United States Senator.

Mr. DOUGHERTY. Mr. Speaker, I will not detain the House further than merely to repeat the request that it will either allow the year's salary in this case as asked, or will at least allow the balance which would have accrued to this officer had he lived until the expiration of the year.

Mr. BURNES. It was my purpose, Mr. Speaker, to submit at this time something in the nature of a résumé of the appropriations of this Congress in connection with some remarks of a political nature; but under the circumstances I content myself with asking unanimous consent to extend in the RECORD some remarks which I made the other day in reply to my friend from Illinois [Mr. CANNON], and to include also in those remarks such tables of expenditure and other matter as may be pertinent.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. If there be no objection, the request of the gentleman will be granted. The Chair hears no objection.

Mr. STRUBLE. I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to attach some exhibits.

There was no objection, and it was so ordered.

Mr. CAINE. I ask unanimous consent to print some remarks in the RECORD on this subject.

There was no objection, and it was ordered accordingly.

Mr. ROGERS. I desire to ask the gentleman from Missouri one or two questions for the purpose of obtaining information. I noticed in some observations recently delivered it was stated that $10,000 heretofore appropriated by this Government was used by this corporation in the purchase of real estate. I wish to know if the gentleman is advised in whose name that real estate was taken?

Mr. BURNES. This private corporation purchased $10,500 worth of lots, upon which it is proposed to erect this new building.

Mr. ROGERS. I understand the limit of cost of the building to be erected is $50,000.

Mr. BURNES. Just $50,000.

Mr. ROGERS. And five or ten thousand to furnish it?

Mr. BURNES. Five thousand dollars.

Mr. ROGERS. It is to go into the hands of this private corporation and is not to be under the control of Congress.

Mr. BURNES. No, sir.

Mr. ROGERS. What provision of law is there to prevent the diversion of this property, when they get ready, to other uses?

Mr. BURNES. Nothing except the bond of the treasurer.

Mr. ROGERS. That is for the expenditure of the money. But I understand there is no provision to prevent this private corporation diverting this property to any other purpose.

Mr. BURNES. The only security for the Government would be suit on the bond of the treasurer of the corporation to recover.

Mr. ROGERS. I understand that is only for the expenditure of the money.

Mr. BURNES. That is all.

Mr. ROGERS. Now, as this may result in another public scandal, we are at the point where, if we are to go on with this business, we ought to provide that the money appropriated for this purpose shall not be diverted to improper channels. We ought to see to it before any money is appropriated to it that it shall be accompanied by legislation of that character.

Mr. BURNES. After the report is disposed of, and I hope it will not be agreed to, I shall insist on the disagreement of the House to the Senate amendments, and request another conference with the Senate.

Mr. RYAN. If the report goes back it will have to go back altogether.

Mr. BURNES. Yes, a separate vote can not be had on each amendment.

Mr. DINGLEY. It must be voted on as an entirety.

Mr. ROGERS. I had some idea there would be doubt as to the proper motion, and consulted the Speaker, who said the question was to be put in the affirmative upon adopting the report; a negative vote would disagree to the Senate amendments.

Mr. BURNES. The question is on the adoption of the report, and when that is voted down I shall then move to insist on our disagreement to the amendments of the Senate and ask for a further conference.

Mr. ROGERS. In order to get a negative vote upon it the motion should be on agreeing to the report, and then for the House to vote the motion down. That is the information I have from the Speaker.

Mr. BURNES. If that be the opinion of the Speaker I shall certainly respect it.

Mr. MCKENNA. Will the gentleman allow me to ask him a question?

Mr. BURNES. Certainly.

Mr. MCKENNA. If the procedure be adopted as suggested by the gentleman from Arkansas, is it tantamount to a negative vote to all the amendments made by the Senate?

Mr. BURNES. It is.

Mr. MCKENNA. Because my object is to get a distinctively negative vote upon the Chinese appropriations.

Mr. BURNES. That is included in the negative vote upon the report.

Mr. STRUBLE. I would like to ask a parliamentary question; whether it is in order to make any motion in regard to these amendments we have been discussing with reference to having certain words stricken out.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore* (Mr. RICHARDSON in the chair). The report is not open to amendment.

The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Missouri——

Mr. RYAN. According to the suggestion of the gentleman from Arkansas, the question should be upon agreeing to the report; and I think perhaps that is the custom under the parliamentary law.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. If the House declines to agree, it is equivalent to agreeing to a motion to disagree; and so the result can be obtained by a negative vote on the pending motion.

The question was taken; and the report of the conference committee was rejected.

Mr. BURNES. I now move that the House insist upon its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate and ask a further conference.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore* announced as conferees on the part of the House Mr. BURNES, Mr. SAYERS, and Mr. RYAN.

CAROLINE M. M'DOUGAL.

Mr. BUTLER, by unanimous consent, reported back favorably from the Committee on Pensions the bill (S. 3392) granting an increase of pension to Caroline M. McDougal; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

ORDER OF BUSINESS.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE, of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, I move that when the House adjourns to-day it be to meet on Monday next; and pending that I ask unanimous consent that next Monday night be fixed, in lieu of Friday night of this week, to consider pension cases as determined by the standing order.

Mr. MCKENNA. Will the gentleman yield to me for a moment?

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE, of Arkansas. For what purpose?

Mr. MCKENNA. I wish to offer a resolution.

Mr. HOOKER. Will the gentleman from Arkansas allow me to make a suggestion by way of an amendment to his motion?

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE, of Arkansas (to Mr. MCKENNA). I do not yield until I hear what the proposition is.

Mr. MCKENNA. It is a resolution about declaring that the House will transact no business after the general appropriation bills are passed. I ask that it be read.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. It will be read, after which the Chair will ask for objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That it is the sense of the House that after the general appropriation bills shall be disposed of the House will transact no further business this session except pension business on Friday nights and except to adjourn from time to time and for the session.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. Does the gentleman from Arkansas yield for this resolution?

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE, of Arkansas. The gentleman can have it referred to the Committee on Rules if he desires it. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi to make a suggestion.

Mr. HOOKER. I concur in the motion which the gentleman has made; but I think we ought to preserve the order of business for to-morrow which provides, under a rule heretofore adopted, that the roll of members should be called with the right when a member's name is reached on the roll to be permitted to call up one bill. I ask my friend from Arkansas, therefore, to so modify his motion as to designate next Monday as the day on which we may consider measures which have been considered heretofore on Friday, under the order I have named.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE, of Arkansas. I have no objection myself to that, Mr. Speaker, and will yield to the gentleman from Mississippi to ask unanimous consent if he wishes.

Mr. HOOKER. I will then move as an amendment to the motion of the gentleman from Arkansas that Monday next be agreed upon as the day for the presentation of such motions by members the same as on Fridays.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The Chair understands the gentleman to ask unanimous consent that the business for Monday next shall be the same as on Fridays?

Mr. MORGAN. I desire to know what objection there is to going on to-morrow with private business? We have pursued that order for two days. Why not continue it?

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. HOOKER]?

Mr. ROLAND and Mr. MCCLAMMY objected.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Arkansas, that when the House adjourns to-day it be to meet on Monday next.

Mr. MORRILL. What about the night session for pensions?

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE, of Arkansas. Pending that motion, I have asked unanimous consent that the consideration of pension bills heretofore fixed for Friday evenings, be fixed for next Monday evening.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. Is there objection to the substitution of next Monday night for Friday night of this week for the consideration of private pension bills?

There was no objection, and it was so ordered.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The question now recurs on the motion of the gentleman from Arkansas that when the House adjourns to-day it be to meet on Monday next.

Mr. MORGAN. I rise to a parliamentary inquiry. Why may we not be permitted to go on with private bills to-morrow just as we have been proceeding for the last two Fridays?

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The Chair will suggest that that is not a parliamentary question.

Mr. MORGAN. Then I object if it is not.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE, of Arkansas. It does not require unanimous consent, I believe.

Mr. MORGAN. It will require a quorum, though.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The gentleman moves that when the House adjourns to-day it be to meet on Friday next.

Mr. MORGAN. Will it not take a quorum to adjourn over until Monday?

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. If the point is insisted upon it will.

Mr. MORGAN. Then I give notice that I shall call for a quorum.

Mr. LANHAM. I hope there will be no objection to the motion of the gentleman from Arkansas, provided that Monday can be substituted for Friday to consider private bills.

Mr. MILLIKEN. Unless that is done there will be objection.

Mr. LANHAM. I hope the Chair will submit that proposition again to substitute Monday for to-morrow.

Mr. ROWLAND. I move that the House do now adjourn.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE, of Arkansas. As the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. MORGAN] indicates his intention of requiring a quorum, I withdraw the motion and simply move that the House do now adjourn.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The motion has been agreed to to substitute Monday night for the consideration of pension bills.

Mr. MORRILL. I ask to reconsider the vote by which that motion was agreed to.

Mr. ALLEN, of Mississippi. I object.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The question is on the reconsideration of the vote by which the motion to substitute Monday night for Friday night for the consideration of pension bills was passed.

The question was put, and the Speaker *pro tempore* announced that the "ayes" had it.

Mr. DINGLEY. Do I understand that the vote on the motion to substitute Monday night for Friday night for the consideration of pension bills was reconsidered?

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. It was.

Mr. ALLEN, of Mississippi. I had objected.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The Chair did not hear any objection.

Mr. ROGERS. I rise to a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The gentleman will state it. The Chair will restate the motion——

Mr. ROGERS. I rise to a question of order. I do not think the Chair and the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. MORGAN] understood each other. The gentleman from Mississippi objected to the substitution of next Monday night for to-morrow night for the consideration of pension bills, and therefore——

Mr. OATES. To get out of this difficulty I ask for the regular order.

Mr. MORGAN. I objected to the substitution of next Monday night for to-morrow night. We desire to-morrow for the consideration of private bills, for the reason that more than half of the member's names have been called, and we want to go on and complete the call.

Mr. ALLEN, of Mississippi. I would like to notify my colleague [Mr. MORGAN] that it will take a quorum to pass anything to-morrow.

Mr. MORGAN. I accept the notice, and propose to try it on. [Laughter].

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. BRECKINRIDGE] has asked that Monday night be substituted for Friday night, anticipating that the House would adjourn until Monday. Inasmuch as the House declines to adjourn until then the gentleman desires to reconsider that motion.

Mr. ALLEN, of Mississippi. And I object.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE, of Arkansas. I move that the House reconsider the vote by which the motion was agreed to substituting Monday night for Friday night for the consideration of pension bills.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE, of Arkansas. I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; and accordingly (at 4 o'clock p. m.) the House adjourned.

PRIVATE BILLS INTRODUCED AND REFERRED.

Under the rule private bills of the following titles were introduced and referred as indicated below:

By Mr. COMPTON: A bill (H. R. 11560) for the relief of Rich. P. Blackistone—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. GEST: A bill (H. R. 11561) granting cannon to the Soldiers and Sailors' Monument Association of Mercer County, Illinois—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. GROSVENOR: A bill (H. R. 11562) granting a pension to Mrs. Isaac Brooks—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also a bill (H. R. 11563) granting a pension to Isaac N. Kline—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. NEAL: A bill (H. R. 11564) correcting the military record of Calvin L. Smith—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11565) granting a pension to Leah Henry—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. McRAE: A bill (H. R. 11566) granting a pension to E. C. Paschal—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MILLIKEN: A bill (H. R. 11567) for the relief of employés in the New York custom-house—to the Committee on Claims.

PETITIONS, ETC.

The following petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk, under the rule, and referred as follows:

By Mr. DELANO: Petition of citizens of Conklin Forks, and of Norwich, N. Y., in favor of the per diem pension bill—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HOUK: Petition of the administrator of J. S. Moffett, of Knox County, Tennessee, for reference of his claim to the Court of Claims—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. NEAL: Petition asking that a pension be granted to Leah Henry, dependent mother of William Henry, late private Company D, Tenth Regiment Tennessee Cavalry—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, petition of Joel J. Pyatt, for correction of the military record of Calvin L. Smith—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. STONE, of Kentucky: Papers in the case of James Crutchett—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. T. L. THOMPSON: Resolutions of the Chamber of Commerce of San Diego, Cal., in favor of the Maritime Canal of Nicaragua—to the Committee on Commerce.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

FRIDAY, *October* 5, 1888.

The House met at 12 o'clock m. Prayer by Rev. J. H. CUTHBERT, D. D.

The Journal of yesterday's proceedings was read and approved.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. THOMPSON, of California, indefinitely, on account of important business.

LEAVE TO PRINT.

By unanimous consent, leave was granted to Mr. WHEELER to extend in the RECORD his remarks on the resolution proposing to give an extra month's pay to employés of the House.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED.

Mr. KILGORE, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that they had examined and found duly enrolled a bill and joint resolution of the following titles; when the Speaker signed the same:

A bill (H. R. 3300) to enable the State of Colorado to select indemnity lands, and for other purposes; and

Joint resolution (H. Res. 101) providing for the printing of decisions of the Department of the Interior regarding public lands and pensions for sale.

AMERICAN GROCER ASSOCIATION.

The SPEAKER. On the 1st of October the Senate passed and sent to the House a resolution requesting the House to return to that body the bill (S. 577) for the relief of the American Grocer Association of the city of New York. The Chair is advised by the Clerk of the House that the Journal shows that this bill, when originally laid before the House, was referred to the Committee on Claims, but it can not be found. The books of the distributing clerk of the House show that it went to that committee; but there is no receipt for it, and that clerk is now dead, so that no further inquiry can be made. The Chair would suggest the propriety of the Clerk of the House informing the Senate that the bill has been mislaid, and request that a duplicate be sent to the House. If there be no objection, that order will be made.

There was no objection.

J. W. PARISH & CO.

Mr. PEEL. I ask unanimous consent to take up for present consideration the bill (H. R. 9718) for the relief of J. W. Parish & Co. I desire to say that that bill was called up last Friday and the report read at length. Mr. OATES objected to its consideration, but since then, learning more about it, he has authorized me to withdraw his objection.

The bill was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and is hereby, authorized and directed to pay to Joseph W. Parish, George C. Hadley, and William L. Huse, composing the firm of J. W. Parish & Co., out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $18,500, the same to be compensation in full to said firm for losses sustained by it by reason of the refusal of the officers of the United States to receive and pay for 5,000 tons of ice which said Parish & Co. had been directed to furnish under a contract dated December 30, 1863, and signed by the medical purveyor of the United States Army stationed at Louisville, Ky., and by said Parish & Co., and approved by the Acting Surgeon-General of the United States.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. DINGLEY. Reserving the right to object, I ask if this is the bill that was debated last Friday?

Mr. PEEL. It is the same bill, and to which Mr. OATES objected, but he has authorized me to withdraw his objection.

There was no objection.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time; and being engrossed, it was accordingly read the third time, and passed.

Mr. PEEL moved to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed; and also moved that the motion to reconsider be laid on the table.

The latter motion was agreed to.

MARY E. WALKER, M. D.

Mr. NUTTING. I ask unanimous consent that the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union be discharged from the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 4265) for the relief of Mary E. Walker, M. D.

The SPEAKER. The bill will be read, after which the Chair will ask for objections.

The bill was read.

The SPEAKER. This bill provides that the claim shall be taken up at an early day. Does the gentleman from New York [Mr. NUTTING] desire to pass the bill?

Mr. NUTTING. I desire to pass the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

Mr. ROGERS. I would like to understand the provisions of this bill. Does it make an appropriation, or does it simply set a day for the consideration of the claim?

Mr. NUTTING. It provides for a payment of $2,000.

The SPEAKER. The bill makes an appropriation of $2,000. That is to say, the original bill appropriates $10,000, but the committee propose to strike out "ten" and insert "two." Is there objection?

Mr. TURNER, of Kansas. I object.

ORDER OF BUSINESS.

Mr. LANHAM. I call for the regular order.

The SPEAKER. The regular order is demanded. This being Friday, the regular order is the call of committees for reports upon bills of a private nature.

Mr. LANHAM. I move that that order be dispensed with.

Mr. RICHARDSON. I ask the gentleman from Texas [Mr. LANHAM] to yield to me for a moment to introduce a resolution for reference.

Mr. LANHAM. I yield to the gentleman for that purpose.

AGRICULTURAL REPORT, 1888.

Mr. RICHARDSON, by unanimous consent, introduced a joint resolution (H. Res. 229) to print the Agricultural Report for 1888; which was read a first and second time, referred to the Committee on Printing, and ordered to be printed.

ASTRONOMICAL OBSERVATIONS OF NAVAL OBSERVATORY.

Mr. RICHARDSON also, by unanimous consent, offered a resolution to print the annual volumes of the astronomical observations of the Naval Observatory for 1886, 1887, and 1888; which was referred to the Committee on Printing.

ORDER OF BUSINESS.

The motion of Mr. LANHAM to dispense with the call of committees for reports was agreed to.

Mr. LANHAM. I now ask unanimous consent that gentlemen having reports to present may be permitted to file them with the Clerk.

There was no objection, and it was so ordered.

REPORTS FILED.

The following reports were filed by being handed in at the Clerk's desk:

MRS. SUE B. JOHNSON.

Mr. HUNTER, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, reported back favorably the bill (H. R. 10649) to increase the pension of Mrs. Sue B. Johnson; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

MOBILE AND GIRARD RAILROAD COMPANY.

Mr. STONE, of Kentucky, from the Committee on War Claims, reported back favorably the bill (H. R. 10914) for the relief of the Mobile and Girard Railroad Company; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

ORDER OF BUSINESS.

Mr. NUTTING. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. TURNER] withdraws his objection to the consideration of the bill which I called up a few minutes ago for the relief of Mary E. Walker, M. D., and I ask that it be now considered.

The SPEAKER. The regular order has been demanded by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. LANHAM].

Mr. NUTTING. I hope the gentleman will withdraw that demand.

Mr. LANHAM. I can not do that now. Objection was made to the consideration of the bill. I now move that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole for the purpose of considering business upon the Private Calendar; and pending that, I ask unanimous consent that we proceed in the same manner as on last Friday and the Friday preceding.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. Speaker, I think I shall be inclined to resist going into Committee of the Whole on the Private Calendar unless there is a quorum present.

The SPEAKER. The motion to go into Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar is pending, but the first question is on the request of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. LANHAM] for unanimous consent that if the House go into Committee of the Whole the same order of precedure shall be observed to-day as on last Friday and the Friday before.

Mr. KILGORE. I think I must object.

Mr. LANHAM. I wish to say in the hearing of my colleague [Mr. KILGORE] that under the arrangement heretofore made a number of gentlemen have been reached in regular order on the roll, and have had an opportunity to have claims considered in which their constituents were interested. I think, therefore, it is only fair that the call of the roll should be completed, so that other gentlemen, who agreed to that arrangement and that method of procedure, shall have the same opportunity as those whose names preceded theirs upon the roll, and I hope my colleague's sense of fairness to other gentlemen who have not yet been reached in the call will induce him to allow us to go on and complete the roll-call, so that members who desire consideration of measures which have been reported from committees of the House duly organized shall have an equal opportunity with others whose bills have been reached earlier.

Mr. KILGORE. I appreciate the observations of my colleague, but we all remember the state of things here last Friday when bills were passed appropriating over $100,000, of which perhaps $5,000 was for meritorious claims, and I am very much inclined to abide by the terms of a resolution which my colleague [Mr. LANHAM] introduced here recently, providing that no legislation shall be had at this session except upon the tariff, upon "trusts," and general appropriation bills. It is true that that resolution has not been adopted, but any gentleman upon this floor can, if he chooses, practically enforce its terms, and I am very much inclined to do it.

Mr. LANHAM. I should be glad to have the purposes of the resolution on "trusts" carried out.

Mr. HOOKER. I hope the gentleman from Texas [Mr. KILGORE] will withdraw his objection. We have all sat here and heard the roll called half through, and the bills of gentlemen whose names have been reached have been considered, and many of them passed, including, I believe, a bill for the gentleman from Texas [Mr. KILGORE] himself, and it certainly would be gross injustice to stop the call at this point.

Mr. ROGERS. Let me suggest also to my friend from Texas [Mr. KILGORE] that there are right-of-way bills, and bridge bills and other bills which do not take a dollar out of the Treasury, and which ought to be considered.

Mr. KILGORE. Are they on the Private Calendar?

Mr. ROGERS. Some of them are.

Mr. KILGORE. Well, Mr. Speaker, I give up. [Laughter.]

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas withdraws his objection. If there be no further objection, pending the motion of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. LANHAM], the Chair will submit a request from the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, which is embodied in a resolution which the Clerk will now read.

ELECTRIC LIGHTS IN THE CAPITOL.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That the subcommittee on electric lights for the House wing of the Capitol of the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds be, and is hereby, authorized to sit during the recess between the present and the second session of this Congress.

The SPEAKER. The Chair is advised that this resolution involves no additional expenditure, the committee having been already authorized to make the investigation. Is there objection to the adoption of the resolution?

Mr. JOHNSTON, of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, as a member of that subcommittee, I would like to know whether the resolution requires us to stay here during the recess?

The SPEAKER. It does not.

The resolution was agreed to.

ORDER OF BUSINESS.

The SPEAKER. The question now is on the motion of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. LANHAM] that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole for the consideration of business on the Private Calendar.

The question was taken; and the Speaker declared that the ayes seemed to have it.

Mr. ALLEN, of Mississippi. I call for a division.

Mr. LANHAM. If the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. ALLEN] is determined to insist upon the point of no quorum being present, it is unnecessary to take up further time in this way.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. LANHAM] that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole for the consideration of business on the Private Calendar.

The motion was agreed to—ayes 38, noes 7.

Mr. McMILLIN. Would it be in order for me to submit at this time a privileged motion that when the House adjourns this evening it adjourn to meet on Monday next?

The SPEAKER. That motion can be made when the Committee of the Whole rises. It is not strictly in order now, the House having just voted to go into Committee of the Whole.

Mr. McMILLIN. I ask unanimous consent to submit the motion.

Mr. MORGAN. I object for the present. If gentlemen propose to filibuster this day away, we will keep them here to-morrow.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

A message from the Senate, by Mr. McCOOK, its Secretary, announced that the Senate had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 2742) to incorporate the Brightwood Railway Company of the District of Columbia.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed without amendment the bill (H. R. 4765) for the relief of G. W. McAdams.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed bills of the following titles; in which the concurrence of the House was requested:

A bill (S. 3340) for the disposition of Fort Brooke military reservation at Tampa, Fla., and for other purposes; and

A bill (S. 3501) relating to the classification of post-offices and amendatory of the act approved March 3, 1883, entitled "An act to adjust salaries of postmasters."

The message also announced that the Senate further insisted on its amendments, disagreed to by the House, to the bill (H. R. 10896) making appropriations to supply deficiencies in the appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1888, and for prior years, and for other purposes, agreed to the further conference asked by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses upon said bill, and had appointed as conferees on the part of the Senate Mr. HALE, Mr. ALLISON, and Mr. COCKRELL.

ORDER OF BUSINESS.

The House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar, Mr. RICHARDSON in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The House is in Committee of the Whole for the consideration of the Private Calendar under the order of business adopted heretofore when the Committee of the Whole was in session.

ESTATE OF RICHARD W. MEADE.

The CHAIRMAN. When the Committee of the Whole rose last Friday the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HOLMES] was upon the floor making an explanation in regard to a joint resolution which he desired to call up for consideration—joint resolution (H. Res. 189) to amend and enlarge the provisions of a joint resolution approved July 25, 1886, "Joint resolution to refer the claim of the administrator of Richard W. Meade, deceased, to the Court of Claims." The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Iowa as now entitled to the floor.

Mr. HOLMES. Mr. Chairman, when this bill was last before the Committee of the Whole, I was making some observations in explanation of it. I stated that the Spanish Government had allowed the claim in this case in the sum of about $300,000, and that the American commission appointed to investigate the matter had refused to make allowance or further to investigate the claim, because the original papers placed before the Spanish Government were not submitted by this claimant, nor would the Spanish Government permit of any use being made of them for the purpose of enforcing this claim before the American commission.

Mr. LANHAM. I rise to a parliamentary question. I would like to know what is the status of the joint resolution with regard to which the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HOLMES] is now speaking. Has the question been submitted whether the Committee of the Whole will consent to its consideration?

Mr. HOLMES. Consent was given me to make an explanation of this matter; that is what I was doing when, on last Friday, I yielded for a motion that the Committee of the Whole rise.

Mr. SOWDEN. At that time I reserved the right to object when the matter should come up again to-day.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is informed that on last Friday the right to object after the statement of the gentleman from Iowa should be completed, was reserved. When the gentleman from Iowa has completed his statement the Chair will put the question whether there is objection.

Mr. NELSON. I ask that the bill be again read; some of us do not know what it is.

The Clerk read as follows:

Joint resolution (H. Res. 189) to amend and enlarge the provisions of a joint resolution approved July 25, 1866, entitled "A joint resolution to refer the claim of the administrator of Richard W. Meade, deceased, to the Court of Claims."

Whereas by joint resolution approved July 25, 1866, Congress referred the claim of Richard W. Meade, administrator of Richard W. Meade, deceased, to the Court of Claims "for adjudication thereof, pursuant to authority conferred upon said court by any existing law to examine and decide claims against the United States referred to it by Congress;" and

Whereas the said court and the Supreme Court of the United States dismissed the said claim upon the ground that the said resolution did not confer upon them jurisdiction to hear and determine the said claim upon its merits: Therefore,

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives, etc., That the claim of Richard W. Meade, administrator of the estate of Richard W. Meade, deceased, be, and the same is hereby, referred to the Court of Claims with full jurisdiction and authority to determine and adjudge whether or not the said Richard W. Meade, deceased, had a valid claim against the Government of Spain which was released to the said Government by that of the United States; and if said court determine that such claim was so released, then it is hereby given jurisdiction and authority to pronounce judgment for such amount as it may find to have been justly and equitably due thereon: *Provided*, That no allowance shall be made for interest on said claim accruing after the date of such release: *And provided further*, That from any final judgment of said court or from any judgment on demurrer with leave to amend or plead either the claimant or the United States shall have the right of appeal to the Supreme Court of the United States, whose judgment in the matter shall be final.

Mr. SOWDEN. Mr. Chairman, so far as I may have intimated any objection to the consideration of this joint resolution, I withdraw it now, because I see that by the terms of the resolution there is reserved a right of appeal to the Supreme Court. The case is to undergo a thorough judicial examination, instead of being examined merely by a committee of this House.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Iowa will now complete his statement.

Mr. HOLMES. After the claim had been disallowed by the American commission Mr. Meade was without remedy. He had his judgment in the Spanish court, but the Spanish authorities maintained that by the treaty the claimant had been relegated to the American Government for the settlement of his claim; that it should be paid out of the $5,000,000 provided in the treaty for the payment of certain claims. On the other hand, the United States Government contended that the claim was still due and owing by the Government of Spain.

What is sought in this case is that this matter may be sent to the Court of Claims for determination of the question whether or not the United States Government is liable; and if not, the further enforcement of the claim will be a matter of diplomatic correspondence between this country and Spain. That is all there is in this proposition. Not a dollar of appropriation out of the United States Treasury is asked, but simply an adjudication of this claimant's rights as between the United States and Spain—nothing more. This is certainly due to any claimant under such circumstances, particularly where a *prima facie* case is made out so absolutely as in this instance. General George G. Meade has deserved well of the people of this nation, and certainly this House is not prepared to do him or his family injustice in connection with a matter so plain on its face as this claim, the justice of which has been conceded so many times in various tribunals, by this Government, and by the Spanish Government as well.

I ask consent that the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. HOOKER], who made the report in this case and who has given it more thorough investigation than I have, be allowed to make a statement in regard to it.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the present consideration of this joint resolution?

Mr. OATES. I do not understand just exactly what it is proposed to be done by this joint resolution, and would like to have the gentleman explain the present status of this matter.

The CHAIRMAN. The joint resolution is not before the committee for consideration. The question is whether the committee will consent to its being brought up.

Mr. OATES. I know that, but I wish to ask a question in reference to this Meade claim so that I may understand what it is proposed to do.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. OATES. Has not a bill been already passed referring this question to the Court of Claims, and is not this joint resolution which it is now asked shall be called up for consideration in the nature of legislation amendatory of that which has been already passed?

Mr. HOOKER. If the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HOLMES] will allow me, I will answer the interrogatory of the gentleman from Alabama, as I made the report from the Committee on Foreign Affairs, which was unanimous in favor of the passage of this joint resolution.

Mr. HOLMES. Certainly, I will yield to the gentleman for that purpose.

Mr. HOOKER. There was a resolution passed in 1886 referring this matter to the Court of Claims for adjudication. It was referred to the Court of Claims, and the Court of Claims passed upon it. From that judgment of the Court of Claims there was an appeal to the Supreme Court of the United States. The Supreme Court in rendering its opinion expressed its regret that the resolution adopted by Congress was not broad enough to give jurisdiction to the Court of Claims to adjudicate the whole question.

Mr. OATES. In what particular regard?

Mr. HOOKER. The Supreme Court of the United States expressed its regret in that opinion that the legislation of Congress did not give the Court of Claims jurisdiction to go into the matter of the judgment rendered by the Spanish court, as well as other matters necessarily involved in coming to a right decision upon the nature and validity of

this claim. Now, Mr. Chairman, Mr. Meade had for a number of years entered into contracts with the Spanish Government, fourteen in number, and when he made his claim before the Spanish Junta, where this was being considered, together with other claims against the Spanish Government, they rendered a judgment in his favor. In the treaty which was entered into between the United States and Spain under which we acquired Florida, the United States agreed to assume all liability on the part of Spain to citizens of this country to the extent of $5,000,000. To the commission which was appointed under the treaty Mr. Meade presented his claim, but being unable to withdraw his papers from the Spanish Government and present them to the commission there was nothing before them upon which judgment could be rendered, and the term of three years having expired under the treaty the claim was rejected.

As I have already stated, Mr. Chairman, the Supreme Court of the United States in rendering its opinion upon the appeal taken from the decision of the Court of Claims expressed its regret that the legislation of Congress was not broad enough to take all these matters into consideration.

The resolution now pending merely proposes to give the Court of Claims full jurisdiction to pass upon the validity of this Meade claim, to go into the judgment of the Spanish Government in favor of Mr. Meade, and other matters necessary to arrive at a just conclusion. In other words, the legislation merely proposes to give the court full authority to go into the whole matter, with the right reserved to each party to appeal to the Supreme Court of the United States, as it is evident in a matter of this kind there can be no final disposition of the case until the Supreme Court of the United States has rendered its decision upon the whole matter.

Mr. OATES. From the investigation which I have been able to give this question, without having gone into the whole case, I am satisfied there is some justice in it. My desire was, in asking the question I did, to discover just exactly what was proposed to be done by this legislation.

Mr. HOOKER. If the Supreme Court decides that the Spanish Government by the judgment of its own junta was liable to Mr. Meade, and that the United States assumed under the treaty with Spain the liability of Spain to American citizens, then that is the end of the matter.

Mr. OATES. The gentleman's statement is satisfactory to me, and so far as I am concerned I do not interpose any objection.

The CHAIRMAN. If there is no objection, the joint resolution will be laid aside to be reported to the House with the recommendation that it do pass.

Mr. ALLEN, of Mississippi. I object.

The CHAIRMAN. The question will then be submitted on laying the resolution aside to be reported to the House with the recommendation that it do pass. [After a pause.] The ayes seem to have it.

Mr. ALLEN, of Mississippi. Division.

The committee divided; and there were—ayes 45, noes 9.

Mr. ALLEN, of Mississippi. No quorum has voted.

Mr. LANHAM. I hope the gentleman in charge of this joint resolution will withdraw it, as it is evident a quorum is not present.

Mr. HOOKER. I hope the gentleman from Mississippi will not insist upon his point of no quorum. This is simply a resolution referring this matter to the Court of Claims for adjudication. There is nothing else in it.

Mr. LANHAM. I hope the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HOLMES] will withdraw the resolution.

Mr. HOLMES. It does not seem to me, Mr. Chairman, there is anything in this case which requires I should withdraw it, and especially when it seems on the part of those present there is no very serious opposition to it.

Mr. CULBERSON. I demand the regular order.

The CHAIRMAN. The regular order is demanded, and the Chair will appoint as tellers Mr. HOLMES, and Mr. ALLEN of Mississippi.

The committee proceeded to divide.

Mr. LANHAM. I am informed by the gentleman from Mississippi that it is not his purpose to allow any bills to pass unless a quorum is present. That being the case, I move that the committee now rise.

The CHAIRMAN. That motion would not be in order while the committee is dividing.

Mr. HOOKER. I believe my name comes next on the roll. I have a little bill here, involving but a small amount——

The CHAIRMAN. The only business in order is the announcement of the vote by tellers.

The tellers reported—ayes 35, noes 5.

Mr. ALLEN, of Mississippi. No quorum.

Mr. LANHAM. I move that the committee now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

The committee accordingly rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. RICHARDSON reported that the Committee of the Whole House having had under consideration House joint resolution 189, had come to no resolution thereon.

Mr. LANHAM. I move that the House do now adjourn.

Mr. McMILLIN. Pending that I move that when the House adjourns to-day it be to meet on Monday next.

Mr. MORRILL. I hope the motion to adjourn will not prevail, because it cuts off the Friday evening session for pensions.

The SPEAKER. The motion of the gentleman from Tennessee does not interfere with the Friday evening session.

Mr. DINGLEY. Let the motion of the gentleman from Tennessee be adopted, but not the motion of the gentleman from Texas, which would cut off the night session.

Mr. WHEELER. I move as a substitute for the motion of the gentleman from Tennessee that to-morrow be substituted for the consideration of private bills.

The SPEAKER. That motion is not in order.

The question being taken on the motion of Mr. McMILLIN, the House divided; and there were—ayes 65, noes 14.

Mr. MORGAN. No quorum.

Mr. LANHAM. I move that the House do now adjourn.

The SPEAKER. That is the pending motion.

Mr. HOOKER. I hope the gentleman will withdraw that motion and allow me to ask leave to present one bill. [Cries of "Regular order!"]

The SPEAKER. The motion of the gentleman from Tennessee is still pending.

Mr. HOOKER. I wish to ask unanimous consent to consider a bill. [Cries of "Regular order!"]

The SPEAKER. If the motion of the gentleman from Texas was withdrawn the Chair would have to proceed with the regular order, which is the appointment of tellers on the motion of the gentleman from Tennessee, on which a quorum is demanded.

Mr. HOOKER. The question of no quorum being made on the motion of the gentleman from Tennessee, is it in order to do anything else except to adjourn?

The SPEAKER. It is not, except to appoint tellers on that motion and complete the vote. If the motion of the gentleman from Tennessee is withdrawn, the Chair will submit the motion of the gentleman from Texas; otherwise the gentleman from Tennessee has priority under the rules.

The point of no quorum being made, the Chair will order tellers.

Mr. MORGAN and Mr. McMILLIN were appointed tellers.

The House again divided; and there were—ayes 42, noes 7.

The SPEAKER. Is the point of no quorum insisted upon?

Mr. ROWLAND. I make the point of no quorum.

Mr. LANHAM. I ask unanimous consent, then, that next Monday be substituted for to-day, and that Monday night be substituted for the night session fixed for to-day for pension bills, so that the House may adjourn over until Monday when it adjourns to-day. In other words, I ask unanimous consent that the order of business for to-day may be executed on Monday and Monday evening.

Mr. HOLMES. I understand under that arrangement that the bill just up would have its same status then that it has to-day.

The SPEAKER. Of course it would occupy the same position precisely if that order were made.

Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

Mr. McKENNA. I object.

Mr. LANHAM. Then I demand the regular order.

The SPEAKER. The tellers will resume their places.

Mr. McKENNA. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw the objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there further objection?

Mr. FULLER. I object.

Mr. ALLEN, of Mississippi. I ask unanimous consent to make a statement for one minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. ALLEN, of Mississippi. I gave notice on yesterday evening, when it was objected that there was not a quorum here, and that therefore the House could not adjourn over until Monday—thinking that it took just about as many to pass a bill as to adjourn over, and that if less than a quorum was not sufficient to adjourn over less than a quorum ought not to be sufficient to pass any bills, I gave notice that no bills should pass to-day without a quorum; but I find a large number of gentlemen here who have unimportant bills—important to them, but unimportant as public measures of legislation—that they are anxious to pass; and I, as everybody knows, being a sort of an amiably-disposed person, and not wanting to obstruct things of that sort, I will, on the condition that the bill that I called a quorum on be laid aside without a favorable or any other recommendation, withdraw my objection to the House proceeding, and let us take up such bills as are unobjectionable and pass them.

Mr. MORGAN. With the understanding that we may proceed to-day as on the last two Fridays, I withdraw my objection to the motion of the gentleman from Tennessee.

The SPEAKER. But the gentleman from North Carolina made the point of no quorum on that motion.

Mr. ROWLAND. I withdraw the point.

Mr. McMILLIN. Still my motion is pending, and I ask the Chair to announce the result of the vote.

The SPEAKER. The ayes are 52, noes 8. The point of no quorum has been withdrawn; the ayes have it, and the motion of the gentle-

man from Tennessee [Mr. MCMILLIN], that when the House adjourn to-day it be to meet on Monday next, is agreed to.

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw the motion to adjourn, and move that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole on the Private Calendar.

The motion was agreed to; and accordingly the House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole on the Private Calendar, Mr. RICHARDSON in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The House is in Committee of the Whole on the Private Calendar, under the same rule as obtained on Friday last.

Mr. HOLMES. I desire, in conformity with the request of several gentlemen, to withdraw the bill, consideration of which I had asked, without prejudice, and that it retain its place on the Calendar.

The CHAIRMAN. If there be no objection, that order will be made.

There was no objection.

A. N. KIMBALL.

Mr. HOOKER. I ask consideration of the bill (H. R. 7151) for relief of A. N. Kimball and sureties on his official bond as receiver of public moneys.

The CHAIRMAN. The bill will be reported, after which the Chair will ask for objection.

The bill was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Commissioner of the Land Office and the proper accounting officers of the Treasury be, and they hereby are, authorized and directed, in the settlement and adjustment of the accounts of Aaron N. Kimball, late receiver of public moneys and disbursing agent at Jackson, Miss., to allow credit for the sum of $1,176.71 (being the sum of $924 of the public funds disbursed by him for clerical services, and for stationery and blanks procured for and used in the land office and receiver's office at Jackson, Miss., in a case of emergency upon a sudden and unexpected increase of the business of said offices, and the sum of $252.71, interest at the rate of 6 per cent. per annum on the amount of said disbursements from May 2, 1883, to the 23d day of November, 1887, on which last-named date a judgment was rendered in the circuit court of the United States for the southern district of Mississippi against the said Kimball and his sureties on his bond as such receiver, for the said and other moneys). And it is further directed that a remitter be entered on said judgment for the amount of said credit.

It is proposed to strike out all following the enacting clause and insert:

That Aaron N. Kimball, late receiver of public moneys and disbursing agent at Jackson, Miss., be, and he is hereby, allowed credit for the sum of $549 for clerical services rendered and blanks furnished his said office without the authority of the Secretary of the Interior, and for which said Kimball has not heretofore received credit. And the marshal for the United States in the district of Mississippi, and the United States court held at the city of Jackson, in said State, be, and he is hereby, directed and required to credit the said sum of $549 on a certain judgment recovered in said court by the United States as plaintiff against said Kimball and the sureties on his official bond as defendants.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. FULLER. I ask that the report be read.

The report was read, as follows:

The Committee on the Judiciary, to whom was referred House bill 7151, having had the same under consideration, respectfully report:

Mr. Kimball was receiver of public moneys at Jackson, Miss., and in the final adjustment of his accounts with the General Land Office he claimed various items of credit, as follows:

ITEMS OF DISALLOWED ACCOUNT.

To amount paid Joseph S. Ware for clerical services from January 1, 1882, to April 30, 1883, as per Voucher A	$415
To amount paid E. B. Comfort for clerical services from July 10, 1882, to April 3, 1883, as per Voucher B	35
To amount paid N. J. Smith for clerical services from March 4, 1883, to March 7, 1883, as per Voucher C	6
Amount paid Power & Barksdale for printing blanks, as per bill marked Voucher D, and samples from Nos. 1 to 10, inclusive	93
Amount paid Mrs. Mary C. Kimball for clerical services from January 1, 1882, to June 1, 1882, inclusive, as per Voucher E	375
Total	924

The following history of the case, from the Commissioner of the General Land Office, through the Secretary of the Interior, explains why this account was rejected:

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR, *Washington, March* 13, 1888.

SIR: There are transmitted herewith the report of the Acting Commissioner of the General Land Office on bill H. R. 7151, "For relief of A. N. Kimball and sureties, on his official bond as receiver of public moneys at Jackson, Miss.," and the papers accompanying said bill, as submitted by you on the 7th instant.

Very respectfully,

WM. F. VILAS, *Secretary.*

Hon. WILLIAM C. OATES,
Chairman of Subcommittee, Committee on the Judiciary, House of Representatives.

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR, GENERAL LAND OFFICE,
Washington, D. C., March 10, 1888.

SIR: I am in receipt of a communication under date of March 7, 1888, from Hon. W. C. OATES, chairman subcommittee on the Judiciary, House of Representatives, inclosing House bill No. 7151, "For the relief of A. N. Kimball and sureties, on his official bond as receiver of public moneys," with accompanying papers, with a request that he be furnished with a "history" of the case, and in reply thereto have to state as follows:

That under date of May 5, 1883, Mr. A. N. Kimball transmitted to this office an account for fractional quarter ending April 30, 1883, debiting the United States with the sum of $549 claimed to have been expended by him for clerical services rendered from January 1, 1882, to April 30, 1883, and for certain blanks furnished the land office at Jackson, Miss., from October 28, 1880, to January 25, 1883.

This account was rejected and returned to him under date of September 17, 1884, because no authority had been given him to make these expenditures.

Nothing further was heard from the account until November 5, 1887, when Mr. A. N. Kimball presented an account for fractional quarter ending April 30, 1883, to this office, supported by vouchers for expenses incurred by said Kimball, as receiver, at Jackson, Miss., from January 1, 1882, to June 1, 1883, amounting to $924, which included the $549, previously rejected, and the further sum of $375 for clerical services rendered to June 1, 1883.

The honorable Secretary of the Interior was advised, under date of November 14, 1887, that the claim of Mr. Kimball could not be allowed without the approval of the Secretary, as is required by section 2255, United States Revised Statutes.

It stands unexplained why Mr. Kimball should submit to this office, under date of November 5, 1887, an account purporting to be for fractional quarter ending April 30, 1887, and containing an item of $375 for clerical services, $75 of which said amount is for services claimed to have been rendered during a period of one month subsequent to the date for which said account is rendered and of the expiration of his term of office, and also why the balance of said $375, amounting to $300, claimed to have been expended for clerical services from January 1 to April 30, 1883, was not included in his account May 5, 1883, for fractional quarter ending April 30, 1883, and rejected as above set forth.

If Mr. Kimball expended the sum claimed for clerical services and blanks, and the United States received the benefit of the same, it is for Congress to determine whether he is entitled in equity to relief or not, and whether he shall be allowed it, notwithstanding the expenditure claimed to have been made was without authority of the Secretary of the Interior, as required by law, and the fact that he was advised by this office that the clerical services could not be authorized. See letters submitted and returned herewith.

Very respectfully,

S. M. STOCKSLAGER,
Acting Commissioner.

Hon. W. F. VILAS,
Secretary of the Interior.

Your committee, while disapproving the course of Mr. Kimball in incurring expenses of his office without authority of the Secretary of the Interior, yet, under the peculiar circumstances, herewith report a substitute and recommend its adoption, allowing him a credit on a judgment recovered by the United States against him and the sureties on his official bond in the United States circuit court at Jackson, Miss., for $549, rejecting $375, the last item in his said account, because the same is not sufficiently explained and proven to entitle him to a credit therefor.

Mr. OATES (during the reading). If the Clerk will suspend the reading I will explain the claim in a few words.

The claimant was receiver at the land office at Jackson, Miss. At a time when there was a great run on the office, the clerical force which he had was unable to do the work, and he ran out of blanks. He took the responsibility of employing additional clerks and having blanks printed for use in his office. After he passed out of office there was a suit brought against him on his bond for a considerable amount—$1,500 or $2,000—and he was found to be insolvent; but his sureties were solvent, and they were unable to use this claim, which amounted to about $900, included in these items. They were unable to use it as a set-off. It was not allowed by the Department, because he had not obtained the authority of the Commissioner of the General Land Office to make this expenditure. After the committee had the benefit of an explanation of the Commissioner of the General Land Office we decided that at least $531 of the claim should be allowed as a credit, giving his sureties the benefit of it on the judgment against them. Some $400 of his claim was rejected by the committee, because we did not think the proof was quite sufficient.

Mr. HOOKER. You recommended that $549 be allowed?

Mr. OATES. Yes. The amount proposed to be allowed is $549, and is certainly just.

Mr. FULLER. I would like to ask the gentleman a question. Did this officer ever make any claim to the Department for this expenditure before he was sued on the bond?

Mr. HOOKER. Oh, yes; repeatedly.

Mr. OATES. He claimed it, but it was not allowed.

Mr. FULLER. Were the claims refused by the Department?

Mr. OATES. They were refused, and the Commissioner of the General Land Office makes the statement that they were not allowed because they did not want to establish the precedent of any inferior official expending any amount without the consent of the Department. But they do not dispute the fact that the expenditure was made and that it was necessary.

Mr. FULLER. Then the amount was claimed before he was sued upon his official bond?

Mr. OATES. Oh, yes.

Mr. TURNER, of Georgia. Did he ask the Department for authority to employ the extra help?

Mr. OATES. He first employed them and then applied for consent; and the only ground on which it was refused at the time was that the appropriation was short. When he went out of office it had not been paid.

Mr. TURNER, of Georgia. I would ask the gentleman if he thinks, with his large experience of legislation here, that it would be prudent to allow officers to employ extra help without first obtaining the consent of the proper Department?

Mr. OATES. I think as a rule it would not be right and I would not sanction it. I think the Department made a correct decision in not permitting a precedent to be made; but there are such equities in this case, the Government getting the benefit of that expenditure, that it looks hard to require the sureties to pay the amount after the Government has got the benefit of the expenditures. I think the equities would be to give them the benefit of that much. Now the whole claim was about $900. We rejected the items about which there was some doubt, but there is no doubt about the amount we now recommend.

Mr. RYAN. Do I understand that this claimant had made application to employ these clerks before he did employ them?

Mr. OATES. It was about the same time. He employed the clerks because there was a rush upon the office, and he did not like to refuse the entries on account of a deficiency of clerical force. He sent his application on and went ahead. The clerks commenced doing the work, and he received an answer in a week, or perhaps a month, that the request could not be complied with, because the appropriation was short.

Mr. RYAN. Is that a maximum office?

Mr. OATES. I can not say as to that. It was laid before the Judiciary Committee, and after canvassing it fully they decided unanimously that that credit ought to be allowed under the exceptional circumstances of this case.

Mr. FULLER. Mr. Chairman, I think this is a very bad precedent to establish, and I shall have to object.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there further objection to the consideration of this bill?

Only three members objected—not a sufficient number.

Mr. HOOKER. I will move that the bill be laid aside to be reported to the House with the recommendation that it do pass. Before submitting that motion, however, I wish to read the concluding sentence of Mr. Stockslager, the Acting Commissioner. He says:

If Kimball expended the sum claimed for clerical service and blanks, and the United States received the benefit of the same, it is for Congress to determine whether he is entitled, in equity, to relief or not, and whether he shall be allowed it notwithstanding the expenditure claimed to have been made was without authority of the Secretary of the Interior, as required by law, and the fact that he was advised by this office that the clerical service which he desired would not be authorized.

Mr. TURNER, of Georgia. Will the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. OATES] state precisely what the items are for which payment is recommended?

Mr. OATES. They are stated in detail in the report. The last item, $375 for services rendered by Mrs. Kimball, was rejected by the committee and is not embraced.

Mr. TURNER, of Georgia. Why was that rejected?

Mr. HOOKER. I understand that that was rejected by the committee because they did not have sufficient proof of the rendition of the services by Mrs. Kimball, but in point of fact she is more entitled to pay than anybody else, in my judgment.

Mr. OATES. There was some testimony taken by the subcommittee of which I am a member;, but as to this item for clerical services said to have been rendered by the wife of the claimant, there was no evidence of the rendition of the service except his affidavit and hers. As to the other services, however, which we reported favorably upon, there is no question; several affidavits were submitted proving that the services were rendered, and well rendered; and also as to the blanks, it was shown that they were furnished and that only a reasonable price was charged for them.

Mr. TURNER, of Georgia. Do not the account and the proof show that these clerical services were obtained by this officer after he had been notified by the Department that it would not authorize the employment or furnish the compensation?

Mr. OATES. That was the case in respect to the service which he claimed to have been rendered by his wife.

Mr. TURNER, of Georgia. Was it not the case as to the whole of the services?

Mr. OATES. No, not as to the whole; only as to part. He renewed his application. There were two or three different applications.

Mr. TURNER, of Georgia. Now, I want to ask my friend from Alabama whether in his judgment it would be wise in Congress to sanction any such extraordinary course as that of this official. A postmaster or any other officer of the Government having asked for authority to expend the public money in a certain manner, and having been refused, does my friend think it would be proper to permit him to go on and incur expenses on his own responsibility and then come to Congress and ask reimbursement either for himself or his securities? Does not the gentleman know that that would tend to encourage similar expenditures on the part of public officials, who would rely upon Congress to make the amount good later?

Mr. OATES. I stated a few moments ago that I thought the Department was right in not allowing a precedent of this kind to be set up there. But herein lies the equity in favor of those who would benefit by it in this case. The blanks were actually furnished and the printer was paid for them. The services upon which we have reported favorably were actually rendered, and lands were being entered and money paid there, and the Government of the United States actually received the benefit of those services. The money went into the Treasury, and while the act of the officer was not warranted, while it was irregular, and while, if no one but the officer himself was to suffer, it might be well not to relieve him—in fact, I do not think I would vote to do it—yet when the man's sureties are concerned, and when the Government received the full benefit of these services and these expenditures, it seems to me rather a hard case not to allow this credit on the judgment. I think there is an equity in the matter, and it is a case that must rest on its own bottom. It is not likely to be a precedent, nor, so far as Congress is concerned, is it likely to influence our future action. I think it ought not to have been established as a precedent in the Department, but I think the parties are entitled to relief here to the extent recommended. There was some doubt in my mind as to whether the service claimed to have been rendered by this man's wife ought to be paid for, because, in addition to other reasons, those services were clearly rendered after he knew of the refusal of the Department to sanction the expenditure. As to the $549, I think the allowance is clearly right.

Mr. CATCHINGS. For how long a period of time was this extra clerical force employed?

Mr. OATES. Only a short time. There was a run made upon the office when there were a great many people taking up land.

Mr. CATCHINGS. Was it not nearly a year?

Mr. OATES. Oh, not so long—only two or three months.

Mr. HOOKER. Unless some gentleman desires to say something more on this subject, I will move that the bill be laid aside to be reported to the House with the recommendation that it do pass.

Mr. TURNER, of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I have great respect for the judgment of the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. HOOKER], as well as the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. OATES], on this question, formed, as no doubt it is, upon fair and considerate attention; and this being a small matter, I would be glad to waive any scruples I may have in regard to it. Small matters as well as large ones make precedents, and I doubt very much whether it would be wise on the part of Congress to set the example of compensating an officer who upon his own responsibility has incurred an expenditure of this sort. We may regret the hardship to his sureties, but I think it much better that a man who has voluntarily incurred a sacrifice of this sort, with full notice that he does so without authority, should suffer the burden of the expenditure rather than that public policy should be violated by Congress in compensating him for an expense incurred in this way.

Mr. HOOKER. I have only a word to say in reply to what has fallen from the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. TURNER]. In the several Departments of the Government, particularly in the Land Department, there arises occasionally necessity for the employment of extra clerical force. Of course the Department has, and ought to have, a supervision of this matter, and usually directs whether the extra force shall be employed. But instances have come to my knowledge in which a register or receiver at a land office has been constrained to employ clerks for the performance of the duties of the office, assuming himself the risk of having the Commissioner grant an extra allowance for such services; and in several instances the Commissioner has granted such an allowance. In this instance the Commissioner says himself that, while he did not grant the allowance, there is no sort of question, as the committee has shown in the report, that the services were rendered, that the Government received the benefit of them; that this money was expended for the purpose of purchasing blanks which were absolutely necessary for carrying on the business of the Land Office. There is no sort of question about any one item of the account.

Mr. TURNER, of Georgia. Will the gentleman allow me to conclude this whole matter, so far as I am concerned, by putting a case to him? Take the case of the postmaster at the city of Jackson, Miss. No doubt there is sometimes at that office a great pressure of business in the distribution of mails, etc., and allowances are frequently made for extra expenses at offices of that magnitude. Now, suppose the postmaster at that city, after asking the Postmaster-General to make a special allowance for such service, and after the refusal of such application (the postmaster having been informed that the allowance could not be made on account of the state of the finances), should go on and employ an extra clerk to help him. Would the gentleman favor an appropriation to reimburse the postmaster in such a case?

Mr. HOOKER. I would not; and I will tell the gentleman why. That is altogether a different case. The administration of the postal business in any city or town—Jackson, Miss., or anywhere else—is usually provided for by an appropriation made by Congress which is deemed adequate for the purpose, and the employment of an additional clerk by the mere action of the postmaster is certainly a condition of affairs which could hardly arise, because there is no such increase in the business of the Post-Office Department from day to day, from week to week, from month to month, as may arise in the Land Office, and as did arise in this case.

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Chairman, the case put by my friend from Georgia [Mr. TURNER] is, as he states it, a very strong one; and in any ordinary case I should accept his judgment on a point of this kind as correct. But I submit to him that he overlooks the controlling element in this case. While I do not distinctly recall the circumstances of this case, my recollection of it, as it came before the Judiciary Committee, has been somewhat refreshed by the observations of my friend from Alabama [Mr. OATES]. As he states, the Land Office declined to make an allowance to this officer because of the fact that there was an absence of appropriation, that the appropriation for work of this sort had been exhausted. There is an act of Congress prohibiting any of the Departments from making any contracts or allowances in excess of the appropriations made by law.

Now here was an emergency—one of a class of emergencies arising from time to time—where the necessities of the office, the convenience

of the people in the proper and speedy dispatch of the public business required an official force for which Congress in its original appropriations had not made provision. To illustrate: At Eureka Springs in our State, some years ago, waters of a medicinal character, or supposed to be medicinal, were discovered; and where there had been a barren waste there was within a few months a population of 5,000 people. The post-office there was completely overrun, persons waiting at the office in large numbers to obtain their mail. The postmaster, with the allowances made to him, could not properly dispatch the duties of his office, and no additional allowance was made by the Department to enable him to do so. Now, the question is whether a public officer, when an emergency like that, unanticipated and unprovided for, arises, should be allowed to neglect or disregard the necessities of the public. In that case, or in some other case of that character (I am not sure about the particular case), the Forty-ninth Congress, when the subject was brought to its attention, made proper provision for the reimbursement of the officer who had been compelled to decide between abandoning the discharge of the public business or staying there and for the time being bearing the additional expense himself. My friend who represents that district states that provision was made by Congress for the reimbursement of the officer in that instance.

Will any gentleman maintain that under such circumstances Congress ought not to have granted relief? And that case is analogous to the one now presented. The Department would have granted the necessary allowance, but Congress had failed to make adequate appropriation, and by statute the Department was prohibited from sanctioning any additional expenditure.

Mr. OATES. I desire to state that the fund appropriated in the general appropriation bill for clerical work in the local land offices is apportioned at the beginning of the year; and the amount apportioned to this particular office was exhausted before this "run" was made upon it. The land officers could not foresee that this rush of business would occur; and as the amount apportioned was exhausted, there were no funds from which an additional allowance could be made.

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Chairman, one other observation and then I will yield the floor to my friend.

There is a provision of the statute regulating the Department of Justice in this way. Very recently during the present session of Congress——

Mr. TURNER, of Georgia. The gentleman from Arkansas will admit it was a wise public policy which was embodied in that statute.

Mr. ROGERS. Yes; I do. I should regard it in a case of public emergency where the public interests are involved to be an unjust and unwise policy not to be allowed in its discretion to make ample provision for such emergency. To illustrate. Recently, in the case of an important investigation, it was found necessary on the part of the Department of Justice to take certain depositions. They were in the progress of taking them in the city of Philadelphia when the Department discovered they would be unable to meet the expenses of the counsel engaged in taking those depositions under notice already served, and when the taking of those depositions was in progress. Now, was the Government to withdraw this special counsel and permit these depositions in which the Government was interested to be taken *ex parte* and without compensation because the statute provided they should not proceed without the funds to carry on the business? Would the Congress of the United States in a case of that kind, when properly presented and when the Department of Justice had taken the responsibility to have these depositions taken, refuse to award compensation to the counsel who were engaged in that work? Certainly not; and they did not refuse to make provision at this very session of Congress, in the general deficiency bill, to provide for the expense incurred in taking those depositions.

Mr. HOOKER. I will now yield to the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. PEEL].

Mr. PEEL. Mr. Chairman, I have listened to the discussion which has taken place, and the case which has been referred to by my colleague is one in point. I wish to say I am familiar with that case. In my district when the Eureka Springs were first discovered the country where they are located was a wilderness. In a little while after the discovery of the springs, in 1881, people had flocked in there from all directions, and it became necessary to accommodate the public that a post-office should be established for the collection and distribution of the mail. A fourth-class post-office was established at that place, where there had accumulated some ten or fifteen thousand population.

As a matter of course, the Post-Office Department could not allow under the law an assistant in that post-office to help in the distribution of the mail, although such assistance was needed. The postmaster paid the money out of his own pocket to provide a sufficient force to accommodate the public needs. I introduced a bill for relief in that case, and it was reported favorably in the Forty-eighth Congress, to reimburse the postmaster for the money which he had paid out of his own pocket to accommodate the public while he was in the management of that post-office. It was a case of emergency which had arisen unexpectedly, and it was necessary to accommodate the people in receiving and collecting the mail; and it was just such a case where the Congress of the United States should intervene to make good whatever losses were suffered on the part of the postmaster.

Mr. HOOKER. I now yield to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. FULLER].

Mr. FULLER. I wish to say a word in reply to some of the statements made by the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. ROGERS]. It seems to me if his line of policy is pursued as indicated by his argument we will then have a case of this kind every session of Congress, upon the ground that the amount placed in the hands of these land officers was not sufficient.

Mr. ROGERS. The amount in the case of the Commissioner was not sufficient.

Mr. FULLER. I understand there is a certain amount in the hands of each one of these land officers to meet the expenditures under their management. I remember the case of the Lamar office in Colorado. Owing to the great amount of business in that office this money was exhausted. So in many other offices where the expenses in behalf of the public interests have exceeded the amount which they had on hand, owing to the amount of business which had been suddenly thrown upon them. Now, if we should establish a precedent like that indicated by the gentleman from Arkansas, that because there was a necessity in the case they should go on and hire extra help and come in afterwards to Congress for relief, we may expect an accumulation of cases of that character at every session of Congress. I think it is a dangerous practice, and one which ought not to be encouraged.

Mr. HOOKER. I think the House is ready to vote on this amendment. This is not asked in behalf of the man who did the work and who paid for the help which became necessary, but it is to make the allowance to the sureties involved in this suit.

The CHAIRMAN. The first question is on the pending amendment.

Mr. FULLER. I ask for a division.

The committee divided; and there were—ayes 29, noes 3.

Mr. FULLER. No quorum has voted.

The CHAIRMAN appointed as tellers Mr. HOOKER and Mr. FULLER.

The committee again divided; and the tellers reported—ayes 32, noes 1.

Mr. FULLER. While I still think this is a bad precedent, I do not feel like stopping the public business and will therefore withdraw the point of no quorum.

Mr. HOOKER. Thank you, sir.

The amendment was agreed to; and the bill as amended was laid aside to be reported to the House with the recommendation that it do pass.

CALL OF THE LIST OF MEMBERS.

The Clerk proceeded to call the list of members.

Mr. RICE. I rise, Mr. Chairman, for the purpose of stating that the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HOWARD] is detained from the Hall by sickness in his family, and to ask that by unanimous consent his name be passed over without prejudice to his right under the call.

There was no objection, and it was ordered accordingly.

STOCKBRIDGE AND MUNSEE INDIANS.

Mr. HUDD. I call up for present consideration the bill (H. R. 5043) for the relief of the Stockbridge and Munsee tribe of Indians, in the State of Wisconsin.

Mr. DUNN. Is that a private bill?

The CHAIRMAN. It is on the Private Calendar, and is a private bill.

The bill was read, as follows:

Whereas a treaty was entered into on the 5th day of February, 1856, by and between the Government of the United States and the Stockbridge and Munsee Indians, in which the said Indians ceded certain lands to the United States, and accepted, in consideration thereof, certain lands as a reservation, to which said Indians removed, and upon which they have ever since resided; and

Whereas by the interpretation placed by Government officials on the act of February 6, 1871, an act for the relief of said Indians, a large part of said Indians (and their descendants) who signed said treaty of 1856, and have continued with said tribe from the making of said treaty to the present time, are excluded from participating in tribal funds and the right to occupy said reservation: Therefore

Be it enacted, etc., That all persons who were actual members of said tribe of Indians at the time of the execution of the treaty of February 5, 1856, and their descendants, and all persons who became members of the tribe under the provisions of Article VI of said treaty, and their descendants, who did not in and by said treaty, and have not since its execution, separated from said tribe, are hereby declared members of said Stockbridge and Munsee tribe of Indians, and entitled to share in former tribal funds and the occupancy of tribal lands.

SEC. 2. That it shall be the duty of the Secretary of the Interior, without unnecessary delay after the passage of this act, to cause to be taken an enrollment of said tribe on the basis of the provisions of this act, which enrollment shall be filed, a copy in the Department of the Interior and a copy in the records of said tribe.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

Mr. HUDD. This is a bill which involves no appropriation of money. It provides merely a mode of settling the differences or disputes between a tribe of Indians residing in Wisconsin. It has been reported favorably by prior Congresses, and the gentleman from Minnesota, my colleague on the Committee on Indian Affairs [Mr. NELSON], has made two reports similar to the one now pending before the House. The bill

only failed on final passage because of not having been reached. It has received unanimous reports from the Indian Committee of three Congresses. It makes no appropriation, is recommended by the Interior Department, and strongly by the Commissioner of Indian Affairs. So I presume there will be no objection to its passage.

I move that it be laid aside.

The motion was agreed to; and the bill was laid aside to be reported to the House with the recommendation that it do pass.

J. GEORGE RUCKSTUHL.

Mr. HUTTON. I ask present consideration of the bill (H. R. 338) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of J. George Ruckstuhl.

The bill was read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of War be, and is hereby, authorized and directed to remove from the military record of J. George Ruckstuhl, late a first lieutenant in the Ninety-seventh Illinois Volunteers, the charge of desertion, and to cancel all penalties and forfeitures arising therefrom.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. HUTTON. There is an amendment I desire to offer to the bill, and also an amendment to the title.

The CHAIRMAN. The question of amending the title will come up hereafter in the House. The first question is, Will the committee now consider the bill.

Mr. KILGORE. Let us have the report read.

The report (by Mr. GEAR) was read, as follows:

They find that he was mustered into the United States service as first lieutenant of Company C, Ninety-seventh Regiment of Illinois Volunteer Infantry, September 16, 1862. That he was left at Camp Smith, Kentucky, on November 11 to superintend the burial of a dead soldier, and that he did not rejoin his regiment until February 1, 1863, during which time he was "absent without leave." Charges were preferred against him, but he tendered his resignation, to take effect December 31, 1862, which resignation was accepted by General U. S. Grant in general orders March 2, 1867.

In the tender of his resignation he states that it is on the ground of "ill-health," which statement is verified by the certificate of two surgeons who testify to the fact.

In regard to his "absence without leave" Ruckstuhl makes the following statement: That he was left under a verbal order of General A. J. Smith at Nicholasville, Ky., to bury one D. C. Fulton, a member of his regiment; that he did so remain, and after having performed this duty he started to rejoin his regiment; that on arriving at Frankfort he was taken severely ill; that he left his detail at that point, telling them that he would rejoin his regiment at Louisville; that on his arrival at Louisville, Ky., he was unable to rejoin his regiment, as he was suffering from a severe hemorrhage, in consequence of which he was unable to travel; that while in Louisville he was under the care of one Dr. Coke, who is now dead.

This statement of the facts in the case Mr. Ruckstuhl makes under oath, and is supported by the affidavits of one Gottlieb Beih and Mary Daesschofer, who both testify to the fact of his illness in Louisville, Ky.; that he was confined to his bed for about six weeks under the care of Dr. Coke, who has since died. The time that these two witnesses testify as to the duration of his illness covers the period for which he is reported "absent without leave from his regiment."

Your committee recommend that the words in the sixth line of the bill, "the charge of desertion," be stricken out and the words "absence without leave" be inserted in lieu thereof, and that when so amended the bill do pass.

There being no objection, the bill was considered, the amendment recommended by the Committee on Military Affairs adopted, and the bill as amended laid aside to be reported to the House with the recommendation that it do pass.

HYLAND C. KIRK AND OTHERS.

Mr. JACKSON. I ask the present consideration of the bill (S. 395) for the relief of Hyland C. Kirk and others, assignees of Addison C. Fletcher.

The bill was read at length.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. KILGORE. I think the report ought to be read in that case.

The CHAIRMAN. The report will be read, subject to objection.

The report was read at length.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. KILGORE. What is the amount of the claim that is proposed to be presented here to the Court of Claims?

Mr. JACKSON. I will say that this is a Senate bill, and I am not so familiar with the facts as other gentlemen on the floor to enable me to answer questions with regard to the bill. The principal information that I have in respect to it was gathered from an examination of the report of the Senate and the accompanying exhibits. I think the gentleman from New York [Mr. BAKER] has given it more attention and can probably answer fully any questions that may arise in regard to it.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the gentleman from New York will make a statement in reference to the bill.

Mr. KILGORE. What amount does it involve?

Mr. BAKER, of New York. Mr. Chairman, this bill was in charge of my colleague from New York [Mr. DAVENPORT] who is absent, but at his request I have informed myself of the facts on record in the case. This matter was examined when pending in the Court of Claims, which court decided that in case the finding was substantially in favor of claimant—but I will read the exact language of the court. They say:

The court find that one-twentieth of 1 per cent. of the amount so collected, to wit, the sum of $35,151.33, would be a reasonable royalty for the use of the device, if the claimant is entitled to recover therefor.

Mr. KILGORE. That is the whole amount involved?

Mr. BAKER of New York. As I understand it, that is the whole amount involved in this claim.

Mr. KILGORE. My understanding is that it may run up into the hundreds of thousands of dollars.

Mr. BAKER, of New York. This is the finding of the Court of Claims, and so stated by Mr. DAVENPORT, and given to me also by other parties familiar with the facts of the case. They inform me that something over $35,000 is the limit of the amount stated by the court as a reasonable royalty for the use of the device, if anything at all is to be recovered.

The CHAIRMAN. The question first is, Will the bill be considered?

Mr. KILGORE. I think I will have to object to the consideration of this bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The question then is, Will the committee consider the bill?

Two members only rising to object, the bill was ordered to be considered.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on laying the bill aside.

Mr. KILGORE. I give notice, Mr. Chairman, that my objection does not end here. I shall insist upon the point of no quorum with reference to this bill. It is too important to be passed in this manner.

Mr. BAKER, of New York. In view of that statement and rather than obstruct the other business to-day, I suggest to the gentleman from Pennsylvania to withdraw the bill.

Mr. JACKSON. Under the circumstances, and at the instance of the gentleman from New York, I will withdraw the bill for the present.

JOHN R. TREUTLEN.

Mr. JOHNSTON, of North Carolina. I ask consideration of the bill (H. R. 2896) for the relief of the heirs of John R. Treutlen.

The bill was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized to pay to the heirs of John R. Treutlen, late an employé in the House of Representatives, $333.33, being the difference in the salaries paid to laborers and that paid to messengers, which latter office he filled from the 7th day of April, 1881, to the 17th day of December, 1881, performing all the duties of messenger and receiving only the pay of laborer.

SEC. 2. That the amount necessary to pay the same is hereby appropriated and made immediately available.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the consideration of this bill? The Chair hears none.

The bill was laid aside to be reported to the House with the recommendation that it do pass.

JOHN GRAY.

Mr. KEAN. I ask consideration of the bill (H. R. 11165) for the relief of John Gray.

The bill was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the proper accounting officers of the Treasury be, and they are hereby, authorized and directed to pay to John Gray, late major of the One hundred and seventy-fifth New York Volunteers, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the pay and allowances of a major of infantry from the 19th of November, 1862, the date he received his commission as major from the governor of the State of New York, to the 17th day of January, 1863, the date he is borne upon the record as having been mustered into the service as major of said regiment.

Mr. ROGERS. Let the report be read.

The report (by Mr. STONE, of Kentucky) was read, as follows:

The Committee on War Claims, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 11165) for the relief of John Gray, report as follows:

This is a claim for pay for services rendered prior to muster, by John Gray, formerly major of the One hundred and seventy-fifth Regiment New York Volunteers.

The claimant applied to the War Department for relief, and was denied in 1886, for the reason that "his muster into service as major January 17, 1863, recognized him from the earliest date by completion of his command."

The proof shows that John Gray was commissioned major of the One hundred and seventy-fifth Regiment New York Volunteers on the 19th of November, 1862, by the governor of New York, and served in that capacity without pay until January 17, 1863.

Having obtained the benefit of Gray's services, the Government ought not to set up a technical plea in bar of its obligation to make compensation therefor, and your committee are of opinion that payment should be made to Maj. John Gray.

Your committee report back the bill, and recommend its passage.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the present consideration of this bill? The Chair hears none.

The bill was laid aside to be reported to the House with the recommendation that it do pass.

MARITIME CANAL COMPANY OF NICARAGUA.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. Chairman, I have a bill here that I want to call up for a friend of mine. I will take charge of it.

Mr. BAKER, of New York. I am informed that there is some question about this bill. How much is there involved in it?

Mr. KILGORE. Not a cent.

The Clerk read the title of the bill, as follows:

A bill (S. 1305) to incorporate the Maritime Canal Company of Nicaragua.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is informed that this bill is on the House Calendar.

Mr. DUNN. It is a private bill, to create a private corporation.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will state that he understands the rule to apply to only those bills which are on the Private Calendar.

Mr. DUNN. I would like to know why it is not on the Private Calendar. It is a private bill, and the rule was intended to comprehend and take in all private bills; and all private bills ought to be on the Private Calendar.

The CHAIRMAN. The time to have made that question woulp have been when it was referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. DUNN. I submit that an erroneous reference of a bill ought not to deprive it of its privilege under this call. The fact that it is on the Private Calendar is a very technical question that ought not under the rule to exclude its consideration.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair would not by its ruling undertake to exclude a private bill. If there be no objection, the bill will be read, after which the Chair will ask for objection to its consideration.

Mr. CULBERSON. I object.

Mr. DUNN. It has not arrived at the stage for objection. The question is on the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair has not called for objection. This discussion is simply upon the point of order, and the Chair has not ruled on the point of order——

Mr. MORGAN. I understand the Chair to state that this bill did not come under the present call, but that it might be called up by unanimous consent.

Mr. DUNN. The Chair called attention to the fact that the bill is on the House Calendar. I state that the bill is a private bill and ought to be on the Private Calendar.

Mr. LANHAM. I raise the point of order on the bill.

Mr. CULBERSON. I demand that the bill be read.

Mr. KILGORE. I understand that the House bill is on the Private Calendar.

Mr. RAYNE (to Mr. KILGORE). Call up the House bill and substitute it for the Senate bill.

Mr. KILGORE. I will just call up the House bill instead of the Senate bill.

Mr. LAWLER. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask how this bill comes up at this time.

Mr. DUNN. The bill is trying to get up now.

Mr. LAWLER. I object to its consideration.

The CHAIRMAN. The time has not come for objections. The Chair is informed that the House bill is on the Private Calendar. The objection would be waived for that reason, and the point of order would not lie against its consideration. I now ask if there is objection to the consideration of the House bill?

Mr. CULBERSON. Let the House bill be read.

The CHAIRMAN. The House bill will be taken up, and after it is read the Chair will ask if there is objection to its consideration.

The bill (H. R. 5616) was read for information.

The CHAIRMAN. Shall the bill be considered?

Mr. CULBERSON. I make the point of order that that bill is not upon the Private Calendar.

The CHAIRMAN. The bill which has just been read is on the Private Calendar.

Mr. CULBERSON. The one that I have is not on the Private Calendar.

Mr. DUNN. But when objection was made the gentleman called up the House bill instead.

The CHAIRMAN. The bill which has just been read is on the Private Calendar, page 41. Those who are opposed to the consideration of the bill will rise and stand until counted.

Seven members objected—more than a sufficient number; so the bill was not considered.

STATE NATIONAL BANK OF NEW ORLEANS.

Mr. LAFFOON. I call up the bill (H. R. 3715) for the relief of the State National Bank of New Orleans, formerly Louisiana State Bank.

The bill was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the claim of the State National Bank of New Orleans, formerly Louisiana State Bank, for the payment of the proceeds of cotton belonging to said bank taken by the agents of the Treasury Department of the United States, in the States of Louisiana and Arkansas, after the 30th day of June, 1865, be, and the same is hereby, referred to the Court of Claims for adjudication, and that said bank may institute suit in said court and the same shall be tried and adjudicated the same as if said action had been filed within the time authorized by law; that the testimony and original papers filed by said bank before the Treasury Department of the United States in connection with said claim be, and the same shall be, received by said court as evidence as if taken or filed under the rules of said court; that the said bank and United States may take further evidence as may be deemed proper, subject to the rules for taking testimony in said court.

The report (by Mr. SHAW) is as follows:

The Committee on Claims, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 3715) for the relief of the State National Bank of New Orleans, formerly Louisiana State Bank, having considered the same, report as follows:

The committee agree with the conclusions reached by the Committee on Claims in the Senate, as embodied in a report from said committee in the Forty-seventh Congress, and adopt said report, and recommend that said bill be amended by inserting, in line 15, after the word "evidence," the words "so far as the same may be legally competent and proper under the rules and practice of said court," and as so amended that said bill do pass.

The Committee on Claims, to whom was referred "A bill for the relief of the State National Bank of Louisiana," having examined the same, make the following report:

That the State Bank of Louisiana, a banking corporation chartered by the laws of Louisiana, and located at the city of New Orleans, in 1863, while said city was in the permanent occupation and control of military forces of the United States, through its agents, contracted with various parties residing in Upper Louisiana and Arkansas, who had raised and were the private owners thereof, for the purchase of several hundred bales of cotton. At the dates of these contracts of purchase the venders resided within the lines of the Confederate forces, and commercial relations between the bank and themselves were prohibited, both by the general and statute laws of the Government and by the proclamation of the President of the United States, made under and in pursuance of said laws. The cotton thus purchased or contracted for remained in the possession of the several venders until after the 30th of June, 1865, when hostilities having ceased, it was delivered over to the agent of the bank, and by said agent collected together at different points preparatory to shipment to New Orleans.

After the cotton had thus reached the possession of the bank, and while awaiting shipment to New Orleans, special Treasury agents of the United States, on the 27th and 29th July, 1865, and the 18th November, 1865, seized the same and caused it to be shipped to Simeon Draper, the agent of the Treasury Department at New York, by whom it was sold, and the proceeds paid into the United States Treasury. The State Bank of Louisiana, after the close of the war, having been merged into the State National Bank of Louisiana, the latter, as the successor to all the rights and interests of the former bank, made claim to the proceeds of this cotton, but its claim was rejected by the Treasury Department. The bank thereafter, on the 21st September, 1877, instituted an action in the Court of Claims for the recovery of said proceeds, and was defeated in said court by the plea of the statute of limitation. The object of the present bill is to allow the bank to have its claim referred to the Court of Claims for trial and adjudication, just as though the action had been filed in said court within the time authorized by law. Its claim before the Department was not finally determined until after the bar of the statute had attached.

The rejection of the claim by the Department was based upon the ground that its purchases having been made in 1863 from parties occupying an enemy relation, the bank failed to acquire title to the cotton, and had therefore no valid claim to its proceeds. If the case stood alone upon the contract for the purchase of the cotton in 1863 the correctness of this ruling could not be well questioned. The decisions of the Supreme Court of the United States in Montgomery *vs.* United States, 15 Wallace, 395, and Mitchell *vs.* United States, 21 Wallace, declare that such contracts of purchase would fail to confer a valid title to the property, and your committee at the present session of Congress have reported against a bill granting relief as to the proceeds of property in a case where the party, by his purchase from inhabitants of insurrectionary districts in violation of the non-intercourse laws of the United States, failed to acquire a valid title. So that if nothing appeared in the present case except the bank's purchase of the cotton in 1863 from venders residing within the Confederate lines, it could not be distinguished from the Mitchell claim, and would be controlled by the principles applied in that case.

But there are important particulars in which the present differs from the Mitchell case. The bank's contract for the purchase of the cotton was not completed in 1863, or during the period of actual war. It had paid and the venders had received the purchase-money, but the cotton remained in the possession of the venders under an agreement for its future delivery. If the venders had subsequently refused to make delivery and complete the contract, and the bank had tried then, either during or after the war, to recover the cotton, it would have been nonsuited in any court of the United States if the illegality of the contract had been pleaded, or if the same had appeared to the court in the course of the trial. The planters did not, however, avail themselves of the illegality of the contract, but, on the contrary, recognizing the moral obligation which rested upon them, after receiving the purchase-money, they voluntarily completed the contract and delivered the cotton over to the possession of the bank after the war had actually closed.

Was this delivery, which appears to have been made subsequent to June 30, 1865, in contravention of law or of the non-intercourse acts and regulations of the Government? If the parties could at that time have lawfully made an original contract with each other for the sale and purchase of the cotton in question, it is difficult to see any valid reason why they could not then, without violation of law or public policy, recognize as binding and complete a contract previously entered into, no intervening rights having attached. Sunday contracts are generally prohibited or forbidden by law; but, when completed on Monday, by delivery, their validity can not be impeached. The controlling question, therefore, in the present case is, could these parties lawfully hold commercial intercourse with each other when the cotton was delivered; or rather, was such delivery, either as an original transaction or as the consummation of a previous agreement, in violation of law?

On the 24th June, 1865, the President of the United States, by proclamation issued under authority of law, expressly ordered that "all restrictions upon internal, domestic, and coastwise intercourse and trade, and upon the purchase and removal of products" lying west of the Mississippi River (excepting those relating to property heretofore purchased by the agents or captured by or surrendered to the forces of the United States) are annulled. Under this express authority given by law, the bank could legally have purchased this cotton. The venders could lawfully have sold or given it to the bank. When the venders, after this proclamation, delivered the cotton to the bank, it was in effect either a new sale based upon the valuable consideration previously received, or a voluntary relinquishment and donation of all their rights and title to the property. But suppose it is treated as the affirmation or confirmation of the contract of purchase made in 1863, what rule of law or principle of public policy forbids the ratification of that contract after June 24, 1865, before the Government had seized or captured the cotton? As a general proposition, void, as distinguished from voidable, contracts can not be confirmed, for the reason that the same legal objections arising from positive law or public policy continue to operate when the confirmation is attempted which existed at the formation of the original contract. But when that is not the case, when the law or public policy that originally vitiates the contract has been changed, when the legal objections to such contracts have ceased to operate, there is no reason why the parties thereto may not lawfully ratify or reaffirm their agreement.

If this position is correct, the act of the venders in ratifying and completing their contracts by delivery of the cotton after the restrictions upon commercial intercourse had been removed, conferred upon the bank a title to the property just as valid as though the contract had been first entered into at the date and place of delivery; so that the case is narrowed down to this, that after all hostilities had terminated and the President had, by his proclamation, removed all restrictions upon trade in the districts formerly declared to be in insurrection, the bank applied to the planters who agreed to sell it their cotton in 1863, and requested them to recognize and complete their agreement and confer upon the bank the possession and ownership of the cotton. This they might have refused to do, but feeling the moral obligation arising out of the receipt of the money the bank had paid them, they freely delivered the cotton to the agent of the bank when it was lawful for them to hold intercourse and before any intervening rights of the Government had attached.

Under those circumstances the transaction may well be termed either a valid confirmation of a former contract, or a new sale as of the date of such delivery, or a gift. When the cotton was so received in 1865 it must be admitted that the

possession which the bank thereby acquired was a legal one. The cotton had never been captured "*flagrante bello;*" it had never been abandoned or seized as such; consequently the United States never acquired the right of seizure coupled with possession before the bank perfected both its title and possession. Whether the agents of the Treasury Department had any authority in law for seizing this cotton in the possession of the bank at the several dates already given is, in the opinion of your committee, a matter of such grave doubt, to say the least of it, as to make this a proper case for the decision of some competent judicial tribunal. What the bank now asks is that it may be permitted to sue in the Court of Claims, and that said court shall hear and adjudicate the case as though it had been instituted within six years after the seizure of the cotton by the officers of the Government.

The proceeds of the cotton are in the United States Treasury, placed there by the alleged wrongful acts of special agents of that Department. The bank prosecuted its claim to these proceeds before the Department, hoping for a favorable decision, until its remedy in the Court of Claims was barred by the statute of limitations. Again, claimants in this class of cases were not supposed by the legal profession to have any remedy in the Court of Claims until the Klein case was decided in December, 1871. Under those circumstances the bank, having been guilty of no "laches," should not be deprived of the opportunity to have its claim passed upon by the Court of Claims. It would certainly be against conscience for the Government in a case like the present to keep this money and deny to the bank the privilege of establishing its superior right thereto. Your committee accordingly recommend the passage by the Senate of the accompanying bill.

The bill was laid aside to be reported to the House with the recommendation that it do pass.

BRIDGE ACROSS THE MISSISSIPPI NEAR ALMA, WIS.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I call up the bill (S. 2816) to authorize the construction of a bridge for railway purposes across the Mississippi River between the States of Wisconsin and Minnesota, to be located north of and in vicinity of the city of Alma, Wis.

The bill was read for information.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. Chairman, is that bill on the Private Calendar?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is informed that it is.

Mr. NELSON. I desire to offer an amendment, to come in at the end of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The bill is not open to amendment at this stage. Is there objection to the present consideration of this bill?

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, I desire to inquire of the Chair whether this is the same bill about which we had a controversy on last Friday.

Mr. NELSON. It is.

Mr. MORGAN. Does the gentleman from Minnesota now say that he will insist upon a quorum for the passage of this bill?

Mr. NELSON. I shall offer as an amendment the same bill that I offered last Friday.

Mr. MORGAN. But do you intend to call a quorum?

Mr. NELSON. I do intend to call a quorum on this bill unless mine is accepted as an amendment.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. Chairman, I shall make the point of order against the gentleman's amendment. I know the bill that he proposes to offer.

Mr. MORGAN. I hope my friend from Wisconsin will withdraw the bill if it is to be antagonized.

The CHAIRMAN. This is all out of order. Is there objection to the consideration of this bill?

There was no objection.

Mr. NELSON. I offer the amendment which I send to the Clerk's desk, to come in at the end of the bill. I do not care to occupy time in reading the amendment beyond the first section.

The Clerk read the first section of the proposed amendment, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the city of Duluth, a municipal corporation in the State of Minnesota, or its assigns, or any legally incorporated railroad company or companies which may be associated with it therein, be, and is hereby, authorized to construct and maintain a bridge and approaches thereto over the ship-canal and upon the Government piers of the same through Minnesota Point, being the entrance to the Duluth Harbor from Lake Superior, if upon consideration of a board of engineer officers, to be specially selected for the purpose, a bridge can be built without serious injury to the canal as an entrance to the harbor, and then only upon the plans and at the location recommended by the board and approved by the Secretary of War; said bridge shall be constructed to provide for the passage of railway trains, and further provide for the passage of wagons, street-railway cars, and vehicles of all kinds, for the transit of animals and foot-passengers, for such reasonable rates of tolls as may be approved from time to time by the Secretary of War.

Mr. NELSON. Now, Mr. Chairman, I do not care to have the amendment read further, but I wish to make a statement, if the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE] is willing.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I make a point of order against the amendment.

Mr. NELSON. I am entitled to have the whole amendment read, but I will waive that right if I can be allowed to make a brief statement.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair understands that the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE] makes the point of order.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Yes; on the ground that the amendment is not germane to the bill under consideration.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair sustains the point of order. The gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. NELSON] asks unanimous consent that he may be permitted to make a statement.

There was no objection.

Mr. NELSON. The only statement I desire to make is that the remainder of the bill which I have sent up as an amendment is like other bridge bills. The first section, the section that has been read, is to authorize the city of Duluth to construct a bridge across the canal entrance to its harbor, provided that a board of engineers, to be appointed by the Secretary of War, shall decide that such a bridge can be built without obstructing navigation. This amendment does not propose to allow the bridge to be constructed until the board of engineers report that it can be done without injury to navigation. If the engineers say it can not be done, the bridge is not to be built. I am compelled to take this course because I have tried several times during this session to pass this bill, but objection has always been made by the gentleman from Wisconsin, not the gentleman who has now called up the bill, but the gentleman [Mr. HAUGEN] within whose district this proposed bridge across the Mississippi is to be built. The bill which I have called up as an amendment has been called up by the Committee on Commerce and has been objected to, and the point of "no quorum" has been made against it, and again I have called it up myself and objection has been made. The bill called up by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE] is to authorize the construction of a bridge from his State across the Mississippi into my State, while my amendment is a bill for the construction of a bridge wholly within my State. The attitude which the gentleman [Mr. HAUGEN] assumed in reference to my bill compels me to take this course, which I have never taken with regard to any other bill, and which I adopt now simply as a matter of self-protection.

I am unwilling to take up further time in this matter, and am very sorry that this controversy has arisen. Whatever may be the merits of the controversy, there is nothing between the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE] who now calls up this bill and myself.

Mr. LAGAN. I wish to ask the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. NELSON] by whom this board of engineers is to be appointed?

Mr. NELSON. By the Secretary of War.

Mr. LAGAN. Are they to be United States engineers?

Mr. NELSON. They are to be United States engineers, appointed by the Secretary of War; and that board is to determine whether a bridge can be built. If the board should decide unfavorably it will not be built.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE] will state his point of order.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. My point is that the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. NELSON] is not germane to the bill under consideration.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is well taken. The amendment is not in order. The question is on laying this bill aside to be reported favorably to the House. Before putting that question the Chair will state that some amendments were heretofore adopted to this bill, and it has been read as amended. The question is now on laying the bill aside to be reported favorably to the House. [The question was put.] The ayes seem to have it.

Mr. NELSON. I call for a division.

The question being again taken, there were—ayes 22, noes 1.

Mr. NELSON. No quorum.

Mr. LANHAM. I hope the gentleman from Wisconsin will withdraw the bill.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. Chairman, if I may be permitted to call up another bill, I will withdraw this, as I do not wish to obstruct the business of the Committee of the Whole.

Mr. NELSON. I trust the gentleman may be allowed that privilege.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the gentleman will be allowed to call up another bill, this being withdrawn. The Chair hears no objection.

WILLIAM TABB.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I ask for the consideration of the bill (S. 741) for the relief of William Tabb.

The bill was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury of the United States be, and is hereby, directed to pay to William Tabb, of Spottsylvania County, near Fredericksburgh, Va., out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $2,149.75, being in full for supplies taken from him during the years 1863 and 1864, by and for the use of the United States troops.

There being no objection, the Committee of the Whole proceeded to the consideration of the bill.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I do not desire to make any remarks on this subject.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on laying the bill aside to be favorably reported to the House.

Mr. CLEMENTS. I think the report had better be read.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. It is very short.

The report of the Committee on War Claims (by Mr. THOMAS, of Wisconsin) was read, as follows:

The facts out of which this bill for relief arises will be found stated in Senate report from the Committee on Claims of the present Congress, a copy of which is hereto annexed for information.

Your committee adopt the said report as their own, and report back the bill and recommend its passage.

[Senate Report No. 59, Fiftieth Congress, first session.]

The Committee on Claims, to whom was referred the bill (S. 741) for the relief of William Tabb, have considered the same and respectfully report:

We adopt the report made by Mr. HOAR from this committee in the first session of the Forty-eighth Congress and recommend the passage of the bill.

"This is a claim for property alleged to have been taken from the claimant in part in May, 1863, by forces under the command of General Joseph Hooker, and in part in May, 1864, by forces under command of Maj. Gen. U. S. Grant. It appears from the evidence on file that the claimant was born in England; that he came to this country in 1848 and has since resided in Spottsylvania County, Virginia; that in 1856 he declared in one of the courts in said State his intention to become a citizen of the United States and to renounce all allegiance to foreign powers, in the manner prescribed by law; that in 1870 he took his final oath and received his naturalization papers.

"On the 16th day of September, 1872, he presented his claim to the Southern Claims Commission. The reports of that commission show that the claim was never prosecuted before them. The claimant alleges that he did not prosecute his claim before the commission because informed by his counsel, after having presented his claim, that the commission had said that they would not take jurisdiction of the cause, owing to the fact that the claimant was not, at the time of the taking of the property, a citizen of the United States. The claimant further alleges that his counsel informed him that the commission advised a petition to Congress.

"Upon this state of facts the claimant made a petition to Congress in 1874, that being two years after he had filed his petition before the Southern Claims Commission.

"There seems to be no doubt as to the claimant's loyalty, it being established by the testimony of several witnesses, including his neighbors and Union soldiers. Your committee are of the opinion that, so far as the character of the claimant is concerned, there is nothing which should deprive him of relief from Congress. The Southern Claims Commission held that they had no jurisdiction because the claimant was not a full citizen in every sense of the word; but he surely was so far a citizen as to entitle him to protection of his rights and property from this Government. The oath declaring his intention to become a citizen of the United States was an act of expatriation, after which he could not claim redress through the British Government.

"The claim is for quartermaster and commissary supplies taken to the value of $2,148.75. No vouchers were given by the officers taking the property, which is explained by the fact that Mr. Tabb and his family were sick at the time with diphtheria. There is evidence showing that on one of the occasions two of Mr. Tabb's children were lying dead in the house from that disease. But there is other satisfactory proof that property belonging to the claimant of the amount and value alleged was taken for the use of the Army.

"A favorable report in the case was made in the second session of the Forty-fourth Congress, recommending that the Southern Claims Commission be given jurisdiction of the claim. Since that commission ceased to exist, it has been the usual way in such cases to recommend the passage of a bill authorizing the Quartermaster-General to examine the claim and report to Congress the facts. This claim, however, is for a small sum, and the proof as to the amount and value of the property taken is very satisfactory.

"Your committee therefore recommend that the bill pass."

The bill was laid aside to be reported to the House with the recommendation that it do pass.

HEIRS OF MARTIN KENOFSKY.

Mr. LAGAN. I ask for the consideration of the bill (S. 1671) for the relief of the heirs of Martin Kenofsky.

The bill was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the heirs or legal representatives of Martin Kenofsky, the sum of $4,992.50, in full of all demands for and on account of the claim of the said Kenofsky for the proceeds derived from the sale of $4,992.50 of gold coin belonging to him and used in the service of the United States.

There being no objection, the Committee of the Whole proceeded to the consideration of the bill.

Mr. LAGAN. I move that the bill be laid aside to be favorably reported to the House.

Mr. OATES. I would like to hear the report read.

The report of the Committee on War Claims (by Mr. STONE, of Kentucky) was read, as follows:

The committee find the facts to be as stated in Senate Report No. 483, first session Fiftieth Congress, which report is hereto annexed and made a part of this report, and is as follows:

[Senate Report No. 483, Fiftieth Congress, first session.]

Your committee, to whom was referred Senate bill 1219, for the relief of the heirs of Martin Kenofsky, find that Martin Kenofsky, a Prussian subject, was a resident of Grenada, in the State of Mississippi, in 1864; that he was a man of Union sentiments; that he converted his possessions into gold, amounting to $4,992.50; then started for Memphis, at that time occupied by the Union forces, was seized within the lines, his gold taken from him, and he cast into prison, from which he was discharged without trial, and without any restoration of his property. The gold was converted into currency, realizing $8,861. By authority of military officers in command, this money was used for military purposes, contrary to law and the regulations of the Treasury Department. It should have been covered into the Treasury.

The claimant was industrious in pursuing his remedy, commencing at once, in 1865, by application to the Secretary of War, and continuing without cessation until his death in 1880. Then his widow petitioned Congress for relief, but died, pending its hearing, in 1881, leaving seven children in destitute circumstances. The authorities of the Widows and Orphans' Home of New Orleans and friends of the family then petitioned Congress for relief. No laches can be charged against the claimants.

The United States have had the benefit of this money; it was not justly exposed to confiscation; it should have been in the Treasury to-day, subject to the disposal of Congress, and in the opinion of your committee justice requires that, notwithstanding it was never covered into the Treasury, having been committed to the use of the Army contrary to law, this money should be paid to the legal heirs of Martin Kenofsky, and they accordingly report back the bill referred, with an amendment striking out the words "eight thousand eight hundred and sixty-one dollars," in the sixth and seventh lines, and inserting instead thereof the words "four thousand nine hundred and ninety-two dollars and fifty cents," with the recommendation that as amended it ought to pass.

Mr. DINGLEY. Is the amount covered by this bill simply the par value of the gold coin referred to?

Mr. STONE, of Kentucky. It is simply the par value.

The bill was laid aside to be reported to the House with the recommendation that it do pass.

JESSE DURNELL.

Mr. LANHAM. On behalf of my friend from Illinois [Mr. LANE], who is now absent from the city, I desire to call up for consideration the bill (H. R. 9211) for the relief of Jesse Durnell.

The bill was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay Jesse Durnell, of Effingham, Ill., out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $1,312.50, being the amount due him for seventeen and one-half months' difference in pay between that of first-class and second-class pilot in the Mississippi Squadron.

There being no objection, the Committee of the Whole proceeded to the consideration of the bill.

Mr. LANHAM. This bill provides simply for paying this claimant the difference between the salary of a first-class and a second-class pilot. The case has been examined by the Committee on Claims, and the allowance of the claim is unanimously recommended.

The amendment reported by the committee was read, as follows:

In line 6 strike out "three" and insert "two," and in line 7 strike out "twelve" and insert "thirty-seven;" so as to make the amount appropriated in the bill $1,237.50.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill as amended was laid aside to be reported to the House with the recommendation that it do pass.

C. C. ROBERTS.

Mr. LAWLER. I desire to call up the bill (H. R. 3557) for the relief of C. C. Roberts.

The bill was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of War be, and he is hereby, directed to cause to be paid to C. C. Roberts the pay and emoluments of a first lieutenant of volunteers from the 4th day of April, 1863, to the 1st day of November, 1863, for services rendered as first lieutenant in what was then designated as the Fourth Regiment of Ullman's brigade Colored United States Volunteers, with interest at 4 per cent. on the amount due from November 1, 1863, to the day when this act shall be in force and become approved.

SEC. 2. That the amount of money necessary to pay for the services of the above-named claimant be, and is hereby, appropriated out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated.

There being no objection, the Committee of the Whole proceeded to the consideration of the bill.

Mr. MORRILL. I would like to hear the report read.

The report of the Committee on War Claims (by Mr. LAWLER) was read, as follows:

The bill authorizes the Secretary of War to pay C. C. Roberts the pay and emoluments of a first lieutenant of infantry from April 4, 1863, to November 1, 1863.

Proof filed in support of the bill shows that C. C. Roberts was one of a number of officers and privates of Maine regiments who were designated by Governor Coburn, by authority of the Secretary of War, to be detached from their various regiments for promotion in the colored brigade. The order of the War Department detaching these officers and men was dated March 25, 1863. The claimant served as first lieutenant from April 4, 1863, to November 1, 1863, and was not paid for said service by reason of a failure to be mustered into service. The other officers of the colored brigade were subsequently mustered into the service and paid, the claimant failing to be mustered by reason of sickness.

Your committee are of opinion that the claimant having performed the duties of a first lieutenant he should be paid, and report back the bill and recommend its passage, with the following amendments:

In line 5, after the word "volunteers," insert the word "infantry."

In lines 10, 11, and 12 strike out "with interest at 4 per cent. on the amount due from November 1, 1863, to the day when this act shall be in force and become approved."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendments reported by the committee, and just read as the concluding paragraphs of their report.

Mr. SOWDEN. I wish to ask the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. LAWLER] whether the amendments strike out the provision in the bill for the payment of interest.

Mr. LAWLER. That provision is struck out by one of the amendments.

The amendments were agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on laying the bill aside to be favorably reported to the House.

Mr. DUNN. On that question I call for a division.

The committee divided; and there were—ayes 32, noes 1.

Mr. DUNN. No quorum has voted.

The CHAIRMAN appointed as tellers Mr. LAWLER and Mr. DUNN.

Mr. LANHAM. I ask, by unanimous consent, this bill be temporarily laid aside not to lose its place, and with the privilege on the part of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. LAWLER] to call it up hereafter.

Mr. DUNN. Or with a privilege of calling it up to-day, if he deems proper to do so.

There was no objection, and it was ordered accordingly.

PIPESTONE INDIAN RESERVATION, MINNESOTA.

Mr. NELSON. Unanimous consent was granted to my colleague [Mr. LIND] before he left the city, when his name was called to have me call up a bill for him, and in pursuance of that privilege I now call up for consideration the bill (H. R. 11128) for the disposition of the agricultural lands embraced within the limits of the Pipestone Indian reservation, in Minnesota.

The CHAIRMAN. The bill will be read, after which objection will be asked.

The Clerk proceeded to read the bill.

Mr. McMILLIN. I rise to a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. McMILLIN. This is a public bill, and does not come within the rule under which we are acting. I make the point of order in justice to gentlemen who have small private bills which they desire to call up. This is a long bill, and is accompanied with a long report. It is not fair to take up the time in reading the bill and report, which ought to be devoted to the consideration of private bills. It is unjust to gentlemen having those measures to call up. While I do not like to do any discourtesy to an absent member, I am compelled to insist upon my point of order.

Mr. NELSON. I admit the point of order made by the gentleman is well taken, and will therefore withdraw the bill. My colleague [Mr. LIND], in case the point of order should be made and the bill ruled out, gave me a private bill to call up, and I now ask for its consideration. The reservation to which reference is made in the other bill is only 1 mile square. But I withdraw that bill.

JAMES DEVINE.

The CHAIRMAN. The bill will be read, after which the Chair will ask for objection.

The bill was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay to James Devine, of the county of Brown, in the State of Minnesota, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $700, for damages done to his land by the United States troops in cutting timber on the same for the building of Fort Hanska, and for fuel and other purposes, while in possession of said troops during the outbreak of the Sioux Indians in Minnesota.

Mr. NELSON. With the permission of the committee I will make a brief statement in reference to this matter. It is a bill which was introduced by my colleague [Mr. LIND] and referred to the Committee on Claims, which has reported it back favorably.

In 1862–'63 an Indian war broke out in the State of Minnesota. During that outbreak the State sent out troops to follow up the Indians. Those troops were mustered into the service of the United States. While in that service they took possession of this man's farm, cut down his timber, and used it in the construction of huts and for fuel. This bill merely provides for the payment of $700 to this man for the loss which he incurred.

Mr. KILGORE. These troops were there for this man's protection.

Mr. NELSON. No more for his protection than for the protection of other citizens in that neighborhood against Indian attacks. In this farm of 157 acres there were 40 acres covered with valuable timber. That timber was cut down and used by these United States troops in the construction of huts and as fuel. For this loss this man has never been compensated, and the object of the bill is to recompense him in that regard.

Mr. KILGORE. How much does he claim?

Mr. NELSON. He claims $700. It has been favorably reported.

Mr. KILGORE. Read the report.

The report (by Mr. LAWLER) was read, as follows:

The Committee on War Claims, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 3765) for the relief of James Devine, have considered the same and respectfully report:

A bill (H. R. 1150) for the relief of this claimant was introduced in the Forty-second Congress, second session, and referred to the Committee on Claims. That committee reported the bill favorably, and upon a full examination of the evidence on file in support of the claim this committee finds that the report of that committee (No. 1587) is in accordance with the facts, and the same is hereby adopted and attached hereto.

Your committee accordingly report back the bill and recommend its passage.

[House Report No. 1587, Forty-sixth Congress, second session.]

The Committee on Claims, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 1150) for the relief of James Devine, have considered the same, and respectfully report:

That James Devine was the owner of certain lands in the State of Minnesota, namely, the SE. ¼ of SE. ¼ and lot No. 6 of section No. 28, and lot No. 8 of section No. 33, and the NW. ¼ of NW. ¼ of section No. 34, in township 108, range 31, containing 157 acres, 60 acres of which was timbered. During the Indian outbreak, known as the Sioux massacre of 1862, Company I, Minnesota Mounted Rangers, was stationed on said land for the protection of the settlers and built a stockade or fort thereon, 100 feet long, 75 feet wide, and about 10 feet high. They also built on said land four buildings of various sizes. All the logs, roofing, and shingles for said buildings were taken from the land of Devine. The troops occupied the fort, and used timber for fuel for a period of two and one-half years, and when the troops were removed they took some of said houses with them to other locations.

James Devine testifies that he was at the time the troops occupied the land, and is now, the owner thereof, having a patent for the same from the United States; that there is 157.72 acres of land, 60 of which was timbered; that less than one-fourth of said timber was left standing, the balance, 40 acres, being cut by the troops. The value of timber land at that time was from $20 to $50 per acre, and his loss by said damage was not less than $700, and at the time said timber was taken he was a resident of Milwaukee, Wis., and did not return to his land in Minnesota until 1866; that he has never received any pay or compensation for said loss.

Guttora Thorsdson and Tergrim Tergrimson testify that they own and live on lands adjoining the lands of James Devine; that there was no timber cut on said land before the troops entered thereon to build the fort. The timber land at that time in the vicinity of Devine's land was worth from $20 to $50 per acre; that the troops were there for two and one-half years, and the damage to Devine by loss of timber was not less than $700.

Iver Iverson testifies that he knows the property of James Devine, and to his positive knowledge there was no timber cut off said land previous to the occupancy by the troops, and that the loss to Devine was not less than $700.

John Hauenstein, a second lieutenant of Company I, Minnesota Mounted Rangers, testifies that he commanded said company at Fort Hauska, in township 108, range 31; that the fort and buildings were being erected during the time he had command; that the logs, roofing, shingles, etc., were taken from the land of James Devine; that Fort Hauska was built on Devine's land, and to the best of his knowledge there was about 60 acres of timbered land, and the actual loss at the time to James Devine's property by the destruction of the timber was not less than $700.

Mr. Devine being a resident of the State of Wisconsin from 1857 until 1866, when he returned to Minnesota, he learned for the first time that the State had adjudicated such claims, for which the United States reimbursed the State.

A bill for the payment of damages was presented to the State Legislature, which received a favorable report, was passed to a third reading and defeated because the time expired that had been set for the State to pass on such losses.

Mr. Devine's absence from the State kept him in ignorance of the method of prosecuting his claim until some years after the property had been taken. When he was aware of the manner in which such property was paid for, he presented his claim to the Legislature of the State of Minnesota. Payment was refused, it being a claim against the United States.

Your committee believe the property was taken by the troops for their use, and that the amount asked for the same is just and reasonable, and recommend the passage of the bill.

Mr. SOWDEN. What evidence is there that these troops were mustered into the United States service? The report says they were State troops.

Mr. NELSON. My colleague [Mr. RICE] was a citizen of the State at that time, and knows the fact, which he will state, that they were mustered into the United States service.

Mr. RICE. It is the fact that these troops at the time were mustered into the service of the United States.

Mr. SOWDEN. The gentleman from Minnesota has answered my question that these State troops had been mustered into the service of the United States, and that is satisfactory.

There was no objection; and the bill was laid aside to be reported to the House with the recommendation that it do pass.

E. J. ALDRICH.

Mr. LYMAN. I call up for present consideration the bill (H. R. 3155) for the relief of E. J. Aldrich.

The bill was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That jurisdiction be, and the same hereby is, conferred upon the Court of Claims to try and determine, upon its merits, the claim of E. J. Aldrich, of Pottawattamie County, State of Iowa, against the United States for cotton seized and appropriated in the States of Arkansas and Louisiana, any statutes of limitation to the contrary notwithstanding: *Provided*, Suit be commenced in said court within six months next after the passage of this act.

Mr. ROGERS. My attention was temporarily distracted while this bill was being read; will the gentleman state the purport of it?

Mr. LYMAN. It refers a claim for cotton to the Court of Claims. The claimant commenced a suit in the Court of Claims, but he was too late, not having commenced it before the statute of limitations applied. He is an old gentleman, apparently not familiar with the law; and for this or some other reason the claim was not presented in time. This simply removes the bar of the statute.

Mr. ROGERS. What committee does it come from?

Mr. LYMAN. From the Committee on War Claims.

Mr. ROGERS. Is this for a portion of the proceeds of the captured and abandoned property fund now in the Treasury?

Mr. LYMAN. I can not answer the question.

Mr. ROGERS. I would like to hear the report.

Mr. CULBERSON. Let the report be read.

The report (by Mr. THOMAS, of Wisconsin) was read, as follows:

The beneficiary, E. J. Aldrich, claims to be the owner of a claim once owned by one H. A. Millen, for cotton seized and appropriated by the United States Government. In 1871, prosecution therefor was commenced in the Court of Claims. In December, 1876, a motion was filed to dismiss the case on the ground that the cause of action was barred by the statute of limitation; which motion was afterwards sustained. The claimant is an old man and greatly in need financially of the relief demanded if he is entitled thereto. His loyalty is unquestioned and unquestionable, and his claim appears to have merit in it. The bar of the statute of limitation prevents him from establishing the same. All he asks in the bill is that this bar may be removed, and he permitted to establish his claim, if he can, in the Court of Claims.

The committee recommend the passage of the bill.

Mr. CULBERSON. I ask the attention of the gentleman from Iowa for a moment, to inquire on what this claim is based, on what statement of facts it is presented? The report does not show.

Mr. LYMAN. I can not answer as to the facts, because I do not know.

Mr. CULBERSON. As I understand the report, it states that the beneficiary is the assignee of a claim in favor of one Millen against the Government, but it does not state what the claim is for.

Mr. SENEY. What is the claim based upon?

Mr. CATCHINGS. It says in the report for cotton.

Mr. CULBERSON. I would like to have the first clause of the bill again reported.

The bill was again read.

The CHAIRMAN. The first question is, Will the committee consider the bill.

Mr. CULBERSON. Permit me first to ask if this bill provides that there shall be an absolute judgment against the Government, or simply that the court shall report the findings?

Mr. LYMAN. That there shall be a judgment for whatever the court finds due. I assume that the court will take care of all incidental questions that may arise in connection with the investigation

of the claim; and the point is that this removes the bar of the statute of limitations to allow the consideration of the claim.

Mr. CULBERSON. I do not think this bill ought to pass.

Mr. SENEY. What is the amount of the claim?

Mr. LYMAN. I do not know.

Mr. ROGERS. I would like to know something further about this case. The gentleman from Iowa does not seem to be familiar with the facts. What State does it come from, where does the claimant reside, and who has charge of it?

Mr. LYMAN. The claimant lives in the county in which I reside, and I introduced the bill for his relief at his request. I know the claimant, but do not know the facts in the case.

Mr. ROGERS. I would like to make an observation or two.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will first submit the question whether the committee will consider the bill.

Mr. ROGERS. I am asking unanimous consent to be heard for a moment.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection the gentleman will proceed.

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Chairman, as strong a case, perhaps, as could possibly be submitted to the House was presented by the report from the Judiciary Committee accompanying the claim of Mr. Noble, who has since died. That claim after a full and exhaustive discussion in a full committee of the House was defeated on the call for a quorum. The general sentiment of the House at that time was, and I think the justice of all this question is, that all of the claimants for any portion of this property should be allowed to go into the Court of Claims and let their claims for this money or any portion of it, which the Supreme Court of the United States have held belongs to these people and not to the Government, be adjudicated and settled forever. Now, I am willing, so far as I am concerned, and so far as this case is involved, to concede that this man has a claim. I do not know anything of the case and will not deny that he has a claim; but I do not think we ought to consent to suffer one individual to go in and have consideration and the other side to be kept out if there is merit. It is not fair play. It is not the proper way to deal with such a question. If any of them are entitled to any portion of this property, then all persons under like circumstances are entitled to some proportion of it, and should be entitled to have their share of it. I think in all such cases we ought to pursue that policy, and not be diverted from it in the consideration of an individual case.

Mr. OATES. That is the principle on which Noble's claim was defeated.

Mr. ROGERS. That is what I have just stated. Out of personal friendship and committee associations I reluctantly yielded to my friend from Alabama, who was interested in that case, and made no minority report; but my judgment is that the proper way to deal with the question is to pass a bill for the purpose of letting these people all go into the Court of Claims, and there let the matter be adjudicated between them and a distribution made of the funds.

And there is a matter about this bill which does not obtain in reference to others, and that is that there is a statute of the United States, founded in a wise public policy, which is directly in the teeth of this bill. That statute prohibits anybody from bringing a claim against the Government where he obtains it as assignee. In other words, only original claimants shall be permitted to make claims against the Government.

I trust my friend from Iowa, who is a good lawyer, will understand the motives which prompt my action in this matter. I never object in such cases unless there is a principle involved which I think sufficiently important to invite attention to the case itself, and I regard this as a question of that character.

Mr. CULBERSON. In addition to what my friend from Arkansas has said, there is a general bill now on the Calendar providing for the very object the gentleman has in view; that is, the removal of the bar of the statute of limitation—two reports, one from the Committee on War Claims and one from the Judiciary Committee.

Mr. LYMAN. I will support the general bill when it is presented.

Mr. CULBERSON. We have never had an opportunity to bring it up.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is, Shall the bill be considered?

The question was put; and the Chairman announced that more than a sufficient number had objected, and consideration was refused.

MELCHISEDEC ROBINSON.

Mr. MARTIN. I ask consideration of the bill (H. R. 10099) for the relief of Melchisedec Robinson.

The bill was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the claim of Melchisedec Robinson, of Benton County, Mississippi, for quartermaster stores and commissary supplies taken by or furnished the United States Army during the war for the suppression of the rebellion, be, and the same is hereby, referred to the Court of Claims, with all the vouchers, papers, proofs, and documents pertaining thereto, and the same shall there be proceeded in, under the rules and practice of said court, upon the said proofs, vouchers, and documents and such other testimony as may be introduced by either party, and when the facts shall have been found both as to the loyalty of the said Melchisedec Robinson when this claim originated and thereafter to the close of the war, and the merits of his said claim, the court shall thereupon report to Congress the facts as established by the evidence, with its opinion as to the compensation or relief, if any, which should be allowed the said claimant.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the consideration of the bill? The Chair hears none.

The bill was laid aside to be reported to the House with the recommendation that it do pass.

JAMES IREDELL MEARES.

Mr. McCLAMMY. I ask consideration of the bill (H. R. 5480) for the relief of James Iredell Meares.

The bill was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, directed to pay to James Iredell Meares, deputy collector of customs at Wilmington, N. C., the sum of $612, this being the amount of money stolen from the safe of the collector at Wilmington, N. C., and paid by the said James Iredell Meares.

SEC. 2. That this act shall take effect from and after its passage.

Mr. OATES. I did not hear the amount of money involved.

The Clerk read as follows:

Six hundred and twelve dollars.

Mr. OATES. I would like to hear the report read.

The report (by Mr. SIMMONS) was read, as follows:

The Committee on Claims, to whom was referred House bill 5480, having considered the same, submit the following report:

The claimant in this bill, James Iredell Meares, was in 1885, and is now, special deputy of customs at Wilmington, N. C. On Saturday night, the 21st of November, 1885, or Sunday night, the 22d of November, same year, the building in which the collector of customs for that collection district had his office was entered by burglars and the combination safe, in which the moneys and records of said office was kept, was broken open (the said Meares being the cashier of said office, and having the custody of said moneys and records), and the sum of $612 of the money belonging to said office was taken therefrom.

Mr. Meares is shown to be an honest man, a most excellent and faithful officer, and the affidavits make it clear that the burglary was not the result of any negligence or fault of his.

He not only immediately made the money thus taken good to the Government, but without waiting the action of the Department, employed R. J. Southall, chief of the detective system of the Atlantic coast line system of railroads, to ferret out and bring to punishment the criminals, who for three months worked at great expense to Mr. Meares trying to find a clue to the mystery, but without results.

Every fact necessary to bring this claim within the line of precedents is clearly made out by the affidavits of a number of creditable witnesses, and your committee, without any hesitation, recommend that the claimant be indemnified, as provided in the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection? The Chair hears none.

The bill was laid aside to be reported to the House with the recommendation that it do pass.

MONUMENT AT FREDERICK, MD.

Mr. McCOMAS. I ask consideration of the joint resolution (H. Res. 73) providing for the erection of a monument at Frederick, Md., over the grave of Francis Scott Key, the author of "The Star-Spangled Banner."

The resolution was read, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That the sum of $10,000 be, and is hereby, appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for the purpose of erecting a monument over the grave of Francis Scott Key, the author of "The Star-Spangled Banner," at Frederick, Md., which said sum shall be expended under the direction of the Secretary of War, who shall have the management and control of the selection of and the erection of said monument.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is informed that the resolution is on the Union Calendar and not on the Private Calendar. It would therefore not be in order.

Mr. McCOMAS. Then I ask unanimous consent for its consideration, as it is for a small amount of money and for a monument over a grave which is not in a public place.

Mr. ROGERS. This is a special order under which we are proceeding, and I do not think, where unanimous consent is given to consider a special order, that the committee at a subsequent hour of the day should change that order.

The CHAIRMAN. The point is well taken; and, objection being made, the joint resolution is not in order.

Mr. McCOMAS. Then I withdraw it, and I ask consideration of the bill which I send to the Clerk's desk instead.

There was no objection.

I. L. CAIN.

The Clerk read the title of the bill, as follows:

A bill (S. 97) for the relief of I. L. Cain, and others.

The bill was read for information.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. OATES. The price fixed on the cotton mentioned in the bill is entirely too high.

Mr. McCOMAS. I offered this bill at the request of the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. BUTLER].

The CHAIRMAN. The question is, Shall the bill be considered? The Clerk read amendments that are not before the committee. The wrong bill was sent up by the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. McCOMAS], and the bill which he desires to call up is a Senate bill which has not been read to the committee. The bill as it comes from the Senate has no amendments. The question is, Shall the bill be considered? Is there objection? [After a count.] More than a sufficient number of gentlemen have arisen to object to the consideration of the bill.

Mr. BUTLER. If the report be read I believe there will be no objection to the bill.

Mr. KILGORE. Regular order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read the report if the gentleman from Tennessee so desires.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. Chairman, the question has been submitted as to whether or not the bill shall be taken up, and the requisite number having signified their objection, I do not think we ought to consume any more time with this bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is probably at fault in the matter. The gentleman from Tennessee asked to have the report read, and I think in justice to him that it should be done.

Mr. LANHAM. I hope the gentleman from Tennessee will not insist on the reading of the report. A sufficient number have signified their objection to prevent the bill being considered, and it will but retard the consideration of other bills to have the report read.

Mr. BUTLER. If the gentleman from Texas will remember, I called up that Senate bill, and on his suggestion I withdrew it with the understanding that I might at any other time bring it up in the House. I refrained from doing so, and the gentleman from Maryland not having anything to call up he called it up for me. We have passed a similar bill for $98,000 in favor of Mr. Dickinson. These are small claims. It has been reported on favorably by the Senate and by the House Committee on War Claims.

Mr. LANHAM. What I said was in the interest of economy of time, because a sufficient number of gentlemen have indicated their intention to object to the consideration of this bill.

Mr. BUTLER. If the report was read I do not think any gentleman would object.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair does not feel that a vote has been taken upon the question, as the Chair was in error.

Mr. BUTLER. I do not want to do anything that looks like being mean or contrary, as that does not belong to my disposition.

Mr. SENEY. Regular order.

Mr. BUTLER. All right. They are all good Democrats who are the beneficiaries in that bill.

The question was put as to whether the bill should be considered, and the Chairman announced that eight gentlemen had objected, more than a sufficient number, and under the rule the bill could not be considered.

WILLIAM R. WHEATON AND CHARLES H. CHAMBERLAIN.

Mr. McKENNA. I call up the bill (H. R. 661) for the relief of William R. Wheaton and Charles H. Chamberlain, of California.

The bill was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is hereby authorized and directed to pay to William R. Wheaton, ex-register, and to Charles H. Chamberlain, ex-receiver of the land office at San Francisco, Cal., jointly, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $3,800, being a portion of the amount deposited in the Treasury of the United States by them as fees for testimony which was taken by clerks whose compensation was paid from the private funds of said ex-register and said ex-receiver.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the present consideration of this bill?

Mr. KILGORE. I ask to have the report read.

Mr. McKENNA. If the gentleman from Texas will give me his attention for a minute, I will state that the report is quite long, because it sets forth not merely the facts but the evidence, and I think I can explain the case very briefly.

Mr. KILGORE. I want to say to the gentleman from California that the fact that the report is very long is a suspicious circumstance. [Laughter.]

Mr. McKENNA. Oh, no. It only shows the industry of the member who wrote it, the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. SHAW]. But the facts of the case are these: Mr. Chamberlain and Mr. Wheaton were respectively register and receiver of the land office in San Francisco. Under a practice that obtained in the office the fees collected for taking testimony were allowed to be retained by the register and the receiver. The Department, however, ruled that the officers could not be allowed, as a matter of law, to retain the fees, and required them to deposit the amount of those fees in the subtreasury in the city of San Francisco, which they did. The amount deposited was about $5,000, somewhat more than the sum mentioned in the bill. Afterwards a salary of $100 a month was allowed to the register and the receiver for doing the very work for which they had charged fees, and this bill is to give them the money which they paid out for clerk-hire. That is all.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Only two members objected.

The bill was laid aside to be reported to the House with the recommendation that it do pass.

MILES F. WEST.

Mr. McMILLIN. I desire to call up House bill 1156, for the relief of Miles F. West.

The bill was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized to pay $474 to Miles F. West, of Macon County, Tennessee, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, in full payment for quartermaster and commissary stores taken from him for the use of the Union Army during the late war.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the consideration of this bill?

Mr. KILGORE. Let the report be read.

The report (by Mr. STONE, of Kentucky) was read, as follows:

The Committee on War Claims, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 1156) for the relief of Miles F. West, report as follows:

This is a claim for stores and supplies taken from the claimant's farm in Macon County, Tennessee, during the late war by the Army of the United States. Claim stated at $474.

The claim was filed in the office of the Quartermaster-General October 21, 1879. It was finally considered September 4, 1884, and not allowed for the reason that the Quartermaster-General was not convinced of the loyalty of the claimant.

Your committee are satisfied that the claimant never gave aid or comfort to the rebellion, but was throughout that war loyal to the Government of the United States; that the accounts are correct and just, and that the stores and supplies were taken as charged.

Your committee therefore report back the bill and recommend its passage.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the consideration of this bill?

Mr. McMILLIN. I move to amend the bill in one particular. Either in draughting or in printing it the figures 7 and 4 have been transposed. The bill reads $474, but it should read $447. The change reduces the amount of the claim, but that is the just amount.

Mr. KILGORE. All I desire was to be satisfied of the loyalty of this man. [Laughter.] If the gentleman from Tennessee can give me any information upon that point I shall be obliged to him.

Mr. McMILLIN. The proof shows that he was loyal during the war.

Mr. KILGORE. To which side? [Laughter.]

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill as amended was laid aside to be reported to the House with the recommendation that it do pass.

NICARAGUA MARITIME CANAL COMPANY.

Mr. DUNN. Mr. Chairman, since the bill known as the Nicaragua Canal bill was objected to by six or seven gentlemen awhile ago, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. CULBERSON] has prepared an amendment which satisfies the objections of those gentlemen, so ask I unanimous consent that the bill be now taken up, with the understanding that this amendment shall be added to it.

Mr. CULBERSON. I wish the gentleman to understand that I speak only for myself in regard to that amendment.

Mr. DUNN. I understand; but the other gentlemen have told me that they take the same view. I ask the Clerk to report the bill.

Mr. FULLER. I shall object to that bill being taken up on this day.

Mr. MORGAN. I wish to ask the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. DUNN] whether it will provoke any discussion.

Mr. DUNN. I am willing to make this agreement, that if gentlemen will let the bill be taken up, considered by the committee, and reported to the House to-day, it shall then go over for full discussion and amendment in the House to any day next week which may be designated.

Mr. McMILLIN. I hope that will be assented to.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. FULLER] withdraw his objection?

Mr. DUNN. Will the gentleman allow us to recur to the bill now?

Mr. FULLER. I do not think that bill should be considered on Friday, private bill day.

Mr. DUNN. I will agree that the bill, after it is reported to the House, shall be considered there on any day next week that may be designated.

Mr. FULLER. That is a bill which should be carefully considered section by section, and I must object to its being taken up to-day.

Mr. DUNN. I rise to a parliamentary inquiry. Can we not go back to the bill now unless there are five objectors?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair thinks not, the bill having been called and objected to.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. Chairman, the situation of the bill is this, as I understand it: I had a right to call up a bill when my name was reached, and I called up this bill, but gentlemen objected, and the bill had to be withdrawn. Now, have I not a right to call up another bill in place of that?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman would have had that right before his name was passed, but the Chair does not think he has that right now.

MARITIME CANAL COMPANY OF NICARAGUA.

Mr. McRAE. I call up the bill (S. 1305) to incorporate the Maritime Canal Company of Nicaragua.

Mr. LANHAM. I ask that the reading of the bill be dispensed with at this time, as it has heretofore been read.

The CHAIRMAN. If there be no objection, the reading of the bill will be dispensed with.

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is, Shall this bill be considered?

Mr. MORGAN. What is the proposition of the gentleman from Arkansas with reference to discussion?

The CHAIRMAN. There is no proposition at all.

The question being put upon considering the bill, only one member objected.

So the Committee of the Whole proceeded to the consideration of the bill.

Mr. DUNN. I yield to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. CULBERSON] to offer an amendment.

Mr. CULBERSON. I offer the amendment which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

At the end of section 5 add the following:

"And nothing in this act shall be held or construed to in any manner involve the United States in any pecuniary obligations whatever, other than in respect to the payment of tolls, as provided for in this act."

Mr. DUNN. I hope this amendment, which is a cautionary matter, will be agreed to.

The amendment was adopted.

Mr. PHELAN. I offer the amendments which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Add to the preamble the following:

"And whereas the interests of the United States of America and of the North and South American Governments render it necessary that said ship-canal should be under the control and guaranty of the United States Government;

"And whereas the said canal when constructed will form a part of the coast-line which the United States would be compelled to defend in case of war."

Also insert, after section 4 of the bill, the following:

"SEC. 5. That the canal to be constructed under this act shall be under the control and protection of the United States, in order that the representatives of all the North and South American peoples may be guarded against any infringement or aggression on the part of foreign nations.

"SEC. 6. That tolls shall be equal upon the same class of tonnage for the vessels of all nations, except as provided in Article LIV of the concession and decrees of the Republic of Nicaragua to the Nicaragua Canal Association of New York.

"SEC. 7. The United States Government binds itself to protect all the rights of the citizens acquired under said concession and decrees, and guaranties the neutrality of the said canal and its operation under the terms of said concession and decrees, subject to the consent and approval by treaty or otherwise of the countries through which the said canal may be constructed."

Mr. DUNN. I hope these amendments will be agreed to. They are acceptable to the friends of this measure and to the country.

Mr. NELSON. I wish to inquire of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. CULBERSON], who introduced the first amendment, whether this last proposition does not to some extent neutralize the other.

Mr. CULBERSON. I think so.

Mr. PHELAN. If the gentleman will allow me to answer that question, I will tell him that in no respect whatsoever——

Mr. CULBERSON. Before the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. PHELAN] commences his statement, I desire to inquire where this amendment is expected to come in.

Mr. PHELAN. One amendment is an addition to the preamble; the other proposes to insert three new sections as sections 5, 6, and 7, the numbering of the other sections of the bill being changed in accordance with this amendment.

Mr. FARQUHAR. I would like to inquire of the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. PHELAN] whether his amendment conforms to the concessions and guaranties of the Nicaraguan Government in connection with the company seeking this charter?

Mr. PHELAN. I do not wish to bring up any question which might precipitate a discussion of our whole foreign relations in connection with the Nicaragua Canal; but I will say to the gentleman that the amendment I have drawn and submitted was prepared in careful conformity to the utterances of the State Department upon this subject from the time of the Presidency of General Grant to the present Administration. My object is to protect the United States in connection with this enterprise. Under this amendment the Government of the United States could not possibly be involved by the assumption of any financial obligation. The amendment is drawn for the purpose of enunciating clearly and distinctly in the terms of this bill the course which we propose to pursue if any discussion should arise in reference to that canal in the future. In other words, the amendment is drawn for the purpose of carrying out our construction of the Clayton-Bulwer treaty and for the purpose of emphasizing the fact that we repudiate the English construction.

Mr. FARQUHAR. I am perfectly satisfied with the gentleman's explanation.

Mr. CULBERSON. I think the House ought to hear that amendment read again.

The Clerk again read Mr. PHELAN's amendment.

Mr. CULBERSON. Mr. Chairman, I think this amendment changes the whole character of the bill. I have not had an opportunity to investigate this matter thoroughly; but my understanding has been all the while that the gentlemen who have petitioned Congress for the passage of this bill desired simply an act of incorporation. Further than that they have not asked and did not expect the Government to go. The bill as passed by the Senate and as now presented to the House, with the amendment I have offered, cuts the Government off from any connection whatever with this canal. But if the amendment proposed by the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. PHELAN] should be adopted, our Government will be obliged to keep a standing army in that portion of the continent to protect the rights of this corporation. By the terms of the amendment the Government is bound to protect the interests of all persons concerned in the corporation. If this property should be destroyed by a foreign enemy or by any other means, our Government by this proposition binds itself to make good to these incorporators the amount of their loss.

Another thing. As I understand the reading of the amendment, and I have only heard it read at the Clerk's desk, the Government binds itself to secure to these incorporators their rights in any cession the Government of Costa Rica may grant. Now, I think if the amendment is adopted it becomes a Government project, and the Government will have to send a part of its army there to take care of it and to protect the rights of the people who desire to pass through it, and to protect the rights of property of these people.

It is an extraordinary demand to make on the Government of the United States, in the first place, to create a corporation outside of the limits of the United States, and, in the second place, it is a more extraordinary demand to bind the Government to protect the rights of those people in their property in that country, as must be done if that amendment be adopted.

Mr. PHELAN. If the gentleman from Texas will allow me a moment——

Mr. CULBERSON. I will yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. PHELAN. I would like to answer the statement made by the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. CULBERSON. How long?

Mr. PHELAN. Five minutes.

Mr. CULBERSON. I will yield to the gentleman for that time.

Mr. JACKSON. Is it still open to a point of order?

The CHAIRMAN. It is not.

Mr. PHELAN. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Texas labors under a radical misapprehension of the terms of the amendment I have offered. If it purported what he seems to think it does, I would be of the members of this House the last to offer it and the very last to allow it to pass through this House without serious and earnest protest.

My amendment was drawn expressly for the purpose of preventing the very result which the gentleman from Texas is apprehensive may ensue.

The amendment has been drawn, as I have already said, in careful conformity with the utterances of the State Department from General Grant's administration down to the present time. The rights we have in the premises and the duties imposed in connection with this canal are not dependent on the grant of any particular charter; that is, we have those rights and we are compelled necessarily to protect them, it matters not whether this or some other company undertakes to construct this canal.

I offered the amendment for the purpose of serving notice on the investors of the world what our relations to that project were independent of the fact we granted that charter.

I will not enter into a discussion of the Clayton-Bulwer treaty, but content myself with saying that there are two radically different and opposite constructions of it, one held by the diplomats of England and the other held by Mr. Blaine and every Secretary of State of the United States since.

My amendment was drawn in conformity with the utterances of our foreign policy on that subject, and not for the purpose of granting these incorporators any greater rights than they would have without it. On the contrary, the privileges they will have will be the same without as with the amendment.

The gentleman from Texas, therefore, is laboring under a misapprehension, and a serious misapprehension, in regard to the effect of the amendment. It was not drawn hastily, but after careful consideration of the subject, and with strict reference to the views of those who favor the United States side of the question. There is nothing binding us in any contingency to assume any financial responsibility in the matter. The grant to these corporators is no greater in the way of protection than the United States grants to any one of its citizens, no matter where he may be. It is to serve notice to the outside world of what our position is.

I have not time, and will not trespass upon the patience of the House, to enter upon any extended discussion with the gentleman from Texas, who is, as I have shown, laboring under misapprehension as to the effect of the amendment I have offered.

[Here the hammer fell.]

Mr. CULBERSON. Mr. Chairman, I think that sections 5 and 7 of the amendment proposed by the gentleman from Tennessee are obnoxious to the objections I have suggested. The fifth section is simply the announcement of the Monroe doctrine in substance, that is to say that the Government of the United States grants and extends to this corporation a distinct announcement that it is bound to protect and defend the rights of the corporation against encroachments or infringements or aggressions on the part of any foreign country. In other words, the Government of the United States undertakes to protect North and South American people against any aggressions or infringements from foreign nations. That is the Monroe doctrine, as I understand it. That is to say, I understand the Monroe doctrine to be this in substance: that the Government of the United States would hesitate before permitting a foreign country or any foreign country to take possession of this canal and dominate these Central American Republics.

But now we are asked to agree to bind ourselves by this amendment in advance of any effort on the part of any foreign country to take possession of the canal. We agree, if we adopt this amendment, to protect the North and South American people, all of them, against invasions or aggressions from foreign nations. That is the substance of it.

The seventh section of the proposed amendment provides that the United States Government binds itself to protect all the rights of the citizens acquired under said concessions and decrees. I have not had an opportunity to investigate this subject fully, but I understand that this Government has made certain concessions to this company. They are, as I understand it, concessions of rights of way or lands, or some franchises in connection with the projected canal. But the Government of the United States binds itself by this amendment to protect all of the rights of citizens acquired under these concessions and decrees; and further guaranties the neutrality of said canal and its operations under the terms of the said concessions and decrees, subject to the consent and approval by treaty or otherwise of the countries through which the canal may be constructed. It also provides that this is to form a link of the chain of our national coast defenses. It provides:

And whereas the said canal when constructed will form a part of the coast line which the United States would be compelled to defend in case of war, etc.

The proposition is, therefore, if this amendment is adopted and if the bill is passed with that amendment embodied in it, to give notice to the whole world that the Government of the United States undertakes in advance to defend the interest of the incorporation in case of war against all aggressions. We make it an American institution. We plant an American institution in this foreign country and give notice that we will protect the interest of every man who acquires any title to the project under the decrees and concessions of this foreign government, and will defend such interests against aggression in time of war.

I repeat, therefore, sir, that I think these amendments change entirely the whole scope, object, and intent of the original bill.

I now yield to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. FULLER] such time as he may desire.

Mr. PHELAN. Will the gentleman, before he proceeds, allow me a minute?

Mr. FULLER. Certainly.

Mr. PHELAN. I wish to say to the gentleman from Texas that I am entirely willing to accept any amendment which he may propose to the amendment I have suggested which will ingraft upon this bill a full enunciation of the Monroe doctrine. If the amendment I have drawn does not cover it, if the amendment is inartistically drawn, or is indefinite in any of its terms, I am perfectly willing and anxious to accept any suggestion in the way of an amendment that he may offer to make it clear and emphatic in that respect. The gentleman has unfortunately for myself and my position confused the relations we propose to occupy to the citizens who undertake this enterprise as American citizens and those which we propose to occupy towards the general enterprise itself. It would apply to the construction as well by German, French, or English capital. My object was to ingraft upon the bill the announcement of the Monroe doctrine. If I have not done so in the amendment, or if I have gone beyond that, I am willing to accept any amendment the gentleman may designate which will restrict it clearly to the limits designed to be covered by the amendment or will enlarge it to meet that point. That was the sole object I had in view in preparing the amendment.

Mr. CULBERSON. I do not think it is at all necessary for us to reaffirm the Monroe doctrine. All nations of the world understand our relations to that doctrine, and we can add no strength to our position by a reaffirmation here in this bill.

I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. PHELAN. But that doctrine is denied by England.

Mr. CULBERSON. That is very true; but we are not bound by that denial.

Mr. FULLER. Mr. Chairman, this debate so far as it has proceeded satisfies me that I was correct in the position I took when I objected to the consideration of the bill at this time. I want to say that I am in favor of the building of a canal connecting the waters of the Atlantic with the Pacific; but this is the most gigantic legislation that has been before Congress for many years.

For the first time in the history of this country the United States Government proposes to charter a company to do business on foreign soil.

Mr. BAYNE. Oh, no; not the first time by any means.

Mr. FULLER. I think that this bill is of such importance that it should not be considered on Friday, when it is expected that only the ordinary private bills will be considered, and especially is it objectionable at a time when there are but about sixty members present on the floor.

I have not had an opportunity to examine the bill in all of its details, but I am satisfied from the cursory examination I have given to it that it is not surrounded by the proper guards; that it has not even the safeguards surrounding it that would surround an irrigating-ditch company in the State of Kansas or any mining corporation in the State of Colorado.

I say that this bill should be considered when there is a quorum present, and carefully considered. It is a new question, a great question, and I for one am not in favor of, and do not propose to permit this bill to go through unless there is a quorum present. I give notice of that now.

Mr. DUNN. Will the gentleman allow me to ask him a question just there? How much time does the gentleman desire for the purpose of examining the bill?

Mr. FULLER. I will say that I think this bill should be referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, as there are legal questions involved. We have already heard from the chairman of that committee [Mr. CULBERSON], who gives one view as to the responsibility of the Government. Mr. PHELAN, who is a member of the Committee on Commerce, gives another. It is already evident that there is a division of opinion as to the legal questions; and I believe the bill should go to the Committee on the Judiciary upon the legal questions for consideration and report.

Mr. DUNN. But the gentleman from Texas [Mr. CULBERSON] has no trouble in reaching conclusions on which he will be satisfied. How much time does the gentleman from Iowa desire to satisfy himself? Will he agree to a day in the future?

Mr. FULLER. I certainly will.

Mr. DUNN. Will you name it now?

Mr. FULLER. I will name it.

Mr. DUNN. Name the day when you will allow the bill to be considered.

Mr. FULLER. I will be in favor of taking this bill up for discussion the second week of the next session.

Mr. DUNN. Oh, well, if the gentleman desires to be captious he can.

Mr. O'NEILL, of Pennsylvania. I desire to say to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. FULLER] that this bill has been investigated thoroughly by the Committee on Commerce of this House; it has been before that committee a long while and carefully considered; and I will say to him that there are gentlemen on that committee who are very able lawyers—the chairman, the present acting chairman of the committee, and several others—who certainly have looked into this bill and its provisions in every point of view, and would not undertake to present to the House a bill unless it was correctly guarded. The giving of corporate powers by Congress is no new thing.

Mr. CULBERSON. Mr. Chairman, I am entitled to the floor; and I desire to ask the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. O'NEILL] a question. Did not the Committee on Commerce report adversely on this proposition offered by the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. PHELAN]?

Mr. O'NEILL, of Pennsylvania. Yes.

Mr. CULBERSON. Then I understand that this amendment offered by the gentleman from Tennessee has been acted upon by the Committee on Commerce, and that the committee refused to report it favorably to the House.

Mr. O'NEILL, of Pennsylvania. This bill has been reported favorably from the Committee on Commerce.

Mr. CULBERSON. Without this amendment?

Mr. O'NEILL, of Pennsylvania. The amendments of the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. PHELAN] are those of his own suggestion. Mr. Chairman, I think this bill should be allowed to pass.

Mr. PHELAN. I beg the indulgence of the House for just three minutes. At the end of my remarks I will withdraw the amendment which has raised the objection of the gentleman from Texas.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. PHELAN] to be allowed three minutes in which to make a statement? The Chair hears none.

Mr. PHELAN. So far as the question of constitutionality is concerned, the Committee on the Judiciary, which is composed of lawyers, have already passed upon that subject. When the question came up in the Committee on Commerce it was considered in full committee at three or four different meetings. It was considered carefully and at length. The amendments I offered were not amendments which were antagonized by any member of the Committee on Commerce except upon the proposition that this was a private charter, and it was inexpedient to ingraft upon a private charter any expression of our foreign policy.

Not for the purpose of defeating this bill, but in earnest protest against the proposed action, I offered this amendment. Now, in accordance with the manifest desire of the House, and with no view of applying that rule by which its passage may be obstructed, and having no desire to thrust my single individuality before the House and utilize the brute strength the rules of this House give for the purpose of enforcing my peculiar ideas or requiring a quorum to be present, I feel compelled to agree that a vote of the House shall be taken upon the bill without my amendment, and I withdraw my amendment. [Cries of "Vote!"]

The question was put as to ordering the bill to be reported to the House with a favorable recommendation.

The CHAIRMAN announced that the ayes seemed to have it.

Mr. FULLER. Division.

The committee divided; and there were—ayes 33, noes 6.

Mr. FULLER. No quorum.

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise.

Mr. BAYNE. Mr. Chairman, I desire to make a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. BAYNE. Is not this question still pending?

The CHAIRMAN. The question is pending as unfinished business.

The motion of Mr. LANHAM was agreed to.

The committee accordingly rose; and Mr. MCMILLIN having taken the chair as Speaker *pro tempore*, Mr. RICHARDSON reported that the Committee of the Whole had had under consideration the Private Calendar, and had directed him to report to the House sundry bills with various recommendations.

WASHINGTON AQUEDUCT TUNNEL INVESTIGATION.

Mr. BURNES. Mr. Speaker, I offer the concurrent resolution which I send to the desk.

The resolution was read, as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That all work heretofore performed upon the Washington aqueduct tunnel, together with the provisions of any contract made for the same or any portion thereof, and all the facts and circumstances connected with the bidding for and letting and making of said contracts, and all expenditures of moneys heretofore appropriated for said work, together with the extent of any force employed in said work by the Government, the nature of the same and the compensation therefor, shall forthwith be fully investigated by a joint select committee of six members, of whom three shall be members of the Senate, to be appointed by the President of the Senate, and three shall be members of the House of Representatives, to be appointed by the Speaker. Said committee shall have authority to employ a clerk, a stenographer, and such experts as it may deem necessary for the investigation. It may sit during the sessions of Congress or in recess, and shall have full power, either in full committee or in subcommittee, to administer oaths and send for persons and papers, and to conduct its investigation either in Washington or in such places as may be deemed necessary, and shall make full report of its proceedings and the conclusions arrived at, with such recommendations as it may deem proper to Congress on or before January 1, 1889.

Mr. DINGLEY. I desire to reserve the right to object until I learn why that matter is brought here in this form when it is now pending in conference.

Mr. BURNES. The lawyers of the Senate and the great lawyers of the Senate have suggested, with a good deal of force, that perhaps we have not the right or the power under our system of legislation to raise this joint committee in an appropriation bill. Therefore, in order to prepare the appropriation bill properly, it is necessary to get this first out of the way. We introduce this resolution, therefore, and appropriate the money necessary to conduct the investigation.

Mr. DINGLEY. That explanation is entirely satisfactory.

Mr. BURNES. The gentleman being satisfied, I now move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The concurrent resolution was adopted.

Mr. BURNES moved to reconsider the vote by which the resolution was adopted; and also moved that the motion to reconsider be laid on the table.

The latter motion was agreed to.

PRIVATE BILLS PASSED.

House bills of the following titles, reported from the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar, were severally ordered to be engrossed and read a third time; and being engrossed, they were accordingly read the third time, and passed:

A bill (H. R. 5043) for the relief of the Stockbridge and Munsee tribe of Indians, in the State of Wisconsin;

A bill (H. R. 2896) for the relief of the heirs of John R. Trentlen;

A bill (H. R. 11165) for the relief of John Gray;

A bill (H. R. 3715) for the relief of the National Bank of New Orleans, formerly Louisiana State Bank;

A bill (H. R. 3765) for the relief of James Devine;

A bill (H. R. 5480) for the relief of James Iredell Meares; and

A bill (H. R. 10099) for the relief of Melchisedec Robinson.

Amendments reported from the Committee of the Whole to House bills of the following titles were severally agreed to, and the bills as amended were severally ordered to be engrossed and read a third time; and being engrossed, they were accordingly read the third time, and passed:

A bill (H. R. 7151) for the relief of A. N. Kimball and sureties;

A bill (H. R. 338) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of J. George Ruckstuhl;

A bill (H. R. 9211) for the relief of Jesse Durnell; and

A bill (H. R. 1156) for the relief of Miles F. West.

Senate bills of the following titles, reported from the Committee of the Whole, were severally ordered to a third reading, and were accordingly read the third time, and passed:

A bill (S. 741) for the relief of William Tabb; and

A bill (S. 1671) for the relief of the heirs of Martin Kenofsky.

WILLIAM R. WHEATON AND C. H. CHAMBERLAIN.

The House proceeded to the consideration of the bill (H. R. 661) reported from the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar for the relief of William R. Wheaton and Charles H. Chamberlain, of California.

Mr. MCKENNA. I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Claims be discharged from the further consideration of Senate bill No. 664, and that it be substituted for this House bill, with which it is identical.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. If there be no objection, the House will proceed to the consideration of Senate bill No. 664, in lieu of House bill No. 661, the two bills being, as stated by the gentleman from California [Mr. MCKENNA], identical in their provisions.

There being no objection, the bill (S. 664) for the relief of William R. Wheaton and Charles H. Chamberlain, of California, was taken up, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

House bill No. 661 was, by unanimous consent, laid on the table.

Mr. LANHAM. I move to reconsider the several votes by which these bills reported from the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar have been passed; and also move that the motion to reconsider be laid on the table.

The latter motion was agreed to.

ESTATE OF JOSEPH FENNO.

Mr. ROGERS. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill (S. 1190) for the relief of the estate of Joseph Fenno, deceased.

The bill was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay to the legal representatives of Joseph Fenno, deceased, late of Little Rock, Ark., out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $580, for rent of buildings owned by him in Little Rock, Ark., which were occupied by the military authorities of the United States, under contract, from July 1, 1864, to January 30, 1865, and for which vouchers were given said Busby by said authorities.

There being no objection, the House proceeded to the consideration of the bill.

Mr. ROGERS. By a clerical or typographical error the word "Busby" appears in the last line of the bill instead of "Fenno." I move to amend by striking out "Busby" and inserting "Fenno."

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill as amended was ordered to a third reading, was accordingly read the third time, and passed.

Mr. ROGERS moved to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed; and also moved that the motion to reconsider be laid on the table.

The latter motion was agreed to.

J. M. HOGAN.

Mr. MORROW. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill (H. R. 4489) for the relief of J. M. Hogan.

The bill was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay the claim of J. M. Hogan, of Stockton, in the State of California, for loss of property in consequence of depredations committed by Snake or Shoshone Indians in the year 1861, while *en route* through the Territory of Utah to the State of California; and that the sum of $6,000 be, and the same is hereby, appropriated to pay the said claim of the said J. M. Hogan, said claim having been fully examined into by the Indian Bureau of the Interior Department, under rules and regulations promulgated by the Commissioner of Indian Affairs to the Secretary of the Interior, with the recommendation for an allowance in the amount hereby appropriated, said claim having been duly reported to Congress, in pursuance to law, by the Secretary of the Interior.

Mr. KILGORE. I think, perhaps, the report in this case ought to be read. I am inclined to object to the bill.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The gentleman from Texas asks that the report be read, reserving the right to object.

Mr. MORROW. This claim was investigated carefully by the Indian Bureau, and was reported by the Interior Department to Congress for allowance. It has already been once passed by this House unanimously; but unfortunately it did not pass in the Senate.

Mr. KILGORE. The bill calls for a considerable amount of money.

Mr. MORROW. The money does not come out of the Treasury—not a dollar of it.

Mr. KILGORE. How is the claim to be paid?

Mr. MORROW. It is to be paid out of the funds of the Indians.

Mr. KILGORE. Well, I do not care much about it.

There being no objection, the House proceeded to the consideration of the bill, which was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time; and being engrossed, it was accordingly read the third time.

The question being on the passage of the bill,

Mr. SOWDEN said: I move that the House now take a recess.

The motion was not agreed to.

The question recurring on the passage of the bill, it was passed.

Mr. MORROW moved to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed; and also moved that the motion to reconsider be laid on the table.

The latter motion was agreed to.

JAMES SIMS.

Mr. MORGAN. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill (H. R. 9297) for the relief of James Sims.

The bill was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That there be, and hereby is, appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $6,338, to be paid to James Sims, of Marshall County, in the State of Mississippi, for quartermaster and commissary stores furnished by him to the Army of the United States in the years A. D. 1862 and 1863.

Mr. MORGAN. I ask that the report be read.

The report of the Committee on War Claims (by Mr. BLISS) was read, as follows:

The committee finds from the sworn statement of James Sims, Alfred Featherstone, and Manuel Sims that the claimant furnished quartermaster and commissary stores to the Army of the United States from December, 1862, to August, 1863, valued at $5,582. Receipts are also filed with the committee for a portion of the supplies enumerated in the sworn statement of claimant, which were given at the time by officers of the Army who took them. Also the following order from General Grant in his own handwriting:

"HEADQUARTERS DEPARTMENT OF THE TENNESSEE,
"*Holly Springs, Miss., January 4, 1863.*

"Mr. James Sims, living 8 miles southwest of Holly Springs, is authorized to retain four mules and the remainder of stock, grain, and provisions on hand.

"All United States troops are prohibited from further molesting or taking from Mr. Sims, he having already contributed largely to the support of the Federal Army.

"U. S. GRANT, *Major-General.*"

This order shows that a large amount of supplies not covered by the receipts of officers were furnished by James Sims. Conclusive evidence is also filed showing claimant's loyalty.

The committee is of the opinion that this claim should be paid, and recommend the passage of the bill.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. Is there objection to the present consideration of this bill?

Mr. KILGORE. I believe this claim ought not to be paid. I am inclined to doubt the proof of the claimant's loyalty. He lived in Mississippi during the war, and the pretense of a man down in Mississippi being loyal to the Government of the United States during the war is tolerably "thin." [Laughter.]

Mr. MORGAN. I presume I was just about as disloyal as the gentleman from Texas, for I was in the Confederate army from the beginning of the war until its close. I would be as unwilling as any one to pay the claim of a man not entitled to payment. But of course persons can prove their loyalty; and the Committee on War Claims, having investigated that subject, is satisfied that this man was loyal. I think the claim ought to be paid.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. Is there objection to the present consideration of this bill?

Mr. KILGORE. Will not somebody over there object to it if I do not? [Laughter.]

There being no objection, the House proceeded to the consideration of the bill; which was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading; and being engrossed, it was accordingly read the third time, and passed.

Mr. MORGAN moved to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed; and also moved that the motion to reconsider be laid on the table.

The latter motion was agreed to.

WILLIAM ENGLISH.

Mr. ROCKWELL. I ask unanimous consent for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 3721) authorizing the President to appoint William English an officer in the regular Army of the United States Army.

The bill was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the President be, and he is hereby, authorized to appoint William English a second lieutenant in the regular Army of the United States and to assign him to any vacancy in said rank existing therein.

Mr. SOWDEN. Let us have the report read.

Mr. ROCKWELL. I will make a statement of the facts, if the gentleman from Pennsylvania will allow me.

Mr. SOWDEN. I am willing to accept the gentleman's statement in lieu of the reading of the report.

Mr. ROCKWELL. The report of the Committee on Military Affairs in this case, which was made by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. HOOKER], not now present, is unanimous.

Mr. SOWDEN. What are the facts of the case?

Mr. ROCKWELL. I will state them in a moment. Two different courts-martial sat upon the cases of two officers of the Army, although the cases rested upon practically the same evidence. One of the officers was sentenced to six months' suspension and the payment of a fine of $50; the other officer was condemned to dismissal from the Army, though in the latter case there was substantially the same state of facts, or if anything there was reason for a lighter sentence than in the other case. The committee has unanimously reported this bill; and I am authorized by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. HOOKER], who presented the report, to say that the measure has his entire and hearty approval.

Mr. DINGLEY. What was the offense?

Mr. ROCKWELL. The offense——

Mr. SOWDEN. This is simply to restore the officer?

Mr. ROCKWELL. That is all.

Mr. DINGLEY. What was the offense alleged?

Mr. ROCKWELL. There were two charges, one that he committed some act unbecoming an officer and gentleman, and the other was for absence without leave. On this latter charge, absence without leave, he was found guilty, but on the other he was dismissed on the statement as embodied in the specifications; but they filed certain new specifications at the time of the trial, which the committee thought ought not to have been done.

Mr. DINGLEY. It was not for habitual drunkenness?

Mr. ROCKWELL. No, sir.

Mr. OATES. He was charged with some immoral conduct?

Mr. ROCKWELL. For some conduct unbecoming an officer and a gentleman. The case has been reported unanimously by the committee.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

Mr. OATES. I did not hear the reading of this bill. Does it require the appointment absolutely, or leave it discretionary with the President?

Mr. ROCKWELL. It authorizes the appointment.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The bill will be again reported.

The bill was again read.

Mr. OATES. I take it that it does not require the President to make the appointment, but only authorizes him.

Mr. ROCKWELL. Not by any means. It has been brought to the attention of the President, and meets his approval in that form.

Mr. OATES. If it only leaves it to his discretion I have no objection.

There being no objection, the bill was considered, ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and being engrossed, it was accordingly read the third time, and passed.

Mr. ROCKWELL moved to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed; and also moved that the motion to reconsider be laid on the table.

The latter motion was agreed to.

ST. CLAIR FLATS SHIP-CANAL.

Mr. CATCHINGS, from the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, by unanimous consent, reported back favorably the bill (H. R. 11445) for completing the dredging of the St. Clair Flats Ship Canal, Michigan; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

HENRIETTA M. SANDS.

Mr. TRACEY. I ask unanimous consent to discharge the Committee of the Whole House from the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 1089) for the relief of Henrietta M. Sands, widow of the late Rear-Admiral Benjamin F. Sands, United States Navy, and put it upon its passage.

The bill was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any moneys in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Henrietta M. Sands, widow of the late Rear-Admiral Benjamin F. Sands, United States Navy, the sum of $370.50, being the sum due to the decedent under the decisions of the Supreme Court of the United States in the Graham and Temple cases as the difference between actual traveling expenses allowed and the mileage due for travel performed by decedent upon duty under orders in June, 1861.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. Is there objection to the present consideration of this bill?

Mr. KILGORE. Let the report be read, so that we can wind up the evening on that case.

The report (by Mr. TIMOTHY J. CAMPBELL) was read, as follows:

The Committee on Claims, to whom was referred Senate bill No. 1089, for the relief of Henrietta M. Sands, widow of the late Rear-Admiral Benjamin F. Sands, United States Navy, have considered the same, and respectfully report that a report on this bill was made to the Senate at this session of Congress (Senate Report No. 415), and your committee adopt said report as their own, which is appended hereto, and report the bill back and recommend its passage.

[Senate, Report No. 415, Fiftieth Congress, first session.]

The Committee on Claims, to whom was referred the bill (S. 1089) for the relief of Henrietta M. Sands, widow of Rear-Admiral Sands of the United States Navy, have considered the same, and respectfully report:

This claim is for the balance of mileage due under the law to the estate of the late Rear-Admiral Benjamin F. Sands, United States Navy, for travel performed by him under orders in June, 1861. Under the construction put by the accounting officers of the Treasury upon the act of 1855, officers of the Navy had been notified that mileage would only be allowed where the travel was performed within the United States, and simply actual expenses when they traveled outside of the United States. It was only by the decisions of the Supreme Court of the United States in the Graham and Temple cases (105-110, U. S. Reports) that officers were informed of the erroneous ruling of the accounting officers, and all who had only received actual expenses claimed, and the accounting officers allowed, and Congress appropriated the money to pay them the difference between what had been allowed and what was due as mileage, a great many of the cases being for travel under orders dating prior to 1850.

The amount due to the late Admiral Sands has been stated by the Second Comptroller, in an opinion laid before the committee, to be $370.50, which he says he could not certify to Congress, as the amount allowed for actual expense of travel was in the accounts of a coast survey officer, and so came under another bureau of the Treasury Department, which declined to consider it.

It is clear that this sum was due to Admiral Sands, and that it has never been paid. It is about the only such claim that remains unsettled. The estate of Admiral Sands, which was solvent, has been closed by the administrator, wherefore it is that the money so due is made by the bill payable directly to the officer's widow, who is the residuary legatee; and your committee recommends the passage of the bill as just and proper.

There being no objection, the bill was considered, ordered to a third reading; and being read the third time, was passed.

Mr. TRACEY moved to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed; and also moved that the motion to reconsider be laid on the table.

The latter motion was agreed to.

WILLIAM J. SOWELL.

Mr. PEEL. I ask unanimous consent to take up and pass the bill

(H. R. 2025) to place William J. Sowell on the rolls of the Arkansas Volunteers. I ask to discharge the Committee of the Whole from its further consideration, and pass the bill. It does not appropriate a dollar.

The bill was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of War be, and he hereby is, directed to place the name of William J. Sowell on the rolls of Capt. Thomas J. Williams's company (B), First Arkansas (six months') Infantry Volunteers, as having enlisted June, 1862, and to enter him as having died in service on the 7th day of October, 1862; and all pay, bounty, and pension due under any laws of the United States on account of his services and death shall be paid to the parties thereto entitled.

There being no objection, the bill was considered, ordered to be engrossed, and read the third time; and being engrossed, it was accordingly read the third time, and passed.

Mr. PEEL moved to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed; and also moved that the motion to reconsider be laid on the table.

The latter motion was agreed to.

And then (the hour of 5 o'clock having arrived) the Speaker *pro tempore* declared the House in recess under its previous order until 8 o'clock p. m.

EVENING SESSION.

The recess having expired, the House at 8 o'clock p. m. was called to order by Mr. MCMILLIN, who directed the reading of the following communication:

SPEAKER'S ROOM, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, October 5, 1888.

DEAR SIR: I hereby designate Hon. BENTON MCMILLIN, of Tennessee, to preside as Speaker *pro tempore* at the session of the House this evening.

JOHN G. CARLISLE.

Hon. JOHN B. CLARK,
Clerk House of Representatives.

ORDER OF BUSINESS.

Mr. LYMAN. Mr. Speaker, I wish to submit a parliamentary inquiry. Some few weeks ago the Senate bill 3018, granting a pension to John N. Bovee, passed the committee and was reported to the House, the question being upon its third reading. I wish to ask if it is proper to call that bill up now, or if it can be called up the first bill after the committee shall rise to-night?

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The Chair will state to the gentleman from Iowa that in the regular order this bill will be reached first when the committee rises to-night.

Mr. LYMAN. That is satisfactory to me.

Mr. YODER. I move that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole to consider bills on the Private Calendar, under the special order.

The motion was agreed to.

The House accordingly resolved itself into Committee of the Whole, Mr. BACON in the chair.

Mr. MORRILL. Mr. Chairman, I ask consent that the same order of business be pursued to-night as on last Friday; that is, that the roll be called and each member be allowed to call up a bill as his name is reached.

There was no objection, and it was so ordered.

ELLEN WHITE DOWLING.

Mr. FULLER. I call up the bill (S. 1481) granting a pension to Ellen White Dowling.

The bill was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension-roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of Ellen White Dowling, a volunteer nurse in the Army during the war of the rebellion, and pay her a pension of $25 a month, during life, from and after the passage of this act.

The report (by Mr. MORRILL) was read, as follows:

The Committee on Invalid Pensions, to whom was referred the bill (S. 1481) granting a pension to Ellen White Dowling, submit the following report:

The papers submitted to your committee in this case fully substantiate the statements made in the report of the Committee on Pensions in the Senate, and their report is adopted and the passage of the bill recommended, with an amendment striking out the words "twenty-five" and inserting "twelve."

[Senate Report No. 1066, Fiftieth Congress, first session.]

The applicant is one of the army of noble and patriotic women who rendered such valuable service in caring for the sick and dying soldiers of the late war. She entered the Massachusetts General Hospital to prepare for field service, and while there cared for many wounded soldiers sent home from the first battle of Bull Run. She left this hospital intending to go to the field, when she was instated in the Armory Square Hospital as first volunteer nurse. Here she served faithfully until May, 1863, acting not only in the capacity of nurse, but as surgeon's assistant during painful operations, when her delicate woman's nature was subjected to the severest nervous strains. Her system has never recovered from the fatigues and shocks of this service, and the committee, after a careful review of the evidence, are convinced that she is entitled to national recognition, and therefore recommend the passage of the bill.

The amendment was adopted.

The bill as amended was laid aside to be reported to the House with the recommendation that it do pass.

MARY J. FOSTER.

Mr. GIFFORD. I call up the bill (S. 3030) granting a pension to Mary J. Foster.

The bill was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place upon the pension-roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of Mary J. Foster, widow of Milton S. Foster, late a private in Company A, Fifth Regiment Kansas Cavalry.

The report (by Mr. MORRILL) was read, as follows:

The Committee on Invalid Pensions, to whom was referred the bill (S. 3030) granting a pension to Mary J. Foster, submit the following report:

The claimant in this case is the widow of Milton S. Foster, of Company A, Fifth Kansas Cavalry, who enlisted August 4, 1861, and was discharged April 20, 1865. In her declaration for pension she declares that her husband contracted catarrh in the service and died therefrom December 16, 1872. The case was rejected on the ground that the soldier's fatal disease was consumption, and it was not proven to have been due to his military service. The prisoner of war records show that he was captured at Marks Mills, April 26, 1864, and released at Red River Landing, February 26, 1865. The assistant surgeon-general United States Army reports that no hospital records of the Fifth Kansas Cavalry were ever on file in this office, so the claimant is unable to show by the hospital records the incurrence of the disease in the service.

A. Thomas testifies that Foster was a strong, healthy man at the time of his enlistment, and that the exposure and hardships of his prison life were the main cause of his injury, which afterwards resulted in his death; that he knew him after the war, and that his constitution was completely broken down.

Other witnesses testify to his robust health at the time of his enlistment, and that he was broken down in health at the time of his discharge.

The evidence submitted to your committee seems to establish the fact at the time of his discharge from the service that he was suffering from catarrh in the head, which gradually increased until the bones of his face began to decay, and until, as one witness testifies, it seemed as if the whole inside of his head was rotten.

His death was caused by consumption, which your committee are satisfied was the natural sequence of the diseased condition of his head, and they therefore recommend the passage of the bill.

The bill was laid aside to be reported to the House with the recommendation that it do pass.

ORDER OF BUSINESS.

Mr. LAWLER. I would suggest to the House that the call of the roll be dispensed with, and that when an initial is announced gentlemen may rise and ask for the consideration of a bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The committee can not dispense with the order of the House, which requires the call of the roll.

MARY ANN SHOOK.

Mr. JOHNSTON, of North Carolina. I call up for consideration the bill (H. R. 2702) granting a pension to Mary Ann Shook.

The bill was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he hereby is, authorized and directed to place on the pension-roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of Mary Ann Shook, widow of Joseph G. W. Shook, late a private in the company of Daniel Hake in the war of 1812, and to pay her a pension from and after the passage of this act.

The CHAIRMAN. The bill which the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON] has sent up has an amendment written in it.

Mr. JOHNSTON, of North Carolina. It is merely a misprint. The name in the bill should be "Daniel Hoke," instead of which it is printed "Hake." I offer that amendment.

The report (by Mr. HENDERSON, of North Carolina) was read, as follows:

The Committee on Pensions, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 2702) granting a pension to Mary Ann Shook, have considered the same and report as follows:

The claimant is the widow of Joseph George Shook, who she declares was a soldier for the period of ten weeks during the war of 1812, under Captain Hoke, of the North Carolina Infantry, and was discharged about March 25, 1815.

Her claim has been rejected by the Pension Bureau on the ground that there is no evidence in the Third Auditor's office, Treasury Department, that her husband was ever in the military service.

The following certificate from the records on file with the State officers of North Carolina shows that a service was rendered in the company alleged:

"NORTH CAROLINA, ADJUTANT-GENERAL'S DEPARTMENT,
"*Raleigh, January* 5, 1885.

"This is to certify that upon the original manuscript muster-rolls of the war of 1812, of the North Carolina troops mustered into the service of the United States, appears the name of George Shook, as a private in the company commanded by Capt. Daniel Hoke, of Lincoln County. That company was of the Seventh Regiment, of which Andrew Irwin was lieutenant-colonel commandant.

"FRED. A. OLDS, *Clerk in Charge of Records.*"

A further statement from Mr. Olds is to the effect—

"That Lieutenant-Colonel Irwin's regiment was ordered to rendezvous at Wadesborough, Anson County, March 1, 1815, a requisition having been made by Maj. Gen. Thomas Pinckney for one regiment to march to the defense of the southern frontier of the sixth military district of the United States. Our records were in part destroyed in 1868, and so I can not give the dates of muster in and muster out."

The claimant is ninety-two years of age.

Your committee are of the opinion that the records on file in the archives of the State should be accepted as sufficient to establish the fact of the service of the claimant's husband. They recommend the passage of the bill.

The amendment was agreed to, and the bill as amended was ordered to be laid aside to be reported to the House with the recommendation that it do pass.

ABBIE L. HAM.

Mr. DINGLEY. I was detained this evening and my name was called when I was absent. I ask unanimous consent that I may call up a bill at this time.

There was no objection.

Mr. DINGLEY. I call up for consideration the bill (S. 3197) granting a pension to Abbie L. Ham.

The bill was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby authorized and directed to place on the pension-roll, subject to the provisions and

limitations of the pension laws, the name of Abbie L. Ham, widow of John S. P. Ham, late captain of Company C, Thirteenth Maine Volunteers.

The report (by Mr. GALLINGER) was read, as follows:

The Committee on Invalid Pensions, to whom was referred the bill (S. 3197) granting a pension to Abbie L. Ham, have had the same under consideration, and beg leave to submit the following report:

Abbie L. Ham is the widow of John S. P. Ham, late captain of Company C, Thirteenth Regiment Maine Volunteers. The widow's application was rejected on the ground that her husband's death was not due to his service.

The records of the War Department show that the soldier served as second lieutenant, first lieutenant, and captain, respectively, from December 4, 1861, to January 6, 1865.

Dr. Bates, late surgeon of Ham's regiment, testifies to his suffering from attacks of chills and fever, the result of climatic influences and exposure; that he was a sound, able-bodied man when he entered the service; that at the battle of Sabine Cross-Roads, Louisiana, on the 8th of April, 1864, he was severely wounded in the abdomen and hip by a rifle ball, which entered in front at the lower portion of the abdomen, by the side of the bladder, and passed through the body and lodged in the hip; that he dressed said Ham's wound as he was brought off the battle-field; that he had the reputation of being a brave soldier in his company during his service in the Army.

Dr. Donovan, who knew the soldier twelve years as a neighbor, commenced to treat him professionally in October, 1876; was called to treat him January 5, 1882; found him in a high degree of mental excitement; feverish, pulse accelerated, left arm and leg paralyzed. Upon examination of the heart aortic and mitral murmurs were discovered. Paralysis and delirium continued until January 15, when he died. The diagnosis was cerebral hemorrhage, due to degenerate changes in cerebral arteries. His early death, occurring at the age of fifty years, dependent on organic disease of the heart and brain, in one whose family history has been so exceptionally good, inclines deponent to believe that the soldier's gunshot wound, the general severity of army life, and the damaging effects of malarial infection led to the development of cardiac disease and then to the cerebral affection which resulted as described. This theory seems more probable, since, as it is alleged, he was in a sound physical condition at the time of his enlistment.

Dr. Horr knew the soldier since 1870. He belonged to a large family, who were vigorous and healthy, and was considered to have inherited a vigorous constitution. During the last few years of his life he appeared to be failing in health and growing old prematurely. Deponent first visited him professionally January 8, 1882, in consultation with Dr. Donovan. He was partially conscious, one-half of his body paralyzed, valvular murmurs were heard, and some irregularity of the heart was noted. The case was diagnosed as one of cerebral hemorrhage, from degenerative disease of the blood-vessels, or possibly embolism with hemorrhage infraction. The disease of blood-vessels and heart were believed to have existed for a long time. Five days later they consulted again. The symptoms were more intensified; was in a comatose condition. The scar was nearly over the left hip-joint, the ball having entered the lower part of the abdomen and made its exit near the left trochanter major. Death occurred two days later, and deponent is of the opinion from information obtained by examination and from the history of the case that the disease which caused his death had its origin from malarialpo isoning and other enfeebling agencies to which he was exposed while in ser vice.

This deponent was late an assistant surgeon in the Army and a practitioner of medicine over twenty-two years. A special examiner says he stands at the head of his profession in Maine, and his reputation is excellent.

Amos Nevens testifies to the soldier's soundness before enlistment; lived near him since his boyhood, worked with him and had a good opportunity of judging. From the time of his return home from the Army to the date of his death he was never a well man. He suffered every year from frequent chills and fever and nervous prostration, which was attributed to his wound. They occurred about once a month. Deponent worked with him much of the time, and was a partner with him in the mill and grain business.

The reputation of this witness, as well as that of all who testify, is admitted to be of the best.

The Adjutant-General reports that he was discharged January 6, 1865, and that he was then "present, sick." Amos Nevins, who knew him from his boyhood, says he was sound prior to enlistment, and that he was never well after he returned from the Army.

The long and faithful service of Captain Ham, his serious disability from the wound and disease due to his military service, as well as the opinions of the attending physicians, afford your committee ample justification in returning the bill with the recommendation that it do pass.

The bill was laid aside to be reported to the House with the recommendation that it do pass.

MARGARET M. HATCH.

Mr. LAWLER. I ask consideration of the bill (H. R. 5751) for the relief of Margaret M. Hatch.

The bill was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension-roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension law, the name of Margaret M. Hatch, mother of William E. Hatch, deceased, formerly of Company B, Seventh New York Heavy Artillery.

The report (by Mr. LANE) was read, as follows:

The Committee on Invalid Pensions, to whom was referred House bill 5751, submit the following report:

The claim of Margaret M. Hatch, mother of William E. Hatch, deceased, formerly of Companies A and B, Seventh New York Heavy Artillery, for mother's pension, No. 264917, was rejected January 7, 1884, for the reason that there was no record or other evidence showing that the soldier's fatal disease, hemorrhage of the lungs, was owing to his army service, and claimant is unable to furnish such proof.

The testimony on file in the War Office and Pension Office shows that soldier received a gunshot wound of shoulder and chest in the battle of Cold Harbor, in June, 1864, for which he was sent to the hospital, and that afterward he had partially recovered and returned to his regiment, and that he was discharged with his regiment in 1865.

The mother claims that the wound of shoulder and chest affected soldier's lungs, and that he had lung trouble at the date of his discharge and continuously to the date of his death. Soldier died in Buffalo, N. Y., of hemorrhage of the lungs, October 27, 1867.

Dr. Thorn, the family physician, who treated soldier immediately after his return home and thereafter, is dead.

The mother says the doctor told her, when her son first returned home after discharge, that the ball had taken a downward course in the chest, and would be apt to cause hemorrhage of the lungs, which proved in the end to be true.

Claimant's husband, the father of the soldier, was a dissipated man, and died in 1878. She is now old, about seventy-eight years of age, and feeble and unable to support herself; has no real estate, and but little personal property, and no one legally bound to support her.

The record further shows that the soldier was a sound man when he enlisted; that he was in the hospital for treatment from June to August, 1864, after receiving the said wound, and that the ball remained in the body, and Dr. Thorn said, when the soldier first returned home, that the ball had taken a downward course in the chest, and the soldier died October 27, 1867, of hemorrhage of the lungs, as the coroner's inquest shows; and an equitable construction of the testimony shows that the soldier died from the injury received in battle.

The committee therefore recommend that the bill do pass.

The bill was laid aside to be reported to the House with the recommendation that it do pass.

WILLIAM A. MATHES.

Mr. KILGORE. I call up for consideration the bill (H. R. 8521) for the relief of William A. Mathes. I call it up for Colonel MATSON, the next governor of Indiana. [Laughter and applause.]

The bill was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, instructed to place the name of William A. Mathes, late of Company B, Eighteenth Regiment Volunteer Infantry, on the pension-roll, subject to the conditions and limitations of the pension laws.

The report (by Mr. MATSON) was read, as follows:

The Committee on Invalid Pensions, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 8521) for the relief of William A. Mathes, having considered the same, beg leave to submit the following report:

This soldier is pensioned at $30 per month for loss of right arm, as provided by the general law. The next highest rate fixed by law is $50, which is for a condition of total helplessness, requiring the regular aid and attendance of another person. He has been examined, and a board of surgeons recently determined that he was not in that condition, but it was shown by that examination that he had another wound on the remaining hand that greatly disables it, so that he nearly approaches the condition of helplessness.

This wound of left hand was received in battle at the same time the wound of right arm was received, and for the two disabilities it is the judgment of the committee that he should receive a pension of $45 per month; and they therefore ask that said bill do pass, with the following amendments:

In line 4, strike out the words "place the name" and insert instead the words "increase the pension," and strike out all after the word "regiment," in line 5, and add these words: "Indiana Volunteers, to $45 per month, in lieu of the pension now paid him."

The amendments offered by the committee were agreed to, and the bill as amended was laid aside to be reported to the House with the recommendation that it do pass.

SARAH C. TAYLOR.

Mr. LAFFOON. I ask consideration of the bill (S. 1482) granting a pension to Sarah C. Taylor.

The bill was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension-roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of Sarah C. Taylor, a volunteer nurse in the Army during the war of the rebellion, and pay her a pension of $25 a month, during life, from and after the passage of this act.

The report (by Mr. MORRILL) was read, as follows:

The Committee on Invalid Pensions, to whom was referred the bill (S. 1482) granting a pension to Sarah C. Taylor, submit the following report:

The Committee on Pensions in the Senate submitted a report which, upon a careful examination of the papers in the case, your committee find to contain a clear statement of the case, and they thereupon recommend the passage of the bill with an amendment striking out "twenty-five," in line 6, and inserting "twelve."

"[Senate Report No. 962, Fiftieth Congress, first session.]

"The Committee on Pensions, to whom was referred the bill (S. 1482) granting a pension to Sarah C. Taylor, have examined the same and report:

"That the claimant was a volunteer Army nurse in the military hospitals of the Government during the war of the rebellion. She entered the service October 15, 1862, and as appears from the sworn statement of Dr. Thurston, assistant surgeon, United States Army, she remained in the service three years, until the close of the war.

"It appears from the evidence that she was a faithful, valuable, and efficient nurse during all this period, and that her services were much needed and highly appreciated. Considering the nature of these services, the laborious details of attention and attendance upon the sick and wounded soldiers of the Government, the care and anxiety incident to an employment so kind, so beneficent in its objects, we do not hesitate to say that such a woman has earned the right to recognition and compensation very nearly, if not equivalent, to that accrued by service in the field for the same period."

We therefore recommend the passage of the bill, more especially as she is now over sixty years of age and without means of support.

The amendment proposed by the committee was agreed to, and the bill as amended was laid aside to be reported to the House with the recommendation that it do pass.

WILLIAM SMITH.

Mr. LYMAN. I ask consideration of the bill (S. 1926) granting a pension to William Smith.

The bill was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension-roll, at the rate of $45 per month, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of William Smith, late a private in Company H, Ninety-third Pennsylvania Volunteers, this act to take effect from its passage, and the pension hereby granted to be in lieu of that which he is now receiving.

The report (by Mr. LYNCH) was read, as follows:

The Committee on Invalid Pensions, to whom was referred the bill (S. 1926) granting a pension to William Smith, have had the same under consideration and respectfully report:

William Smith enlisted as a private in Company H, Ninety-third Pennsylvania Volunteers, January 1, 1864; discharged June 14, 1865, on surgeon's certificate of disability because of "amputation of left leg, upper third, for gunshot wound received at Fisher's Hill, Va., October 22, 1864." He was pensioned August 18, 1865, at $8 per month, on account of amputation of left leg. Said pension has been increased from time to time. Claimant now receives $30 per month.

From the papers on file in the Bureau of Pensions it is apparent that the claimant suffers intense neuralgic pain from the stump of his leg; that he is frequently compelled to discard his artificial limb, owing to severe suffering from its use; that his general health is very poor from general debility, and that he is unable to perform manual labor to any extent.

In addition to the loss of his left leg below the knee, he suffered, not long ago, a comminuted fracture of the thigh of the same leg by an accident.

Your committee recommend that the bill be amended by striking out the word "fifty" and inserting the word "fifty-five" in fifth line of the bill, and that it be passed as amended.

Mr. MORRILL. I think the recommendation to strike out "fifty" and insert "fifty-five," which would be contrary to the rules of the committee, is an error.

Mr. LYMAN. The bill proposes to grant a pension at $45 and the recommendation seems to be an error. The Senate bill fixes the pension at $45. I think there should be no amendment offered at all. The Senate bill is just as the committee recommended that it should be passed.

The CHAIRMAN. The bill as printed fixes the pension at $45.

Mr. LYMAN. The amendment proposed in the report is certainly a mistake.

The amendment was disagreed to, and the bill was laid aside to be reported to the House with the recommendation that it do pass.

W. J. TAPP & CO.

Mr. MARTIN. I ask consideration of the bill (H. R. 332) for the relief of W. J. Tapp & Co.

The bill was read for information.

Mr. MORRILL. I raise the point of order that that does not come under the order for Friday evening sessions.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair understands the order for Friday evening sessions restricts the House to the consideration of bills reported by the Committee on Pensions and Committee on Invalid Pensions. This seems to be a bill reported by the Committee on Claims, and the Chair sustains the point of order.

Mr. MARTIN. I will withdraw that bill.

There was no objection.

DAVID HEINBACH.

Mr. MARTIN. I ask consideration of the bill (S. 1219) granting a pension to David Heinbach.

The bill was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension-roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of David Heinbach, Company G, One hundred and seventy-third Pennsylvania Volunteers.

The report (by Mr. THOMPSON, of Ohio) was read, as follows:

The Committee on Invalid Pensions, to whom was referred the bill (S. 1219) granting a pension to David Heinbach, having considered the same report as follows:

The committee adopt and make part hereof the report of the Senate Committee on Pensions, and recommend the passage of the bill. The Senate report is as follows:

[Senate Report No. 462, Fiftieth Congress, first session.]

The Committee on Pensions, to whom was referred the bill (S. 1219) granting a pension to David Heinbach, have examined the same and report:

This claimant enlisted in Company G, One hundred and seventy-third Pennsylvania Militia, November 2, 1862, and was mustered out August 18, 1863. He claimed pension for a rupture caused by falling from a bridge which he was assisting to build over Goose Creek, Virginia, August 1, 1863. He received no hospital treatment, as he swears his captain, who was also a physician, treated him. His claim was rejected by the Pension Office because he could not obtain evidence that he received the injury in the service. There is ample evidence that the rupture did not exist at the time of enlistment, and that it does exist now, but the claimant swears that he is unable to furnish the evidence required by the Pension Office by reason of the death of his captain and the only two of his comrades who knew and could testify to the facts.

Your committee are of opinion that this is a meritorious case, and recommend that the bill do pass.

The bill was laid aside to be reported to the House with the recommendation that it do pass.

MARY M. ORD.

Mr. McKENNA. I ask consideration of the bill (S. 2663) granting an increase of pension to Mary M. Ord.

The bill was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension-roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of Mrs. Mary M. Ord, widow of the late General E. O. C. Ord, and to pay her a pension at the rate of $100 per month, in lieu of the pension she is now receiving.

The report (by Mr. SAWYER) was read, as follows:

The Committee on Invalid Pensions, to whom was referred the bill (S. 2663) granting an increase of pension to Mrs. Mary M. Ord, have had the same under consideration and beg leave to submit the following report:

The beneficiary named in the bill is the widow of the late Maj. Gen. E. O. C. Ord.

Upon the death of General Ord the following order was issued by the War Department:

"HEADQUARTERS OF THE ARMY,
"ADJUTANT-GENERAL'S OFFICE,
"*Washington, July 24, 1883.*

"With profound sorrow the General of the Army announces the death, at Havana, Cuba, at 7 o'clock on the evening of the 22d instant, of Maj. Gen. Edward O. C. Ord, retired, and lately brigadier-general and brevet major-general on the active-list.

"General Ord was graduated at the Military Academy and appointed second lieutenant in the Third Artillery July 1, 1839. Having passed through the several grades, including that of lieutenant-colonel in the artillery arm, he received his appointment as brigadier-general of the permanent establishment on the 26th of July, 1866. He had, on the 14th of September, 1861, for service in war, been appointed brigadier-general of volunteers, and on the 2d of May, 1862, major-general of volunteers. He was mustered out of the volunteer service September 1, 1866.

"For gallant services in action at Dranesville, Va., Iuka, Miss., the Hatchie, Miss., and at the assault of Fort Harrison, Va., he received, successively, the brevets of lieutenant-colonel, colonel, brigadier-general, and major-general, United States Army. He served in the Florida war against the Seminole Indians, on the Pacific coast in the war against Mexico, and in Indian campaigns on the same coast.

"In the Army of the Potomac he was brigade and division commander; in the Army of the Tennessee he commanded the left wing from August to September, 1862, and subsequently he commanded, successively, the Thirteenth, Eighth, Eighteenth, and Twenty-fourth Corps, and the Army of the James. He was severely wounded in the battle of the Hatchie, Miss., and was wounded in the assault and capture of Fort Harrison, Va.

"Since the late war he has at different times commanded the Departments of Virginia, the Ohio, Arkansas, California, the Platte, Texas, and the Fourth Military District.

"He was retired on the 6th day of December, 1880, and by act of Congress approved January 28, 1881, he became a major-general on the retired-list. Retirement did not close his active life, for immediately thereafter he engaged in civil pursuits and continued therein until death suddenly came upon him.

"Distinguished among his country's defenders, General Ord was a soldier of national repute. Through his long military service, reaching towards half a century, his career has been marked by faithful, devoted, and intelligent discharge of duty, by personal gallantry, by honest administration, and by a firmness which was not weakened by his great kindness of heart. As his intimate associate since boyhood, the general here bears testimony of him that a more unselfish, manly, and patriotic person never lived.

"By command of General Sherman.

"GEO. D. RUGGLES,
"*Acting Adjutant-General.*"

Mrs. Ord is now in receipt of a pension of $50 per month, under act of Congress, approved July 5, 1884. She was married to General Ord October 15, 1854, at San Francisco, Cal., and is now a resident of that State. Having exhausted her limited means in support of an invalid daughter, she is now poor and not able to maintain herself and daughter, who is dependent upon her, on present pension, which is her only resource.

In view of her dependence and the long and eminent services of her gallant husband, your committee report favorably on the accompanying bill, and ask that it do pass, amending the same by striking out the words "one hundred" and inserting in lieu thereof the words "seventy-five."

The amendment recommended by the committee was agreed to, and the bill as amended was ordered to be laid aside to be reported to the House with the recommendation that it do pass.

NANCY POLOCK.

Mr. MOFFITT. I ask consideration of the bill (S. 2567) granting a pension to Nancy Polock.

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension-roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of Nancy Polock, widow of W. A. Polock, late of Company C, First Nebraska Volunteers.

The report (by Mr. MORRILL) was read, as follows:

The Committee on Invalid Pensions, to whom was referred the bill (S. 2567) granting a pension to Nancy Polock, submit the following report:

The report of the Committee on Pensions in the Senate sets forth fully the facts in this case and is herewith adopted, and the passage of the bill recommended.

SENATE REPORT.

William A. Polock, the late soldier, was a second lieutenant in Company C, First Nebraska Volunteer Infantry, from April 30, 1863, to October 3, 1865. He was pensioned at the rate of $6 per month from October 4, 1865, to March 30, 1882, the date of his death, on account of rheumatism contracted in the service. Application of Nancy Polock, widow of said soldier, was filed August 23, 1882, and rejected August 30, 1885, on the ground th t the soldier's fatal disease of kidneys was not a result of the rheumatism for which he was pensioned.

The records of the War Department show that the above-mentioned soldier contracted rheumatism in the service, and the evidence in the case shows that the said disability continued to the time of his death. He also had varicose veins of right leg, said to have resulted from rheumatism.

In her affidavit, filed May 5, 1885, claimant states that it is impossible for her to furnish medical evidence showing the pathological connection between the rheumatism for which her late husband was pensioned and the chronic diarrhea from which he died, because he never allowed physicians to attend him, and he was attended by no doctor during his last sickness. In affidavit filed June 18, 1885, claimant states that two years prior to soldier's death he suffered from dropsy in his back and right leg, and affection of the kidneys, causing swelling of his hands, arms, and lower extremities; that his heart was also affected as a result of rheumatism.

In affidavit filed April 23, 1883, Moses M. Conner, of Brownville, Nebr., testifies that he waited on the late soldier for eight days next preceding his death, and is satisfied that he died from dropsy, a result of rheumatism.

In affidavit filed April 23, 1883, Dr. Charles F. Stewart, of Brownville, Nebr., testifies that he has been a practicing physician for twenty years; that he was called to see the late soldier about fifteen hours before his death, which was caused from dropsy; that he found upon examination a large ulcer upon right leg, which he supposed to be a varicose vein; that he was informed by soldier's family that no physician had been employed in the case.

In a letter filed May 19, 1885, Dr. Stewart states that he found the soldier in a dying condition when he arrived at his bedside, and consequently made but a casual examination of him; that having never seen the soldier professionally before, it is impossible for him to say what pathological connection there might have existed between his rheumatism and dropsy.

In affidavit filed December 21, 1885, Dr. Alfred Crane, of Brownville, Nebr., testifies that claimant suffered two years prior to his death from a kidney complaint caused by a varicose ulcer, chronic diarrhea, and rheumatism.

In an affidavit filed September 27, 1887, Paul H. Douglas, of Brownville, Nebr., testifies that soldier's former wife died September 3, 1854, and his testimony is corroborated by Moses M. Conner, of Brownville, Nebr.

The marriage of claimant to soldier is certified to be a transcript from the record of Scott County, Illinois.

There are now minor children surviving the late soldier.

John M. Thayer, governor of Nebraska; Thomas J. Majors, state senator; Wilson E. Majors; J. H. Bradley, district judge; F. E. Johnson; S. M. Rich, mayor of Brownville; R. T. Rainey, postmaster; Theodore Hill, and others, in a petition dated February 3, 1888, state that the soldier died March 30, 1882, from the effects

of chronic diarrhea and muscular rheumatism, contracted in the service, and that his widow, Mrs. Nancy Polock, is now in very indigent circumstances.

The facts in the case warrant favorable action, and your committee therefore report a bill and recommend the passage of the same.

The bill was laid aside to be reported to the House with the recommendation that it do pass.

EASTER A. JACKSON.

Mr. MORRILL. I ask consideration of the bill (S. 3241) granting a pension to Easter A. Jackson. The report is quite lengthy, and I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the report be dispensed with.

The bill was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he hereby is, authorized and directed to place upon the pension-roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the general pension laws, the name of Easter A. Jackson, widow of Moses H. Jackson, Company D, First Tennessee Mounted Infantry.

There was no objection, and the reading of the report was dispensed with.

The report (by Mr. MORRILL) is as follows:

The Committee on Invalid Pensions, to whom was referred the bill (S. 3241) granting a pension to Easter A. Jackson, having had the same under consideration, submit the following report:

The report of the Senate Committee on Pensions is herewith adopted, and the passage of the bill recommended.

[Senate Report No. 1852, Fiftieth Congress, first session.]

This bill proposes to place upon the pension-roll the name of Easter A. Jackson, widow of Moses H. Jackson, deceased.

Moses H. Jackson enlisted August 20, 1863, in Company D, First Regiment Tennessee Mounted Infantry, and was discharged April 25, 1865.

On June 29, 1880, he made application for a pension, alleging in his declaration "that whilst in line of duty near Celina, Tenn., about the middle of August, 1864, he was badly injured in right knee and leg, also in back and hips, by his horse falling with him while on a scout near Celina, Tenn."

Before this claim was adjudicated by the Commissioner of Pensions the soldier died, and his widow, the claimant, made application for pension, which application the Commissioner, under date of October 14, 1887, rejected "on the ground that the special examinations fail to show that the fatal disease was due to the soldier's military service in line of duty."

Prior to the death of the soldier he had submitted, in support of his claim, the affidavit of James Beatty, a comrade, who swears to origin and continuance of the disabilities as alleged by the soldier. This is fully corroborated by the affidavit of Comrade F. M. Smith.

The presence of these comrades is verified by the records of the War Department, and their credibility established by the reports of the postmasters at their respective places. Lieut. W. J. Nornd, in answer to an official letter from the Commissioner of Pensions, says:

"I can say to you that I recollect Sergt. Moses H. Jackson being crippled in the Army, and in the hospital at Granville, Tenn., at the time you say he charges; but I was not with him on the scout when he got hurt."

Lemuel C. Wright, late first lieutenant of Company D, First Tennessee Mounted Infantry, in response to an office letter, says:

"I was present at one time about the middle of August, 1864, when Moses H. Jackson's horse threw him near Celina, Tenn. Myself with Jackson and others were in close pursuit of and shooting at some rebel guerrillas, and in crossing a fence his horse fell and threw him off; I saw him get up, and with some help got on his horse; he complained very much at the time, and appeared to be badly hurt; Jackson was confined from duty for some time by said injury; remained in camp at Granville, Tenn.; he may have been treated by the surgeon; I do not remember, to be certain about that; but the circumstance of the horse falling with him I remember well, and know he was hurt. Jackson was a brave, daring soldier, honest and obedient. He went West soon after the war. I have not seen him since soon after his discharge."

Dr. C. R. Prewitt swears to an acquaintance of nineteen or twenty years, and that in November, 1865, he was called to see him, and found him suffering with his right knee, which was very much swollen and very tender and painful, with an ulcer on the inside, and seemed when probed to run up and under the patella. He was also suffering with partial paralysis of the hips and spinal column. His knee got some better, the ulcer healed before he left Kentucky in the year 1871, but the paralyzed condition of his hips and spinal column grew gradually worse, or at least there was no improvement up to the time he left. He was not really able to perform any manual labor, for whenever he went to the field to work his wife always had to go with him to take care of him, for he would frequently fall in the field and be unable to rise for hours at a time. Visited him twice a week from November, 1865, to March, 1871.

Abundance of evidence is presented showing condition and continuance from 1871 to date of death. It is also shown that the mind of the soldier gave way, and that he was committed to the hospital for the insane at Osawatomie, Kans., June 15, 1881, and that he died in that institution on the 21st day of November, 1881.

As before stated, the claim was rejected, and the widow appealed the case to the honorable Secretary of the Interior, who affirmed the action of the Commissioner of Pensions in rejecting the claim, saying "there is no due proof of the alleged casual connection." It is proper to add that the claim was also examined by special examiners in the field. Mr. George B. Fleming, special examiner, gives the opinion that the claim is of "doubtful merit," and recommends further examination. Wray Beattie recommends rejection.

The testimony taken by Mr. Beattie is rather of a negative character, none of them testifying with any degree of positiveness that the disability was not incurred as alleged. They all remember the soldier well; that he was a stout, able-bodied man at enlistment, and that they have no recollection of his incurring any injury or disability. This is more than offset by the plain, positive, and direct testimony presented by the claimant.

The prior soundness of the soldier is well established; his condition at discharge is shown; his gradual failure of health and constitution presented beyond doubt or question; and from the examination of the case given by your committee, we submit that there is a sequence between paralysis of the spinal column and the lower limbs and the insanity which caused the death of the soldier, and recommend the passage of the bill.

The bill was laid aside to be reported to the House with the recommendation that it do pass.

PHILLIPE RAY.

Mr. O'NEILL, of Pennsylvania. I call up the bill (S. 1614) granting a pension to Phillipe Ray.

The bill was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretery of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension-roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of Phillipe Ray, late of Company B, First New Jersey Cavalry, in the war of the rebellion.

The report (by Mr. LYNCH) was read, as follows:

The Committee on Invalid Pensions, to whom was referred the bill (S. 1614) granting a pension to Phillipe Ray, have considered the same and adopt and submit the Senate report, which is as follows:

Phillipe Ray, the claimant, was enrolled and mustered on the 20th day of August, 1861, as sergeant of Company E, First New Jersey Cavalry; was early in 1862 reduced to the ranks and transferred to Company B, where he was made a corporal; was captured by the enemy at Harrisonburgh, Va., June 6, 1862, and is borne as a prisoner upon the regimental rolls for May, June, July, and August of that year. At a date not of record he was returned as a paroled prisoner to Camp Parole, Annapolis, Md., and thence transferred to a Washington hospital September 22, 1862. He rejoined his regiment, re-enlisted at the expiration of his term of service, and was discharged as corporal Company B July 21, 1865. A pension is claimed for disabilities originating in exposure while a prisoner at Belle Isle and Lynchburgh, Va. His application was filed originally in 1869, and relinquished by his attorney in 1871, with the avowal that the evidence required by the Commissioner of Pensions could not be furnished. The case was afterward reopened upon the personal application of the claimant, and on June 17, 1887, was finally disposed of adversely by the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, who said in his letter dismissing it that the claimant was no doubt a good soldier, and may have contracted the disability in the service, but that he had failed signally to prove it by the scanty evidence adduced.

The evidence submitted to the committee consists of a certificate of ex-Surgeon Rulett, of the First New Jersey Cavalry, and an affidavit of M. Hutchinson, as to the sound health of the claimant at enrollment, and affidavits of Mrs. E. Beech and Mrs. C. Hornby, that he was suffering in 1873 from kidney disease, which he said was contracted while in the United States service. The medical examiners to whom his case was committed reported his disability from diabetes at one-fourth of total, and permanent, and that in their belief it originated in the service in line of his duty. Ray himself testifies that it had its origin in a severe cold contracted on account of want of shelter while a prisoner, and that his health improved after his return to his regiment, but that during "Burnside's mud march," in January, 1863, he suffered a relapse, since which this disease has been continuous. He accounts for the impossibility of securing favorable testimony from his comrades by stating that he was desirous of promotion which would have been difficult if his physical condition was known.

Your committee, in consideration of the long service of this soldier, his disabled condition, and the possibility and fair probability that his statement is true, report back his petition with the accompanying bill and recommend its passage.

There being no objection, the bill was laid aside to be reported to the House with the recommendation that it do pass.

CHARLES E. SCOTT.

Mr. PETERS. I call up the bill (H. R. 4887) granting a pension to Charles E. Scott.

The bill was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior is hereby directed to place on the pension-roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of Charles E. Scott, late a private in Company G, Twenty-third Illinois Infantry Volunteers.

The report (by Mr. MORRILL) was read, as follows:

The Committee on Invalid Pensions, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 4887) granting a pension to Charles E. Scott, submit the following report:

The soldier was a corporal in Company G, Twenty-third Illinois Volunteers. In his application for pension he alleges that he contracted camp itch near Richmond, Va., about July 1, 1865, which resulted in loss of eyesight. The origin of disability is clearly proven by the affidavits of Lieut. Horace J. Mack, and by a comrade, J. S. Collister, and its existence and continuance by abundant lay testimony. The claim was rejected on the ground of claimant's inability to furnish satisfactory evidence that his loss of sight was the result of the disability contracted in the service.

It appears from the evidence that the soldier was a great sufferer from the disease contracted in the service, and was continuously treated for the same until the year 1871, when he became totally blind and remained so for about three years, when his sight was partially restored. The medical referee of the Pension Office decides that the loss of sight could not be accepted as the result of the disease contracted, but says that if it was scorbutus and not camp itch with which the soldier was afflicted in the service that it might be admitted. Dr. E. Williams, who treated him in 1872 and 1873, and who is also a medical examiner of the Pension Bureau, describes his case fully and says: "I can not feel justified that it was the result of exposure or hardships of army service."

The examining board at Wellington, Kans., reported August 31 describing his condition, and added: "Do not find any indication of venereal disease; probable cause of impaired sight retinal hemorrhage." They rate him at total second grade.

Your committee are unable to decide positively that the disease contracted in the service was the cause of the impaired vision, and even the medical authorities are in doubt about it. They seem unwilling to say that it might not have been, while they declare their inability to accept it as a positive result. The claimant is helpless and destitute.

Your committee, after a careful examination of all the evidence, recommend the passage of the bill.

There being no objection, the bill was laid aside to be reported to the House with the recommendation that it do pass.

JEMIMA STERLING.

Mr. POST. I call up the bill (H. R. 4648) granting a pension to Jemima Sterling.

The bill was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension-roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of Jemima Sterling, mother of James Goldsmith, deceased, late of Company I, One hundred and third Illinois Volunteers.

The report (by Mr. LANE) was read, as follows:

The Committee on Invalid Pensions, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 4648) granting a pension to Jemima Sterling, have had the same under consideration, and beg leave to submit the following report:

The proposed beneficiary is the mother of James Goldsmith, who was killed in battle near Kenesaw Mountain, June 15, 1864, while serving as private of Company I, One hundred and third Regiment Illinois Volunteers. Her claim for pension has been rejected on the ground that the soldier left surviving him a widow and minor child. The widow remarried August 11, 1864, and the minor drew pension during pensionable minority. There is, therefore, no one now

drawing pension or entitled to draw pension on account of the death of the aforesaid soldier.

Because of the debarment of the mother from the benefits of the general pension laws, for the reason above stated, the Pension Bureau deemed it unnecessary to call for the requisite evidence as to dependence past and present. But sufficient testimony has been filed showing that the mother was dependent upon the son prior to and at date of his death because of her husband's physical condition, he being totally blind, and that her condition has not since improved.

Being now seventy-four years of age, she is unable to gain a subsistence by her own efforts, and consequently dependent upon others for support.

Congress having always liberally responded to the calls for relief of this unfortunate class, and being fully impressed with the merits of the case under consideration, your committee return the accompanying bill, with the recommendation that it do pass.

There being no objection, the bill was laid aside to be reported to the House with the recommendation that it do pass.

ELI J. YAMGHEIM.

Mr. RYAN. I call up the bill (H. R. 2236) granting a pension to Eli J. Yamgheim.

The bill was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension-roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of Eli J. Yamgheim, late of Company A, Sixth Regiment of Kansas Cavalry.

The report (by Mr. MORRILL) was read, as follows:

The Committee on Invalid Pensions, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 2236) granting a pension to Eli J. Yamgheim, submit the following report:

The claimant in this case enlisted August 1, 1861, in Company A, Sixth Kansas Cavalry, and was discharged November 15, 1864. He filed his declaration for pension April 5, 1875, alleging that he was struck by a spent ball on the left ankle, causing lameness. Jacob A. Heany, Jacob H. Bartles, and Alfred N. Jerrold all testify to the incurrence of the injury. There is abundant evidence to show that it continued to the present time. The examining surgeon at Emporia reported July 27, 1875, and January 9, 1878, that he found him totally disabled. Examining board at Emporia, March 7, 1883, make the same report. On the other hand it is shown that the soldier had suffered from a fever-sore on the same leg prior to enlistment. The fact still remains that the man was sufficiently strong and able-bodied to be accepted in the service; that he served his country faithfully for three years and two months; that he received an injury from which he has suffered ever since, and that now he is disabled.

It is highly probable that if he had never suffered prior to enlistment from the fever-sore of the leg, or that some comrade who was perfectly sound had received the same injury, that no serious result would have followed from it. It is equally probable that if the soldier had not received the injury in the service that he might have gone through life comparatively well. It seems to your committee hardly honorable for the United States Government, after accepting this man in the service and receiving the benefit of his service for over three years, during which time he was frequently exposed to the dangers of the battle-field and suffered all the hardships and privations of army life, to plead now that he was not sound before enlistment, and therefore not entitled to a pension.

Your committee therefore recommend the passage of this bill.

There being no objection, the bill was laid aside to be reported to the House with the recommendation that it do pass.

SYLVESTER STEARNS.

Mr. SENEY. I desire to call up the bill (H. R. 7516) to increase the pension of Sylvester Stearns. This bill passed the House several sessions ago. The claimant is upon the roll at $36 a month, and the bill before the House was for the purpose of raising the pension from $36 to $50 a month. The report of the House committee was made under the impression that the claimant was then a pensioner at $24 a month, and the amount in the original bill was changed from $50 to $36 a month. Subsequently it was ascertained that the claimant was already on the pension-roll at $36 a month, and the Senate amended the House bill so as to change the sum from $36 to $50, and the matter is now before the House upon the amendment of the Senate.

The CHAIRMAN. Is the bill which the gentleman calls up a Senate bill?

Mr. SENEY. It is a Senate amendment to the House bill, and I suppose the proper motion is to concur in the Senate amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is informed that the bill is not upon the Calendar, and perhaps it had better be passed over temporarily.

Mr. SENEY. Well, I desire that it shall be acted upon without further delay, because it was acted upon by the Senate two or three weeks ago.

Mr. MORRILL. I suggest to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SENEY] that the proper time to take up that bill will be after the committee rises and we go into the House. The Committee of the Whole can not act upon a matter of that kind.

Mr. SENEY. What is the difficulty in the way of the Committee of the Whole acting upon the Senate amendment to the House bill?

Mr. MORRILL. The House acts upon Senate amendments without any action of the Committee of the Whole. Such action is quite unnecessary.

The CHAIRMAN. Upon the suggestion made by the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. MORRILL], the opinion of the present occupant of the chair is that a question of that kind does not properly come into Committee of the Whole, but must be acted upon by the House. If the House concurs in the Senate amendment, then there is nothing for the committee to do.

Mr. SENEY. Well, I do not care how we get at it, but I do not wish to lose my opportunity to call up the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk informs the Chair that the bill called up by the gentleman from Ohio came back from the Senate with an amendment, that the bill and amendment were referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions, and that the bill has not yet been reported back from the committee, so that it is not upon the Private Calendar, nor is it, at the present time, within reach of the House. At any rate it can not be disposed of at this time.

Mr. SENEY. I did not suppose that an amendment of the Senate would have to be referred to the Pension Committee of the House.

The CHAIRMAN. That depends entirely upon the action which was taken in the House at the time. Whatever that action was, the Committee of the Whole can not interfere with it, and as a matter of fact the Clerk informs the Chair that the bill and amendment were so referred.

Mr. SENEY. I can hardly think that any action has been taken by the House in this case since the Senate amended the House bill. I do not know who would call up the bill except myself.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is informed by the Clerk that when the bill was returned from the Senate with amendments, it was formally laid before the House and was referred, with the amendments, to the Committee on Invalid Pensions, from which it has not yet been reported back to the House.

Mr. SENEY. Well, so that I do not lose my right to call it up for consideration when we get into the House, I shall be content.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is of opinion, in accordance with the suggestion of the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. MORRILL], that the bill can not be acted upon in Committee of the Whole this evening.

Mr. SENEY. But I do not understand that I am to lose my right to have the bill considered.

The CHAIRMAN. No; but the bill is not in Committee of the Whole.

MARTHA J. COLE.

Mr. SMITH, of Wisconsin. I call up the bill (S. 3230) granting a pension to Martha J. Cole.

The bill was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension-roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of Martha J. Cole, mother of Robert E. Horner, late a second lieutenant in the Twenty-seventh Regiment Wisconsin Volunteers.

The report (by Mr. SAWYER) was read, as follows:

From a careful consideration of the facts set forth in the Senate report in this case, which is made a part of this report, the committee believe that this is a meritorious case and comes within the line of precedents heretofore adopted by this committee and recognized by this House, and they therefore recommend that the bill do pass.

SENATE REPORT.

This is a bill to pension Martha J. Cole, mother of Robert Horner, late second lieutenant of Company G, Twenty-seventh Regiment Wisconsin Volunteers.

The claimant was pensioned as dependent mother of Robert Horner and drew her pension until her remarriage. She applied to the Pension Office to be restored after the death of her second husband, but her application could not be allowed by law, which provides that pension shall cease at the date of remarriage of the pensioner.

The only question before the committee is whether or not this is a proper case to be relieved by special enactment. The widow is now nearly seventy years old; she is poor, and disabled by age and other infirmities from making any exertion for her support. Two of her sons were in the service and both died from diseases contracted in the line of duty. Thus she is left without means of support and with the alternative of starvation or the almshouse. The committee does not think that the mother of two soldiers whose lives were sacrificed in Army service and who has seen much better days should become an object of charity so long as the Government has the right to extend to her the small relief she requires.

Therefore the bill is reported favorably, with a recommendation that it do pass.

The bill was laid aside to be reported to the House with the recommendation that it do pass.

LEOPOLD MAYER.

Mr. STONE, of Kentucky. I ask the consideration of the bill (S. 619) granting an increase of pension to Leopold Mayer.

The bill was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension-roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of Leopold Mayer, late captain of Company C, Twelfth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteers, and pay him a pension at the rate of $25 per month, in lieu of the pension he is now receiving.

The report (by Mr. LANE) was read, as follows:

The Committee on Invalid Pensions, to whom was referred Senate bill 619, beg leave to report, adopting the report of the Senate, and in consideration of the facts of the case recommend that said bill do pass.

[Senate Report No. 370, Fiftieth Congress, first session.]

The Committee on Pensions, to whom was referred the bill (S. 619) granting an increase of pension to Leopold Mayer, have examined the same, and report:

Claimant was mustered into the service of the United States as first lieutenant Company C, Twelfth Pennsylvania Volunteer Cavalry, to date February 3, 1862, and was mustered out and honorably discharged March 25, 1865; was a prisoner of war from June 15, 1863, till and after May 7, 1864.

The applicant was granted a pension of $4.25 per month, commencing March 26, 1865, on account of rheumatism. Application for increase of pension was rejected on medical grounds July 3, 1886. In his application for increase of pension, filed December 14, 1885, he claims that he is entitled to a higher rating on the ground that for months at a time he is rendered wholly unable to do any manual labor on account of said disability, and this has been his condition each year since the date of his discharge from the service.

Dr. Emil Fischer testifies that he treated claimant from 1864 to 1866 for mus-

cular rheumatism of the right arm and shoulder, so aggravated as to disable him for work. Dr. H. B. Livermore testifies to treatment for rheumatism from 1864 to 1887. Dr. Maunheimer testifies that claimant was under his treatment for rheumatism from 1873 to 1880, and during that time was unable to perform any physical work. Dr. A. S. Munsell testifies that claimant was under his treatment for chronic rheumatism in 1878, and was a great sufferer from said cause in 1880. Dr. Justin Hayes testifies that he treated claimant for rheumatism in 1880.

The board of surgeons at Chicago, Ill., state that the testimony of claimant's physicians is entitled to the fullest consideration.

From all the facts in the case your committee are satisfied that claimant is entitled to a higher rate of pension than he is now receiving, and therefore recommend the passage of the bill.

The bill was laid aside to be reported to the House with the recommendation that it do pass.

JONATHAN C. HARRISON.

Mr. JOSEPH D. TAYLOR. I call up the bill (H. R. 7887) granting an increase of pension to Jonathan C. Harrison.

The bill was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension-roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, at the rate of $36 per month, the name of Jonathan C. Harrison, late a private in Company B, Fifty-second Ohio Volunteers.

The report (by Mr. THOMPSON, of Ohio) was read, as follows:

Jonathan C. Harrison enlisted in Company B, Fifty-second Ohio Volunteers, August 4, 1862, and served in said regiment until his discharge, by reason of wound in right arm, on the 31st day of August, 1864. His discharge states that he was wounded at Resaca, Ga., in the right arm, requiring amputation. The United States surgeon attaches to the discharge a certificate in which are found these words: "Find him incapable of performing the duties of a soldier because of amputation of the right arm below the elbow on account of gunshot wound. Disability total." The United States examining surgeon certifies "that the amputation was performed through right arm just below the elbow."

Dr. C. W. Clancey and Dr. J. B. Conaway, of Smithfield, Ohio, certify that the arm is amputated so near the elbow as to render the stump entirely useless, and that it is so short as to prevent soldier from wearing an artificial limb. Claimant is now drawing a pension of $30 per month, and he asks for an increase of $6 per month, or the same pension that is allowed to soldiers who have an arm amputated at or above the elbow. When the law passed giving soldiers who had a limb amputated below the elbow or knee $24 per month, claimant had an increase allowed him of $6 per month by a special act of Congress on March 3, 1885. He now asks that his pension be increased to $36 per month, and your committee are of the opinion that the claim is a meritorious one and recommend that the bill do pass, as his disability is fully equal to an amputation at or above the elbow, as is clearly shown, not only by the evidence, but by a photograph found among the papers.

The bill was laid aside to be reported to the House with the recommendation that it do pass.

WILLIAM E. PRINCE.

Mr. TURNER, of Kansas. I call up the bill (H. R. 3608) to grant an increase of pension to William E. Prince.

The bill was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior is authorized and hereby directed to place on the pension-roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of William E. Prince, late a private of Company I, Twenty-third Regiment of Missouri Volunteer Infantry, at the rate of $50 per month, in lieu of the pension he is now receiving.

The report (by Mr. MORRILL) was read, as follows:

The claimant in this case is now receiving a pension of $30 per month for disease of the heart, totally incapacitating him from performing any manual labor. This is the highest rate that can be granted by the Pension Office until it is shown that he requires the constant aid and attendance of another person, there being no intermediate rating between $30 and $50 for cases of this character. The evidence is very clear that much of the time he requires the constant attention of another. Your committee feel that an increase ought to be granted, and therefore recommend the passage of the bill with an amendment, striking out "fifty" and inserting "forty-five."

The amendment reported by the committee to strike out "fifty" and insert "forty-five" was agreed to.

The bill as amended was laid aside to be reported to the House with the recommendation that it do pass.

MRS. CAROLINE TAYLOR.

Mr. VANDEVER. I ask the consideration of the bill (S. 3175) granting a pension to Mrs. Caroline Taylor.

The bill was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension-roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension-laws, the name of Mrs. Caroline Taylor, of Logansport, Ind., widow Dr. J. A. Taylor, a volunteer assistant surgeon to the Indiana troops engaged South in the year 1863 in the war of the rebellion.

The report (by Mr. MATSON) was read, as follows:

The Committee on Invalid Pensions, to whom was referred the bill (S. 3175) granting a pension to Mrs. Caroline Taylor, have examined the papers on file, adopt the report of the Senate hereto attached as the report of this committee, and recommend the passage of the bill.

[Senate Report No. 1709, Fiftieth Congress, first session.]

The Committee on Pensions, to whom was referred the bill granting a pension to Mrs. Caroline Taylor, of Logansport, Ind., have examined the same, and report:

That the applicant is the widow of Dr. James A. Taylor, who died in Logansport, Ind., in October, 1867. The husband was never mustered into the service of the United States, and was never commissioned or appointed to any position in said service; yet as a surgeon he did active and efficient service to the sick and wounded soldiers who were in the Army in the war of 1861.

The facts in the case, from the sworn testimony before the committee, are as follows: In January, 1863, Governor Morton, of Indiana, by telegram, called upon eighteen or twenty physicians and surgeons from different parts of the State to go immediately upon temporory duty as such to the Indiana troops then South. Among the number thus summoned was Dr. James A. Taylor, the husband of the applicant, then in perfect health, engaged in a large professional practice at home, and known as one of the most skillful and careful men in his calling. Dr. Taylor accepted this sudden call by the governor, received a passport to go South, and left his home immediately upon this mission. A copy of the passport, signed by Governor Morton in person, dated January 6, 1863, is now among the proofs filed.

He went south to Vicksburg, to Memphis, and to other points, and upon the transports and vessels spent four weeks in attendance upon the sick and in treating and amputating the wounded. The labor was very severe, owing to the then scarcity of surgical and medical aid. It is shown that he slept during his absence only about four hours in twenty-four; that on one occasion he worked without sleep or rest forty-eight hours continuously. The particulars of his service, its character and efficiency, are proven by the testimony of Dr. John B. Shultz and John G. Meek, and Dr. Asa Coleman, who was one of the party of physicians and surgeons responding to the call of the governor, and who was personally acquainted with Dr. Taylor, testifies that he knew of his service and that he was in command of the volunteer medical corps which went on that occasion to render aid to the Indiana troops.

It appears further from the testimony of his friends and neighbors that Dr. Taylor returned from the expedition much broken in health. He complained of shortness of breath, difficulty of breathing, disturbed action of the heart, and though yet able to do somewhat, was wholly unable thereafter to resume the labors of his former practice. The condition of his health did not improve. About a year after his return from the South he sold out his practice and retired. In 1864, as appears from the testimony of witness Meek and others, he was subjected to very frequent attacks of smothering spells. These compelled him to quit any business he might be engaged in, to spend most of his time on the bed or lounge in a prostrate position. He lost flesh, became pale and emaciated. He had never before his service suffered from any such complaint.

This condition of ill-health continued until the time of his death. He died in one of these smothering spells of what the physicians in attendance during his last illness describe as paralysis of the heart, the first and continuous symptoms of which appear to have sprung from the excessive work, privation, and exposure in his service under the call of the governor aforesaid.

The applicant, his widow, formerly in fair circumstances, is now in reduced circumstances. She was married to the deceased March 19, 1846, and lived with him a faithful wife until his death. She is now advanced in years. She has now no means, money, nor property, nor the expectation thereof. She has no way of subsistence except her own labor, barely sufficient to that end.

The committee believe this to be a meritorious case, and accordingly recommend the passage of the bill herewith reported.

The bill was laid aside to be reported to the House with the recommendation that it do pass.

ORDER OF BUSINESS.

Mr. WHEELER. I would like to call up, if there be no objection, the bill for the relief of Mrs. General Ward B. Burnett. I desire to know whether the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. CHEADLE] will make objection.

Mr. CHEADLE. I have stated so often my position with reference to bills of this character that I should suppose every gentleman would understand me by this time. At any rate the bill to which the gentleman refers is in the House, not in Committee of the Whole, and could not be considered now.

SARAH E. M'NAMARA.

Mr. WHEELER. I will call up, then, the bill (S. 2593) granting a pension to Sarah E. McNamara.

The bill was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and is hereby, authorized and directed to place upon the pension-roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of Mrs. Sarah E. McNamara, widow of the late John McNamara, D. D., late a chaplain of the Wisconsin Volunteers.

The report (by Mr. MORRILL) was read, as follows:

The report of the Senate Committee on Pensions is adopted and the passage of the bill recommended.

SENATE REPORT.

Claimant is the widow of John McNamara, who was mustered into the service of the United States as chaplain First Regiment Wisconsin Volunteer Infantry, October 8, 1861, and was mustered out of the service October 13, 1864.

The records of the War Department show that he contracted erysipelas of the face and scalp in the service, by reason of which he was granted a leave of absence for twenty days, as a change of climate was thought by the surgeon to be necessary to save his life.

The claim was rejected March 1, 1888, on the ground that the soldier's fatal disease, paralysis, was not a result of the erysipelas of army origin, nor of any other cause shown to be due to his military service.

In her application filed April 13, 1886, claimant states that her late husband died of disease contracted in the service of the United States; that at the battle of Stone River, March 30, 1863, he incurred paralysis, which affected him every year since the date of his discharge from the service, and which finally terminated in his death.

In her affidavit filed November 29, 1886, claimant states that she was married to the late officer on or about November 18, 1852, and that she lived with him as his wife up to the time of his death, October 25, 1885; that previous to his enlistment into the service the said officer was physically sound and in good health; that he contracted erysipelas in the service, from which he never recovered, and that he was mentally and physically disabled for work by reason of said disability; that the disease seemed to have settled in his left eye, causing said eye to become much smaller than the right eye, and that the said disease grew worse all the time until her late husband became almost totally blind, about six months before his death; that she has good reason to believe that the said disability so weakened her late husband's constitution that the paralysis from which he died was superinduced by the erysipelas of army origin.

In affidavit filed November 29, 1886, George R. Bingham, colonel First Wisconsin Volunteer Infantry, testifies that the late officer contracted erysipelas of the face at Murfreesborough, Tenn., in December, 1863, and that the said disease affected his eyes to such an extent that he was compelled to wear colored glasses for a long time after his return from the hospital.

In affidavit filed November 29, 1886, Dr. Luther J. Abbott, of Fremont, Nebr., testifies that he was acquainted with claimant's husband for ten years prior to the time of his death; that he was physically feeble, and his nervous system much deranged on account of an attack of erysipelas of face, scalp, and eyes, which he had in the year 1875; that for a short time preceding his death the late officer had a shock of paralysis, followed by almost total blindness; that he consulted affiant about a week before his death, and always attributed his diseases to exposure during army life.

In affidavit filed November 29, 1886, Dr. N. F. Donaldson, of North Platte, Nebr., testifies that the late officer died from a stroke of paralysis on the right side of his body, October 24, 1885.

It is shown by medical testimony in the claim that the system of claimant's husband was broken down by erysipelas contracted in the service, in consequence of which he was physically unable to rally from a stroke of paralysis, which terminated fatally October 24, 1885.

The grounds of rejection stated by the Bureau of Pensions seem untenable when considered in connection with medical evidence to the effect that the late officer's nervous system was debilitated and greatly deranged by reason of erysipelas shown to be contracted in the service. The facts warrant favorable action, and your committee therefore recommend the passage of the bill.

The bill was laid aside to be reported to the House with the recommendation that it do pass.

BAKER SAINE.

Mr. YODER. I call up the bill (H. R. 2707) granting a pension to Baker Saine.

The bill was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension-roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of Baker Saine, of Fort Seneca, Seneca County, Ohio, late a private in Company K, Forty-ninth Ohio Volunteer Infantry.

The report (by Mr. YODER) was read, as follows:

Baker Seine enlisted September 23, 1861, in Company B, Fifty-fifth Ohio Volunteer Infantry Regiment, and served until March 21, 1862, when he was discharged for disability. Re-enlisted February 22, 1864, in Company K, Forty-ninth Ohio Volunteer Infantry Regiment, and was discharged March 3, 1865, for disability. Filed his declaration for pension October 3, 1879. Alleges in declaration that at Nashville, Tenn., about the 15th of March, 1864, by reason of exposure in an open car, he contracted chronic bronchitis, chronic rheumatism, and that he sustained a further injury in December, 1864, at —— street barracks, Cincinnati, Ohio, by a fall that he had received.

His claim was rejected by the Pension Office for the reason, as set forth in the record of the case, that the record shows that alleged bronchitis existed prior to his enlistment, and that he was unable to prove origin of the alleged injury that he had received in the service. The hospital record and the record in the Adjutant-General's Office, as well as his discharge, conclusively prove existence of the disease, rheumatism and bronchitis, as alleged, in the service, and there is no question as to its continuance since the service, as is shown conclusively by a number of affidavits on file by surgeons, and the only reason for its rejection is given in the certificate of disability for his discharge, where the surgeon alleges that the claimant had been subject to said disease during the winter for a few years prior to his service. But it does not state how or by what evidence he comes to this conclusion. In contradiction to this statement there is an affidavit on file by James A. Norton, a prominent and creditable citizen of his county, who testifies that claimant was sound and able-bodied, free from bronchitis and rheumatism, at and before he entered the service; that he saw claimant in hospital No. 8, Nashville, Tenn., suffering with erysipelas, in March and April, 1864, and inflammatory rheumatism.

Moses Abbot and Matthew T. Lents testify that they knew claimant from 1853 to 1861, prior to his service in the civil war, and that previous to said time his health was good and perfectly sound. C. P. Lee, M. D., testifies that claimant was sound prior to his enlistment in the service, 1861. A. B. Harvey testifies that during the latter part of June, 1864, claimant was home on a furlough, and that he treated him for inflammatory rheumatism at that time; that he was also suffering from chronic bronchitis. There is abundant evidence to prove the continuance of the disease alleged since the service. The examining surgeon, George L. Hodge, at Fostoria, Ohio, on July 15, 1861, states that he had examined claimant:

"That he had a hacking cough and expectoration of thick yellow sputa; throat is red and irritable; has rheumatism in left shoulder and right knee. I find evidence of the injury that he alleged to have received in a fall while in the service at Cincinnati, and that these disabilities disqualify him in the performance of manual labor and entitle him to two-thirds grade or $12 a month pension."

Your committee is informed by Hon. George E. Seine, who is personally acquainted with claimant, that he is helpless and in destitute circumstances, and that if it were not for an aged sister who provides for him he would have to go to the poor-house; that it will only be a question of a short time unless he is granted aid by this bill before he will have to depend upon public charity for his subsistence.

In view of the testimony of the creditable witnesses, who are men of high standing in the community where they live, who have testified to his prior soundness, your committee is clearly of the opinion that this aged and disabled soldier should not be deprived of a pension by reason of a statement made by an army surgeon, who had no possible means of knowing his condition prior to enlistment. And after a careful investigation of all the evidence on file, your committee has come to the conclusion that this is a meritorious case, and recommend the passage of the bill.

The bill was laid aside to be reported to the House with the recommendation that it do pass.

WILLIAM E. SPRINGSTEIN.

Mr. MORRILL. I desire to call up for the gentleman from New York [Mr. BACON], and upon his personal request, the bill (H. R. 10199) for the relief of William E. Springstein.

The bill was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior is directed to put on the pension-roll the name of William E. Springstein, of Company G, Fourteenth Regiment of Michigan Volunteers, at the rate of $50 per month.

The report (by Mr. CHIPMAN) was read, as follows:

The claimant was a private in Company G, Fourteenth Regiment Michigan Volunteer Infantry. At the battle of Jonesborough, Ga., he received a wound from a shell fired by the enemy, which caused the loss of his left leg above the ankle (amputation lower third) and a wound in the lower third of his right leg. He is now pensioned at the rate of $30 a month. His stump has never healed and, as testified by Dr. N. W. Welker, of Detroit, who has attended him for a long time, he is during long periods (once eight month) confined to his room by reason of its condition, not being able to wear his artificial leg or even his crutches. The same doctor describes a cicatrix (the result of the wound in his right leg) adherent to the muscles of the calf, causing pain and impairment of motion.

It appears that he is without one leg, lame in the other, and in constant pain from both. He is now receiving $30 per month, as much as the Pension Office can grant unless he requires the constant aid of an attendant. He does not claim to be in so hard a condition as that, but that he is frequently incapacitated from any labor, when his wounds are particularly painful, and that at all times he is a sufferer. He ought to be allowed $45. The committee recommend that the word "fifty" be stricken from the sixth line and the words "forty-five" inserted in lieu thereof, and that the bill as thus amended pass.

The amendment reported by the committee to strike out in the sixth line the word "fifty" and insert "forty-five" was read and agreed to.

The bill as amended was laid aside to be reported to the House with the recommendation that it do pass.

ORDER OF BUSINESS.

Mr. YODER. I promised the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. SHIVELY] to call up a bill for him; but when his name was called I was temporarily out of the House. I hope there will be no objection to permitting me now to call up his bill, as the call will no doubt reach all the gentlemen present this evening.

Mr. DINGLEY. The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. SHIVELY] has not been here this evening. Two of my colleagues, who are absent, desired me to call up bills for them, but I supposed it would not be permitted. If this request is to be granted in behalf of the gentleman from Indiana, who is absent, I would like to have the same privilege in behalf of my colleagues.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. YODER]?

Mr. CHEADLE. I object, unless the same privilege be extended to this side of the House. I have an earnest request from my colleague, General HOVEY, to call up a bill for him.

Mr. YODER. This very privilege has been granted only a few moments ago to my friend from Kansas [Mr. MORRILL].

Mr. MORRILL. That was an entirely different case. I called up a bill for the gentleman from New York [Mr. BACON], who has occupied the chair all the evening, and could not call up the bill for himself.

Mr. YODER. As there seems to be objection to the proposition, I withdraw it.

FLORIAN LISCHEWSKY.

Mr. BINGHAM. I call up the bill (H. R. 5918) restoring to the pension-roll the name of Florian Lischewsky. This bill is identical with a bill (S. 3083) which has already passed the Senate, but is not, I believe, on our Calendar. If this House bill be favorably acted upon by the Committee of the Whole, I shall ask in the House to substitute for it the Senate bill, identical in its terms.

The bill (H. R. 5918) was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to restore the name of Florian Lischewsky, late a private in Company C, Twenty-ninth Regiment New York Volunteers, to the pension-roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws.

The report (by Mr. LYNCH) was read, as follows:

That it appears the said Florian Lischewsky was a private in Company C, Twenty-ninth Regiment of New York Volunteers, having served therein from June 4, 1861, to June 20, 1863, having been discharged for expiration of his term of service; that while in said service and line of his duty in the summer of 1862, from excessive marching he contracted varicose veins of both legs, for which he was granted a pension by certificate No. 133444, May 8, 1875; that he drew his pension for about two years, when it was stopped and his name stricken from the rolls on the report of a special examiner of the Pension Bureau, on the ground, as alleged, that it was not shown that his varicose veins originated in the service; that your committee find that the evidence (which has not been impeached) filed by said soldier in his claim shows that his said disability did originate in said service and line of duty.

Following is a synopsis of the evidence filed by said soldier, both in his claim for the original pension and in his claim for restoration of his pension.

In the original claim for pension, Fritz Decker, second lieutenant of his company, testified that about the 1st of June, 1862, between Fairfax Court-House and Cross Keys, Virginia, the said Lischewsky, from continuous marching for several days in succession, carrying heavy accouterments, contracted varicose veins of his legs, which troubled him afterwards more or less while with the regiment, and existed at the time of his discharge, in June, 1863; that he well remembers him in the service, and that he got his varicose veins of legs as stated; that he knew him before he enlisted, and that he was then sound in his legs.

Dr. Theodore Roth testified that he prescribed for the said soldier off and on from the time of his discharge from the Army, in the summer of 1863, to the present time (March, 1874), for varicose veins of both legs below the knees, and he has been badly affected in his legs with varicose veins, which have disabled him for following his customary labor; that he enjoyed good health before and up to his enlistment; witness was then acquainted with him, and had he had the bad veins of legs then, believes he would have known it; that he was of good and temperate habits.

That in the claim for restoration Dr. George H. Kobler testified that he has been his physician for the past six years, and knows that he has suffered with varicose veins to such an extent as to disable him for doing any manual labor whatever.

Frank Niedel and Lewis Troutwein testified that they knew him from fifteen to seventeen years and ever since September 4, 1875 (the date to which his pension was last paid); have seen him about every day, and they know he has been afflicted with varicose or enlarged veins of his legs, which have disabled him for any kind of manual labor, etc.

William Grossman testified that he was a comrade in his company and regiment, and that from long and excessive marching in the summer of 1862 in said service he contracted varicose veins of his legs, and after the battle of Bull Run (the last of August, 1862) the major, having two horses, took him on one of them on account of his varicose veins. Witness saw his swelled veins in said service and knew him before he enlisted, and he had no swelled veins of legs then; and they were all stripped down and thoroughly examined before they were mustered into said service.

Birghardt Wallenhaupt testified that he and the said Lischewsky enlisted in said company and regiment at the same time, and they were all thoroughly examined and he was accepted in said service as a sound man and was then free from any swelled veins of his legs; that about the summer of 1862, before and after the battle of Bull Run, Virginia, from excessive marching day and night

he contracted varicose or swelled veins of his legs, and he complained afterwards of his weak and sore and swelled veins of his legs, and was not able to do duty all the time; witness and he slept together for some time in said service and he several times showed witness his legs of swelled veins below his knees, and he suffered with them at the time of his discharge in June, 1863.

The committee see no reason to discredit the testimony recited, and therefore believe that said invalid soldier should have his pension restored to him. We therefore report the bill favorably, and recommend its passage.

The bill was laid aside to be reported to the House with the recommendation that it do pass.

Mr. KILGORE. The call of the roll has been entirely gone through with during this evening and I think that is enough. I move, therefore, the committee rise. We have gone through the complete circle and everybody has had a whack.

Mr. DINGLEY. Let me make a suggestion to the House. I have been absent during the call of the roll and have not yet had the benefit of calling up a single bill. There is one Senate bill upon the Calendar which I would like to call up for consideration at this time, and I hope there will be no objection.

Mr. KILGORE. We can give unanimous consent for that purpose.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

MARY O. HALL.

Mr. DINGLEY called up for consideration the bill (S. 889) granting a pension to Mary O. Hall.

The bill was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place the name of Mary O. Hall, widow of Augustus J. Hall, late of Company D, Twelfth Maine Volunteers, on the pension-roll, subject to the limitations of the pension laws.

The report (by Mr. GALLINGER) was read, as follows:

The Committee on Invalid Pensions, to whom was referred the bill (S. 889) granting a pension to Mary O. Hall, having considered the same, beg leave to incorporate the report of the Senate committee as a part of their own report, as follows:

"The soldier, Augustus J. Hall, enlisted November 1, 1861, in Company D, Twelfth Maine Volunteers, and was discharged December 7, 1864. At the time of his death, October 13, 1880, he was pensioned at the rate of $3 a month, for gunshot wound of right arm, near the shoulder. The widow, Mary O. Hall, applied for pension, alleging that her husband died of blood poisoning and other complications arising from the said wound. The case was rejected by the Pension Office, on the ground that the soldier's death was 'in no way due to the gunshot wound.'

"After re-examining the case the medical referee vouchsafed the platitude: 'True pathology can not be divorced from common sense.' The case, on appeal to the Secretary of the Interior, was again rejected as a necessary consequence, since the Secretary did not go beyond the opinion of the medical referee, that the death causes, blood poisoning, heart disease, and dropsy, were not *sequelæ* of the wound.

"The only evidence in the case that tends in any possible way to support this rejection is that of the examining surgeon, who examined soldier July 9, 1870. He states that the soldier appeared well, but complained of pain and inability to use the arm. At the next examination, August 9, 1879 the soldier's disability was rated at one-third, and the same rating was fixed on the third and last examination, August 28, 1880. All the rest of the mass of testimony in the case shows irrefutably that the soldier's death was the result of his wound, and blood poisoning is shown, by abundant medical evidence, to have existed continuously from his discharge to death.

"Dr. Silas P. Bartlett, who knew soldier well, testifies that at enlistment he was a 'sound, rugged, and well man,' but that in the spring of 1865 he treated him for abscess of the elbow-joint, with blood poison, and he treated him from that time until 1877.

"Dr. David S. Stevens says he has every reason to believe, from the appearance of said soldier and his symptoms, that he came to his death by gunshot wound in the shoulder and exposure while in the service.

"Dr. S. F. Crooker, who treated soldier for abscess and blood poisoning from 1880 until soldier's death, gives it as his opinion that soldier's heart disease was caused by blood poisoning, the dropsy by heart disease, and the dyspepsia by the dropsy, which resulted in the death of the patient by interfering with a proper arterialization of the blood.

"As stated above, the only evidence in the case is in favor of the claimant, and your committee do not deem it necessary to cumulate the proof. The only possible conclusion that could be reached after an unprejudiced examination of all this proof is that the case is perfectly meritorious, and that it is sufficiently established from a technical stand-point is just as apparent."

In addition to the above your committee have made a careful examination of the papers on file in the Pension Office, which seem to fully justify the granting of a pension notwithstanding the technical professional opinion of the medical referee. It is doubtless a fact that "true pathology can not be divorced from common sense," but the history of medicine abundantly proves that it is not always easy to distinguish true from false pathology. The equity is so clearly with the widow in this case that your committee report the bill back favorably and recommend its passage.

The bill was laid aside to be reported to the House with the recommendation that it do pass.

Mr. KILGORE moved that the committee rise.

The motion was agreed to.

The committee accordingly rose; and Mr. MORRILL having taken the chair as Speaker *pro tempore*, Mr. YODER reported that the Committee of the Whole House had had the Private Calendar under consideration, and had directed him to report back sundry bills with various recommendations.

JOHN N. BOVEE.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The Clerk will read the titles of the bills which have been reported from the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar with a favorable recommendation.

Mr. LYMAN. The Speaker *pro tempore* stated at the beginning of the proceedings that the bill (S. 3018) granting an increase of pension to John N. Bovee came up the first thing in order as unfinished business.

Mr. KILGORE. That is a bill which was under consideration on a former occasion. I wish to say, although I will not make any fight on it, that my impression is it would go out on a point of order.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. What is the point of order?

Mr. KILGORE. It was called up on a previous occasion on Friday, September 18, during the evening session, and a vote was taken on it. The majority of those who voted was against the passage of the bill. The vote was announced, so many votes for and so many against the bill. No motion to reconsider was made, and therefore it will stand upon the record as having been beaten.

But that is not all. I have the RECORD containing a report of what occurred on that occasion. It shows that the gentleman himself said he would like to have the matter stand over, and the Speaker announced it would go over as unfinished business.

Mr. MORRILL. By unanimous consent.

Mr. KILGORE. Not by unanimous consent, but that it would go over as unfinished business. I have the RECORD here. My theory is that the Speaker *pro tempore* having announced the vote, so many for and so many against, and the majority being against the bill, it was beaten up to that time. The only way to avoid that was to make the motion to reconsider, but that must be made within two days under the rules, and it has not been done.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The Chair is of the opinion that when the Speaker *pro tempore* announced the bill would go over as unfinished business, which could only be done by unanimous consent, no one having objected, it was taken that unanimous consent was given to its going over as unfinished business.

Mr. KILGORE. The RECORD shows the vote was against it, and the announcement of the Speaker *pro tempore* could not control that result. I have the RECORD before me, and I will read just what did occur:

JOHN N. BOVEE.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The next bill for consideration is the bill (S. 3018) granting an increase of pension to John N. Bovee, and the question is on the third reading of the bill.

The question was put, and the Speaker *pro tempore* announced that the "noes" seemed to have it.

Mr. TRACEY. I demand a division.

The House divided; and there were—ayes 8, noes 14.

Mr. LYMAN. I called up that bill at the request of a Senator. It is a Senate bill and one I know nothing about; but if it can be passed over without being rejected until I can see the gentleman who asked me to call the bill up, I would be glad.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. It will go over as unfinished business. The hour of half past 10 o'clock having arrived, the House, according to order, will stand adjourned.

I say it was not in the power of the Speaker *pro tempore* to announce under that state of facts the bill went over as unfinished business. I submit the point, however, to the Chair.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The Chair is of the opinion that the then occupant of the chair having announced it went over as unfinished business, and having made that announcement before the vote was declared, and that having been accepted as by unanimous consent, it stands over as the unfinished business.

Mr. KILGORE. He announced the result of the vote before saying it went over as unfinished business. The vote was announced when it was suggested by my friend from Iowa that it should be passed over, and by unanimous consent that was done. I submit the point to the Chair.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The gentleman who occupied the chair at the beginning of this evening session held that this bill came over as unfinished business.

Mr. LYMAN. Mr. Speaker, before the vote is taken on this question I desire to state that I conceive that very great injustice, unintentional so far as any member of this House is concerned, has been done to the claimant. There was read at the time this bill was up for consideration what purported to be a letter from one John Jones, I believe; not a written letter, but a printed circular, which was, I understand, placed upon the desks of some members. I do not wish to take up the time of the House to have a communication under oath, which is intended at least to clear up this implied injustice to the claimant, read, but I ask to have it printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks, and as all I desire to say on the subject.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. That will be done, in the absence of objection.

The communication referred to by Mr. LYMAN is as follows:

WASHINGTON, D. C., *September* 10, 1888.

DEAR SIR: The letter written to the Hon. C. B. KILGORE by one "J. Jones, an old soldier, (?)" is full of falsehoods and misstatements, not to say maliciousness. It is as follows:

"DEAR SIR: I see that a favorable report has been made by the Committee on Pensions to increase the pension of John N. Bovee. (See Senate bill No. 3018, and House report No. 332.)

"Mr. Bovee already receives a liberal pension ($30 per month). He now receives, and has been for years, a salary of $1,600 per annum in the War Records Office, War Department, runs a Turkish bath (in his wife's name) on G street near Fifteenth, and owns valuable real estate at Washington Grove, Takoma Park, etc. Do you think this man, who has been drawing a salary (in addition to his present liberal pension) from the Government since the close of the war, ought to have his pension increased, while hundreds of worthy indigent soldiers are suffering?

"Dr. O'Reilly, in his report, says: * * * 'From appearances, etc., it is evi-

dent * * * and affiant presumes that superficial ulceration occurs, etc., in hot weather.' The doctor is not positive in this case.

"Dr. D. W. Bliss, one of his most intimate friends, says: * * * 'which renders the use of an artificial limb of little value, as the stump will not bear the friction of its presence.'

"The facts are these: The only times that he has been known to cast aside his artificial limb were while working in the Government Printing Office. If a furlough or reduction of force was spoken of he found it expedient to resume the crutch until the scare passed over. Also during the twelve years he has been in his present position the same tactics have been resorted to with success.

"He now receives from the Government $1,960 yearly as salary and pension; also every five years the price of a new limb (including railroad fare to and from the manufacturer) that he can not wear unless he gets an increase of $10 a month.

"Respectfully,

J. JONES, *An Old Soldier.*

"Hon. C. B. KILGORE."

I am satisfied that it is a fictitious name, as I do not know any such man; besides, an old soldier would not be guilty of such a mean act. A letter of the same purport was written to the Secretary of War some months ago signed "Justice," but availed nothing. I therefore challenge him to make himself known and prove his statements. I will take up his letter *seriatim*.

First. In regard to the Turkish bath business, I would say that several years ago my wife and brother started in the business, but subsequently he became so dissipated that she was obliged to buy him out to save the business from being sold for debt, and also to save what little she had in it. Her mother's money was used to start the business, and her family has to be supported from it. My salary would not properly provide for those I am obliged to look after.

Second. As to valuable real estate, I do not own a dollar's worth of property in the world from which I realize any income, and what little I do own is mortgaged. I do not own even a home.

Third. The statement that I "have been drawing a salary from the Government since the close of the war" is also false, as the records will show. Most of the time I have been employed I received a per diem compensation. The position I now hold is solely through merit. I have been out of Government employ since I first entered it.

Fourth. The statement that "Dr. D. W. Bliss is one of my most intimate friends" is also false. His insinuation is that he being an intimate friend, would stoop to anything in order to get my pension increased. He fails to quote from Dr. James T. Young's certificate, when he states that he saw my leg when it was open and a running sore; and that was only last year. All these physicians are well known and honorable men and all examined my leg, and all gave their honest opinion in regard to my case.

Fifth. Again he says: "The only times that he has been known to cast aside his artificial limb were while working in the Government Printing Office" * * * and "also during the twelve years he has been in his present position the same tactics have been resorted to with success." My answer to the above charge is, that it is grossly unjust and false. If "J. Jones" knows anything about the case he must have known that I wore what is termed a "peg leg" for nearly two years, being unable to wear the Government leg, and which was paid for out of my own money; and that for eighteen months I was obliged to go on crutches, my leg being open and suppurating, and this while in the Government Printing Office.

I can not understand why the question of salary or property should enter into the case, as there are many instances of persons drawing high salaries and at the same time drawing large pensions, besides owning property.

In answer to the application for an increase of pension through the Pension Office, I was informed that there was no law covering my case, but the Commissioner of Pensions had asked Congress for authority to increase pensions in this and other cases.

It seems to me that there should be a distinction made between one who has no protection for the end of the stump (excepting a slight granulation) and one whose stump is fully protected. I know several men who can bear their whole weight on the end of the stump, and can walk for miles, while I am obliged to lace so tightly that all the pressure comes on the upper part of the leg, which of course stops the circulation of blood, and I can only walk a short distance at a time.

The facts in the case are these: I entered the United States service May 17, 1861, when between sixteen and seventeen years of age, and was wounded at the battle of Gaines Mill June 26, 1862, where I was taken prisoner, laying on the battle-field two nights and days without attention, when I was taken to a grove near by. Mortification having set in necessitated the amputation of my leg near the knee. In this grove I lay, in company with one hundred and fifty other wounded comrades, for twenty-eight days without shelter and but very little care, there being but four men that were able to assist us. I was obliged to dress my own wound, but finally became so weak that I could not properly attend to it, and the vermin in the wound caused the stitches to give way and the flap to drop down and slough off, leaving me no protection to the end of the stump, from the effects of which I have been a sufferer ever since, and it has broken open every summer since. The morning I entered battle I weighed 175 pounds, and when I was exchanged, twenty-eight days after, I weighed 98 pounds.

Very respectfully, your obedient servant,

JOHN N. BOVEE.

Hon. J. LYMAN.

Sworn to and subscribed before me at Washington, D. C., this 13th day of September, A. D. 1888.

[SEAL.] GOODWIN Y. ATLEE,
Notary Public.

Mr. KILGORE. I will say this in explanation of my position in this matter, that the letter to which reference was made came to my hands——

Mr. LYMAN. Then I wish to say that I have been misinformed; that I did not know what the circumstances were exactly; but at all events my intention was to cast no sort of reflection upon the action of the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. KILGORE. I understand. When this case was called I presented the letter, and stated that if the allegations therein contained were true the increase ought not to be granted. That was all my position. That letter was read and went into the RECORD, and upon that statement the House refused to make the extension. I will say further that this letter was signed by one "J. Jones, an old soldier," and from that time to this "J. Jones," the old soldier, has not materialized [laughter], and I am inclined to make no fight upon a fictitious letter.

Mr. LYMAN. Permit me to state that I made no reflection whatever upon the action of the gentleman from Texas.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The question is on the third reading of the bill.

The bill S. 3018 was ordered to a third reading, and being read the third time, was passed.

SYLVESTER STEARNS.

Mr. SENEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to call up the bill (H. R. 7516) which I tried to have considered in committee, to increase the pension of Sylvester Stearns, and also ask unanimous consent that the Senate amendments be concurred in.

Mr. KILGORE. I will not make any objection to that, if there is no further request for unanimous consent.

Mr. SENEY. This is all I will ask to-night.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. If there be no objection, the Senate amendments to the bill called up by the gentleman from Ohio will be agreed to.

There was no objection, and it was so ordered.

BILLS PASSED.

Bills of the House of the following titles reported from the Committee of the Whole without amendment were severally considered, and ordered to be engrossed and read a third time; and being engrossed, were accordingly read the third time, and passed, namely:

A bill (H. R. 5751) for the relief of Margaret M. Hatch;

A bill (H. R. 4887) granting a pension to Charles E. Scott;

A bill (H. R. 4648) granting a pension to Jemima Sterling;

A bill (H. R. 2236) granting a pension to Eli J. Yamgheim;

A bill (H. R. 7887) granting increase of pension to Jonathan C. Harrison;

A bill (H. R. 2707) granting pension to Baker Saine; and

A bill (H. R. 5918) restoring to the pension-roll the name of Florian Lischewsky.

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to substitute the bill (S. 3083) restoring to the pension-roll the name of Florian Lischewsky, in place of the House bill just passed.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. If there be no objection that order will be made.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. Without objection the House bill No. 5918 will be laid upon the table.

There was no objection, and it was so ordered.

The following House bills, reported from the Committee of the Whole with amendments, were severally considered, the amendments concurred in, and the bills as amended ordered to be engrossed and read the third time; and being engrossed, they were accordingly read the third time, and passed, namely:

A bill (H. R. 2702) granting a pension to Mary Ann Shook;

A bill (H. R. 8521) for the relief of William A. Mathes;

A bill (H. R. 3608) granting an increase of pension to William E. Prince; and

A bill (H. R. 10199) for the relief of William E. Springstein.

Senate bills of the following titles, reported from the Committee of the Whole without amendment, were severally considered, ordered to a third reading, and being read the third time, were passed, namely:

A bill (S. 3030) granting a pension to Mary J. Foster;

A bill (S. 3197) granting a pension to Abbie L. Ham;

A bill (S. 1926) granting a pension to William Smith;

A bill (S. 1219) granting a pension to David Heinbach;

A bill (S. 2567) granting a pension to Nancy Polock;

A bill (S. 3241) granting a pension to Easter A. Jackson;

A bill (S. 1614) granting a pension to Phillipe Ray;

A bill (S. 3230) granting a pension to Martha J. Cole;

A bill (S. 619) granting an increase of pension to Leopold Mayer;

A bill (S. 3175) granting a pension to Mrs. Caroline Taylor;

A bill (S. 2593) granting a pension to Sarah E. McNamara; and

A bill (S. 889) granting a pension to Mary O. Hall.

Bills of the Senate of the following titles, reported from the Committee of the Whole with amendments, were severally considered, the amendments concurred in, and the bills as amended ordered to a third reading, and being read the third time were passed, namely:

A bill (S. 1481) granting a pension to Ellen White Dowling; and

A bill (S. 1782) granting a pension to Sarah C. Taylor.

MRS. MARY M. ORD.

The bill (S. 2663) granting a pension to Mrs. Mary M. Ord, reported from the Committee of the Whole with an amendment, was considered and the amendment agreed to.

The question being on the third reading of the bill,

Mr. KILGORE said: Mr. Speaker, there has been some considerable objection made to that bill, and I think it would be a very good idea for this House to vote on the question of reporting it to a full House to be voted upon at some time hereafter. It is out of the usual line to pass a bill of that size with ten or fifteen men present, and I think it would be a fair and proper disposition of it considering the circumstances. At these evening sessions we have uniformly, so far as my information goes, refused to grant large pensions of that kind, except in one case. I do not know personally—not having been present then—of this fact, but only gather that from what I see in the RECORD.

Mr. McKENNA. This is only an increase of $25 a month. It is not a showy pension, but an absolutely needed increase.

Mr. KILGORE. An increase from $50 to $100.

Mr. McKENNA. No; an increase from $50 to $75. This lady is in absolutely destitute circumstances. Her present pension does not support her. She has been compelled to spend what little she receives, with such accumulations as she had saved in times past, to care for an invalid, almost blind daughter—I do not know but that she is totally blind. It is a very meritorious claim indeed. General Ord was not only one of the gallantest of men, but one of the most unselfish and honorable. I knew him when I was a boy, and knew him at one time to jump overboard, endangering his own life, to save a man from drowning.

Mr. KILGORE. I know General Ord was a distinguished soldier and a gallant gentleman. That I know as a matter of fact. He was for a time in Texas. But that is not the question here. The question is whether such legislation as this ought to be engaged in to-night. I do not know whether I ought to object, or whether if I did my objection now comes too late. Of course I could defeat the bill.

Mr. McKENNA. I hope the gentleman will not insist upon the objection.

Mr. KILGORE. I am inclined to do that at present.

Mr. McKENNA. It is only an increase of $25, and I hope the gentleman will give this lady the benefit of the doubt existing in his mind.

The question being taken, the bill was ordered to a third reading, and being read the third time, was passed.

Mr. YODER moved to reconsider the several votes taken; and also moved that the motion to reconsider be laid on the table.

The latter motion was agreed to.

WILLIAM GALLAGHER.

Mr. YODER. I now ask unanimous consent to call up a bill for Mr. SHIVELY, my colleague, if there be no objection; and I hope there will be none.

Mr. KILGORE. You will not ask another?

Mr. YODER. No. I ask that the Committee of the Whole be discharged from the consideration of the bill (H. R. 10515) to increase the pension of William Gallagher, and that the same be considered in the House.

There was no objection.

The bill was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he hereby is, authorized and directed to increase the pension of William Gallagher, late a private in Company D, Twenty-eighth Regiment Kentucky Infantry Volunteers, to $20 per month.

The report (by Mr. MATSON) was read, as follows:

The Committee on Invalid Pensions, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 10515) granting an increase of pension to William Gallagher, have had the same under consideration, and now report:

The claimant is now receiving a pension of $10 per month for gunshot wound of left hip. He filed application for increase June 22, 1887, for original disability and resulting affection of both legs and rerating. The same was referred to a medical referee, who reported the claim for rejection on the ground of "rerating not warranted on medical grounds." The evidence in this case is purely medical, and the committee are of the opinion that the conclusion of the medical board making the examination under oath ought to be considered in preference to the opinion of the medical referee. The claimant was examined for increase by the examining board at South Bend, March 16, 1887, and they conclude as follows:

"He is, in our opinion, entitled to an $\frac{1}{2}$ rating for the disability caused by gunshot wound of left hip, and results."

Another examination was had by said board July 13, 1887, and after making a full report concluded as follows:

"He is, in our opinion, entitled to an $\frac{1}{2}$ rating for the disability caused by gunshot wound of left hip."

We therefore recommend that in line 6 strike out the word "twenty" and insert "eighteen," and, when so amended, we recommend the passage of the bill.

The amendment recommended by the committee was agreed to, and the bill as amended was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time; and being engrossed, it was accordingly read the third time, and passed.

Mr. YODER moved to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed; and also moved that the motion to reconsider be laid on the table.

The latter motion was agreed to.

LOUISA ROGERS.

Mr. CHEADLE. I ask unanimous consent to discharge the Committee of the Whole from the consideration of the bill (H. R. 8549) granting a pension to Louisa Rogers.

There was no objection.

The bill was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and is hereby, authorized and directed to place the name of Louisa Rogers on the pension-roll, subject to the pension laws of the United States, she being the housekeeper and dependent daughter of Charles T. Bell, who was late captain in Company —, Seventy-sixth Regiment Indiana Volunteers.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The Chair is of the opinion that that would not give any pension.

Mr. WHEELER. I move to amend by inserting "$12 a month."

Mr. KILGORE. How much is asked by the bill?

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The amount is blank.

Mr. CHEADLE. Well, just pass it blank, and the Senate will fill it in by way of amendment.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The gentleman from Alabama [Mr. WHEELER] has offered as an amendment that she be pensioned at the rate of $12 per month.

Mr. CHEADLE. That is entirely satisfactory.

The bill as amended was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and is hereby, authorized and directed to place the name of Louisa Rogers on the pension-roll at the rate of $12 per month, she being the housekeeper and dependent daughter of Charles T. Bell, who was late a captain in Company —, Seventy-sixth Regiment Indiana Volunteers.

The amendment was agreed to; and the bill as amended was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time; and being engrossed, it was accordingly read the third time, and passed.

Mr. CHEADLE moved to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed; and also moved that the motion to reconsider be laid on the table.

The latter motion was agreed to.

MRS. ELIZABETH G. SCOTT.

Mr. WHEELER. I now ask unanimous consent to take up the bill (H. R. 7944) to increase the pension of Mrs. Elizabeth G. Scott.

Mr. CHEADLE. It will save time to announce now that I will antagonize that bill.

Mr. WHEELER. Mrs. Scott is a lady——

Mr. CHEADLE. I wish to give notice to you and to members present in this House that another bill shall not pass in violation of the ratings of law if I am present unless there be a quorum. I have stated that so many times that it does seem strange gentlemen should compel me to state it again and again, when I have so often set forth my reasons for objecting.

Mr. WHEELER. The gentleman objects sometimes and sometimes he does not object.

Mr. CHEADLE. If I ever call up a bill that violates the ratings of the law, I hope gentlemen will vote it down. I would rather resign my seat than ask the House to pass a bill which was in violation of the ratings of the law.

ADJOURNMENT.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The hour of 10.30 having arrived, the House stands adjourned until Monday next, October 8, at 12 o'clock m.

PRIVATE BILLS INTRODUCED AND REFERRED.

Under the rule private bills of the following titles were introduced and referred as indicated below:

By Mr. STONE, of Kentucky: A bill (H. R. 11568) for the relief of John A. Yandell—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11569) for the relief of Sarah Millikan—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. McCREARY: A bill (H. R. 11570) granting arrears of pension to Peter J. Hiatt—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. McRAE: A bill (H. R. 11571) granting a pension to I. T. Houze—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WHEELER (by request): A bill (H. R. 11572) for the relief of Mrs. Fannie Moore—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

PETITION.

The following petition was laid on the Clerk's desk, under the rule, and referred as follows:

By Mr. J. M. ALLEN: Petition of estate of Donald Street, deceased, late of Alcorn County, Mississippi, and also James Conn, of Alcorn County, Mississippi, for reference of their claim to the Court of Claims—to the Committee on War Claims.

SENATE.

MONDAY, *October* 8, 1888.

Prayer by Rev. C. B. RAMSDELL, of the city of Washington.

The Journal of the proceedings of Thursday last was read and approved.

DR. JOHN B. READ.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The Chair lays before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives, which will be read.

The Secretary read as follows:

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, *October* 4, 1888.

Ordered, That the Clerk be directed to return to the Senate, in accordance with their request, the bill (H. R. 10633) for the relief of Dr. John B. Read, and also to inform the Senate that the Speaker had signed the above-enrolled bill before receiving the message of recall from the Senate.

Mr. EDMUNDS. I ask that my motion to reconsider the vote on the passage of the bill be taken up and acted upon, and that the order for the third reading be reconsidered and the bill placed on the Calendar. I do this in pursuance of an understanding with gentlemen interested affirmatively for the bill, that if that should be done it shall go on the Calendar and wait until December before it is again taken up.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. If there be no objection, the vote by which the bill was passed and also the vote by which it was or-

dered to a third reading will be reconsidered, and the bill placed on the Calendar. The Chair hears no objection, and it is so ordered.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

Mr. SPOONER. I present the petition of William H. Prince and Henry Hoover, a committee appointed at a public meeting of the workingmen of the District of Columbia, held at Grand Army of the Republic Hall, corner of Seventh and L streets northwest, April 10, 1888, charging that grave wrongs and abuses involving moral turpitude and the integrity of numerous District officials in regard to their conduct of the public works, disbursement of public moneys, etc., and in relation to their dealings with the District workingmen, exist, consisting in part:

First. Of errors in payment to workingmen;

Second. Failure to pay workingmen (by exceeding appropriations);

Third. Permitting workingmen employed as foremen on District work to take private contracts and use District property and materials in the execution thereof;

Fourth. In allowing the use of teams employed and paid for by the District to plow up and otherwise improve the farm property of prominent real-estate agents;

Fifth. In allowing a gang of laborers employed on permit work to be borne and paid on the pay-rolls of the county middle district;

Sixth. Misapplying appropriations made by Congress for current repairs of county roads and diverting it to other uses wholly foreign;

Seventh. Wasting an appropriation of $20,000 made for repairs on Seventh street road;

Eighth. In sanctioning and employing at great loss to the District and District workingmen, imported contract Italian laborers on public works;

Ninth. In malicious persecutions of faithful foremen and inspectors employed on District works;

And praying that these charges be investigated, to the end that relief may be afforded.

I move the reference of the petition to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. MITCHELL presented resolutions adopted by the Board of Trade of Port Townsend, Wash., favoring changes in the boundaries of certain proposed new judicial districts provided for in the bill recently introduced by Mr. MITCHELL in the Senate, and now pending before the Committee on the Judiciary; which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES.

Mr. BLAIR, from the Committee on Pensions, to whom were referred the following bills, reported them severally without amendment, and submitted reports thereon:

A bill (H. R. 7344) granting a pension to Henrietta Waldron;

A bill (H. R. 9175) granting a pension to George Wallen;

A bill (H. R. 9296) granting a pension to Bridget Carroll;

A bill (H. R. 7877) to place Mary Karstetter on the pension-roll; and

A bill (H. R. 9791) for the relief of Charles W. Geddes.

Mr. JONES, of Arkansas, from the Committee on Indian Affairs, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 7924) for the relief of A. J. McCreary, administrator of the estate of J. M. Hiatt, and for other purposes, reported it without amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

He also, from the Committee on Claims, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 10481) for the relief of Rev. William Gregston, reported it without amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

He also, from the same committee, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 6348) for the relief of Mrs. Ellen P. Malloy, submitted an adverse report thereon, which was agreed to, and the bill was postponed indefinitely.

PUBLIC BUILDING AT DETROIT, MICH.

Mr. VEST. From the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds I report favorably, without amendment, the bill (H. R. 9447) to restore certain money to the fund for erecting a public building at the city of Detroit.

Mr. PALMER. I ask that the bill be considered at present. It will not lead to any debate nor take any time.

By unanimous consent, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill.

The preamble recites that two lots of land in the city of Detroit, Mich., contiguous to the present site of the post-office building in that city, were purchased by the Government as an addition to that site for the purpose of erecting a new public building thereon; that the purchase money paid for these lots was taken out of and deducted from the amount appropriated for the erection of the building, and that the project of erecting the building on these lots has been abandoned, and other lots of land purchased for that purpose. The bill therefore proposes that the Secretary of the Treasury shall sell these two lots of land for a sum at least equal to the purchase price paid by the Government therefor, and restore to the appropriation for the building the amount realized from the sale.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The preamble was agreed to.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. CLARK, its Clerk, announced that the House had passed the following bills; in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

A bill (H. R. 338) to clear the military record of J. George Ruckstuhl;

A bill (H. R. 1156) for the relief of Miles F. West;

A bill (H. R. 2896) for the relief of the heirs of John R. Treutlen;

A bill (H. R. 3721) authorizing the President to appoint William English an officer in the regular Army of the United States;

A bill (H. R. 3765) for the relief of James Devine;

A bill (H. R. 4489) for the relief of J. M. Hogan;

A bill (H. R. 4648) granting a pension to Jemima Sterling;

A bill (H. R. 4887) granting a pension to Charles E. Scott.

A bill (H. R. 5043) for the relief of the Stockbridge and Munsee tribe of Indians, in the State of Wisconsin;

A bill (H. R. 5480) for the relief of James Iredell Meares;

A bill (H. R. 5751) for the relief of Margaret M. Hatch;

A bill (H. R. 7151) for the relief of A. N. Kimball and sureties, on his official bond as receiver of public moneys;

A bill (H. R. 8549) granting a pension to Louisa Rogers;

A bill (H. R. 9211) for the relief of Jesse Durnell;

A bill (H. R. 9297) for the relief of James Sims;

A bill (H. R. 10099) for the relief of Melchisedec Robinson;

A bill (H. R. 10515) to increase the pension of William Gallagher; and

A bill (H. R. 11165) for the relief of John Gray.

The message also announced that the House had passed the following bills:

A bill (S. 619) granting an increase of pension to Leopold Mayer;

A bill (S. 664) for the relief of William R. Wheaton and Charles H. Chamberlain, of California;

A bill (S. 741) for the relief of William Tabb;

A bill (S. 889) granting a pension to Mary O. Hall;

A bill (S. 1089) for the relief of Henrietta M. Sands, widow of the late Rear-Admiral Benjamin F. Sands, United States Navy;

A bill (S. 1219) granting a pension to David Heinbach;

A bill (S. 1614) granting a pension to Phillipe Ray;

A bill (S. 1671) for the relief of the heirs of Martin Kenofsky;

A bill (S. 1926) granting a pension to William Smith;

A bill (S. 2567) granting a pension to Nancy Polock;

A bill (S. 2593) granting a pension to Sarah E. McNamara;

A bill (S. 3018) granting an increase of pension to John N. Bovee;

A bill (S. 3030) granting a pension to Mary J. Foster;

A bill (S. 3083) restoring to the pension-roll the name of Florian Lischewsky;

A bill (S. 3175) granting a pension to Mrs. Caroline Taylor;

A bill (S. 3197) granting a pension to Abbie L. Ham;

A bill (S. 3230) granting a pension to Martha J. Cole; and

A bill (S. 3241) granting a pension to Easter A. Jackson.

The message further announced that the House had passed the following bills, each with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

A bill (S. 1190) for the relief of the estate of Joseph Fenno, deceased;

A bill (S. 1481) granting a pension to Ellen White Dowling;

A bill (S. 1482) granting a pension to Sarah C. Taylor; and

A bill (S. 2663) granting an increase of pension to Mary M. Ord.

The message also announced that the House had concurred in the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 7516) to increase the pension of Sylvester Stearns.

The message further announced that the House had passed a resolution for the appointment of a joint select committee composed of six members of the Senate and House of Representatives to investigate the facts and circumstances connected with the building of the Washington aqueduct tunnel, etc., in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message also announced that the House had directed the Clerk of the House to inform the Senate that the bill (S. 577) for the relief of the American Grocer Association of the city of New York has been mislaid and can not be found, and requested the Senate to furnish a duplicate of said bill.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED.

The message further announced that the Speaker of the House had signed the following enrolled bill and joint resolution; and they were thereupon signed by the President *pro tempore:*

A bill (H. R. 3300) to enable the State of Colorado to select indemnity lands, and for other purposes; and

Joint resolution (H. Res. 101) providing for the printing of decisions of the Department of the Interior regarding public lands and pensions, for sale.

BILLS INTRODUCED.

Mr. STEWART introduced a bill (S. 3616) to provide for the formation of co-operative business corporations in the District of Columbia; which was read twice by its title.

Mr. STEWART. I move the reference of the bill to the Committee

on Education and Labor, and I should like to be indulged in a remark concerning it.

I intended to make some remarks upon the bill introduced by the Senator from California [Mr. STANFORD] early in the session, having the same general objects in view. That bill, however, has not been reported from the committee, and I have had no opportunity to do so. I also intended to submit some amendments to that bill which I have incorporated in the bill now presented as an entire bill.

I believe that co-operation is the solution of the supposed conflict between capital and labor, and that what we want in this country is more proprietors and less wage-earners. In the progress of society we have reached a period when very little can be done by individual effort. Co-operation in almost every pursuit is required, and while capital co-operates and forms trusts, that is accumulated capital, productive capital is apparently, or is supposed to be, a servant of accumulated capital. That ought not to be.

The productive power of the country is its principal wealth. In a single year the productive power of this country could replace all the accumulated property, and could replace in a very few months all the accumulated property in the hands of rich men and rich corporations.

The only difficulty in the way of the laborers of this country uniting their efforts and combining their labor capital in industrial pursuits is the want of some simple, easy mode of organization. The laborers of this country are now sufficiently intelligent to conduct the most complicated business, and it seems to me that if a simple method is provided for them to unite their efforts, so that they can engage in all industrial pursuits, both productive and distributive, they will unite their capital and compel the accumulated capital of the country to become tributary to their enterprises or remain idle.

The Commissioner of Labor has written some very good works on this subject and collected much very valuable information. I should like very much to have his views upon the bill which I have introduced, and I will ask the Committee on Education and Labor to refer it to him for a report at the next session. It seems to me it is one of the most important subjects that can be considered, but I would hesitate to legislate without having the benefit of the mature views of our very able Commissioner of Labor.

Mr. BLAIR. If the bill should be referred to the Committee on Education and Labor, as chairman of the committee I shall take great pleasure in referring it to the Commissioner of Labor for his views and an early report.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The bill will be referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

Mr. SPOONER introduced a bill (S. 3617) granting a pension to J. W. Boyd; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 3618) granting a pension to Meryah Watts; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. JONES, of Arkansas, introduced a bill (S. 3619) for the relief of Alice E. Robertson; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

AMERICAN GROCER ASSOCIATION.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The Chair lays before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives, which will be read.

The Secretary read as follows:

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, *October* 5, 1888.

Ordered, That the Clerk be directed to inform the Senate that the bill (S. 577) for the relief of the American Grocer Association, of the city of New York, has been mislaid and can not be found, and request the Senate to furnish a duplicate of said bill.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The request of the House of Representatives will be complied with, if there be no objection. The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

WASHINGTON AQUEDUCT TUNNEL.

Mr. HALE. I ask the Chair to lay before the Senate the message from the House of Representatives in relation to the Washington aqueduct tunnel.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The Chair lays before the Senate a concurrent resolution from the House of Representatives, which will be read.

The Secretary read as follows:

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, *October* 5, 1888.

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That all work heretofore performed upon the Washington aqueduct tunnel, together with the provisions of any contract made for the same or any portion thereof, and all the facts and circumstances connected with the bidding for, the letting and making of said contracts, and all expenditure of moneys heretofore appropriated for said work, together with the extent of any force employed in said work by the Government, the nature of the same and the compensation paid therefor, shall forthwith be fully investigated by a joint select committee of six members, of whom three shall be members of the Senate, to be appointed by the President of the Senate, and three shall be members of the House of Representatives, to be appointed by the Speaker. Said committee shall have authority to employ a clerk and stenographer, and such experts as it may deem necessary for the investigation. It may sit during the sessions of Congress or in recess, and shall have full power, either in full committee or subcommittee, to administer oaths and send for persons and papers, and to conduct the investigations either in Washington or in such places as may be deemed necessary, and shall make full report of its proceedings and the conclusions arrived at, with such recommendations as it may deem proper, to Congress on or before January 1, 1889.

Mr. HALE. This is substantially the provision that the Senate embodied in the deficiency appropriation bill, and which afterwards was sent to conference. The conferees agreed upon the proposition, there being no objection whatever on the part of any member of the conference, but on reflection, and as suggested by the Senator from Vermont [Mr. EDMUNDS], it was thought doubtful whether a joint committee of the two Houses could legally be raised by the provisions of a statute, it being of course the constitutional privilege of the two Houses to conduct their own proceedings and make their own committees themselves, without regard to any outside statute or the approval of the President.

Therefore, to save that point, which it seemed to the conferees was well made, and in order that there might be no obstruction to this proposed investigation, the committee unanimously agreed that this concurrent resolution should be reported instead of the provision in the appropriation bill.

The resolution was drawn in conference, and was submitted first in the House of Representatives because that body was in session that day. It passed that body and has just come here.

In order that this investigation may be made most complete and searching, I desire that the Senate shall concur with the House in passing this resolution with only one amendment, which may be needed in order to perfect it. I send to the desk the amendment, which I ask the Senate to agree to.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. If there be no objection to the present consideration of the resolution, it is before the Senate, and the amendment proposed by the Senator from Maine will be stated.

The SECRETARY. In line 8, after the word "contracts," it is proposed to insert the words:

And subcontracts.

Mr. HALE. That amendment is moved so that all the relations between one contractor and another or between the subcontractors and the original contractors may be investigated by this committee.

The amendment was agreed to.

The resolution as amended was concurred in.

LOUIS RIEL.

Mr. BLAIR submitted the following resolutions; which were read:

Resolved, That the President be requested to communicate to the Senate any knowledge or information in his possession or in the possession of the Department of State relating to the case of one Louis Riel, otherwise Louis David Riel, who was hanged for the alleged crime of treason by the authorities of the Dominion of Canada on or about the 16th day of November, 1885, notwithstanding that he was recommended to mercy by the jury who convicted him, doubts being alleged of his sanity, with other mitigating circumstances; and the same Louis Riel in whose favor judgment of naturalization is alleged to appear of record in the United States district court of the third judicial district of the Territory of Montana, of the March term 1883; and also to communicate to the Senate all information of any application made by one Edmund Mallett, now or lately president of the French Canadian League of the United States, or by any other persons, whether verbally or otherwise, to the President or to the Secretary of State in behalf of said Riel prior to his execution, requesting inquiry into the circumstances of his case, his alleged citizenship of the United States, and whether the proceedings in his case had been according to due process of law, and whether there had been a full, fair, and sufficient trial thereof, including the presentation of the fact of his citizenship, and especially of the proof of his insanity with which he had previously been afflicted, and for which he had been long confined, undergoing treatment therefor in an asylum for insane persons, and from which there was alleged to be strong proof of his being afflicted when the events occurred for which he was charged with treason as aforesaid; also what action, if any, was taken by this Government in the premises to secure a new trial or mitigation of the punishment of the said Riel, together with copies of all papers, letters, documents, and correspondence bearing upon the subject-matter; also to inform the Senate whether the said Mallett was at the time of his said alleged application in the employ of the Treasury Department of this Government, and if so, whether since the rejection of said application or the neglect and refusal of this Government to inquire into the case of said Riel (if said application was rejected and said inquiry was neglected and refused to be made), said Mallett has been promoted or appointed to other and more responsible and lucrative service under this Government; and, if so, to what service, together with any other facts relating to the subject-matter of the trial and execution of said alleged American citizen Riel by the authorities of the Dominion of Canada; and

Whereas the said Edmund Mallett, under his hand in a letter dated at Washington, D. C., August 24, 1885, and widely published in the press and supposed to have been communicated to the President and to the Secretary of State, alleged in reference to his interviews with the President and the Secretary of State that the Government refused to inquire into said cases except upon the condition following (among others), to-wit, the condition contained in these words: "First, The American Government will not take the initiative in examining into Riel's citizenship or the rights thereunder," with other matters, showing, if true, gross neglect and indifference to the rights of an American citizen when in extreme need of the protection of his Government, being without means, deprived of liberty, and about to be executed by a foreign nation: Therefore,

Resolved further, That the President be requested to inform the Senate whether the aforesaid allegation of the refusal of this Government to institute inquiry into the case of said Riel upon the statements and petitions of the said Edmund Mallett and others is true, and if the same be not true, whether the said Mallett has ever withdrawn or retracted the same, and if he still adheres to the same, for what reason the said Mallett, since making such public charges against this Government, has been appointed to a responsible and lucrative position in the public service requiring a high order of ability and of personal integrity for the proper discharge of the duties thereof; and if the above charge of the said Mallett be or be not true, whether the President or the Secretary of State had knowledge thereof and of the contents of a certain book entitled "The Blood of Abel," written by one Wilbur F. Bryant, and published in the year 1887, prior to the said appointment of said Mallett; which said book relates to the case of the said Riel, and contains the aforesaid and other letters and statements of the said Mallett, with much other like evidence and allegations of fact, charging this Government with gross and inexcusable negligence in the care and defense of the rights of an American citizen when in foreign parts and about to suffer an infamous death without cause.

Mr. BLAIR. I ask that the resolutions be now considered.

Mr. MORGAN. Let the resolutions go over and be printed.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The resolutions will lie over and be printed, under the rule.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. T. O. TOWLES, its Chief Clerk, announced that the House had passed the following bills; in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

A bill (H. R. 246) for the relief of J. W. Patterson;

A bill (H. R. 2025) to place William J. Sowell on the rolls of the Arkansas Volunteers;

A bill (H. R. 2236) granting a pension to Eli J. Yamgheim;

A bill (H. R. 2702) granting a pension to Mary Ann Shook;

A bill (H. R. 2707) granting a pension to Baker Saine;

A bill (H. R. 3608) to grant an increase of pension to William E. Prince;

A bill (H. R. 7887) granting an increase of pension to Jonathan C. Harrison;

A bill (H. R. 8521) for the relief of William A. Mathes;

A bill (H. R. 9718) for the relief of J. W. Parish & Co.;

A bill (H. R. 10199) for the relief of William E. Springstein; and

A bill (H. R. 10606) to constitute Lincoln, Nebr., a port of delivery, and to extend the provisions of the act of June 10, 1880, entitled "An act to amend the statutes in relation to immediate transportation of dutiable goods, and for other purposes," to the said port of Lincoln.

The message also announced that the House had concurred in the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 4601) to amend the naval record of Nickolas Lenschen, Peter Lenschen, and Loth Possum.

The message further announced that the House had concurred in the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 8962) for the relief of Anthony L. Woodson.

The message further announced that the House had passed the following bills and joint resolution:

A bill (S. 45) for the relief of Col. James C. Duane;

A bill (S. 70) to provide for warehousing fruit brandy;

A bill (S. 1137) for the relief of Adam L. Epley;

A bill (S. 3433) authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to accept the surrender of and cancel land patents to Indians in certain cases;

A bill (S. 3597) to provide for the disposal of the Fort Wallace military reservation in Kansas;

Joint resolution (S. R. 59) authorizing Brig. Gen. Absalom Baird, United States Army, to accept from the President of the French Republic a diploma conferring the decoration of Commander of the National Order of the Legion of Honor; and

Joint resolution (S. R. 112) authorizing the Secretary of War to receive for instruction at the Military Academy at West Point Henry Lecomte, of Switzerland.

ANTHONY L. WOODSON.

Mr. JONES, of Arkansas, submitted the following report:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 8962) for the relief of Anthony L. Woodson, of Woodsonville, Ky., having met, after full and free conference have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendment to said bill and agree to the same with the following amendments:

In line — strike out the amount $3,666.90 and insert $4,130.40.

Strike out all after the word "use," in line 9, in the following words: "And the further sum of $2,300, being the value of engineer stores taken in the same way for the construction of forts, stockades, etc., at or near Mumfordville, Ky."

To which the Senate agrees.

JOHN C. SPOONER,
JAMES K. JONES,
JOHN H. MITCHELL,
Managers on the part of the Senate.

W. J. STONE,
J. M. BROWER,
T. R. STOCKDALE,
Managers on the part of the House.

The report was concurred in.

THE NATIONAL MUSEUM.

Mr. WILSON, of Iowa. I offer the following resolution, and ask for its present consideration:

Resolved, That the Regents and Secretary of the Smithsonian Institution, and Director of the United States National Museum be, and hereby are, directed to formulate and transmit to the Senate, at their earliest convenience, a schedule of classified service of the officers and employés of the National Museum, arranged according to duty and salary, as the same is required for the proper working of the Museum.

Mr. HOAR. From what committee does that come?

Mr. WILSON, of Iowa. From none. It is a resolution that I introduced in order to get the information.

Mr. HOAR. I should like to inquire for information—I have no doubt it is all right—have we authority to impose directions on the Regents of the Smithsonian Institution and the Director of the National Museum?

Mr. WILSON, of Iowa. The resolution relates mainly to the National Museum, which, I suppose, we have a right to call upon for information. It might be different as to the Smithsonian Institution, but as the resolution relates to the Museum, I presume we have that authority. There is no reason why we should not have it.

Mr. HOAR. We have authority to give such directions to the heads of Departments, which rests on unbroken usage from the beginning of the Government, but I am not aware that one House of Congress has a right to order an executive officer of the Government to do anything for its convenience, especially that we have such control over the Regents of the Smithsonian Institution. It may be there is such authority reserved by statute. I shall not interpose an objection to the resolution, because I know personally the officers referred to would be anxious to communicate the information, and it is the desire of the Senator from Iowa.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. If there be no objection to the present consideration of the resolution, the question is on agreeing to the same.

The resolution was agreed to.

VIOLATIONS OF CIVIL-SERVICE LAW.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. If there be no further resolutions, the Chair lays before the Senate the concurrent resolution offered by the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. CHANDLER] on a previous day requesting the Attorney-General to inform the Senate whether he has any information concerning violations of the civil-service law. The Senator who offered the resolution not being in his seat, if there be no objection the resolution will lie over, retaining its place on the Calendar of current business for to-morrow morning.

THE REVENUE LAWS.

Mr. ALLISON. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the bill (H. R. 9051) to reduce taxation and simplify the laws in relation to the collection of the revenue.

The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The bill is before the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, and will be read at length.

Mr. ALLISON. As this is a long bill and the Senate is familiar with its provisions, at least with those of the original House bill, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the bill at length may be dispensed with, and that as the substitute is read it may be open to amendment; that is to say, that the formal reading of the bill may be dispensed with.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. It will be so ordered, if there be no objection.

Mr. MORGAN. I ask the Senator from Iowa if there is any objection to having the measure printed in the RECORD?

Mr. HARRIS. It has been printed in the RECORD, I think.

Mr. ALLISON. No, it has not been printed in the RECORD.

Mr. MORGAN. Not the bill.

Mr. HARRIS. The reports were printed in the RECORD.

Mr. ALLISON. Is it proposed that both the bill and the substitute be printed in the RECORD?

Mr. HARRIS. I suppose there is no objection to so printing the bill and amendment, if the Senator suggests it.

Mr. MORGAN. Yes, I make that suggestion. My purpose, of course, is to get the amendment of the Senate Committee on Finance before the country. The bill itself has been before the country. It is a House bill, and has been printed, I believe, in various forms. I have no objection to the bill going in. My request, though, was as to the amendment.

Mr. ALLISON. I have no objection certainly to the amendment being printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. If there be no objection, the amendment of the Committee on Finance will be printed in the RECORD.

Mr. HARRIS. If either is printed in the RECORD, let the bill and amendment both be printed.

Mr. BUTLER. I was about to suggest that, Mr. President.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. If there be no objection, the bill and the amendment reported by the Committee on Finance will be printed in the RECORD. It is so ordered.

The bill is as follows:

A bill (H. R. 9051) to reduce taxation and simplify the laws in relation to the collection of the revenue.

Be it enacted, etc., That on and after the 1st day of October, 1888, the following articles mentioned in this section, when imported, shall be exempt from duty:

Timber, hewn and sawed, and timber used for spars and in building wharves.

Timber, squared or sided.

Wood unmanufactured, not specially enumerated or provided for.

Sawed boards, planks, deals, and all other articles of sawed lumber.

Hubs for wheels, posts, last-blocks, wagon-blocks, oar-blocks, gun-blocks, heading-blocks, and all like blocks or sticks, rough, hewn, or sawed only.

Staves of wood.

Pickets and palings.

Laths.

Shingles.

Clapboards, pine or spruce.

Logs.

Provided, That if any export duty is laid upon the above-mentioned articles, or either of them, by any country whence imported, all said articles imported from said country shall be subject to duty as now provided by law.

Salt, in bags, sacks, barrels, or other packages, or in bulk, when imported from any country which does not charge an import duty upon salt exported from the United States.

Flax straw.

Flax, not hackled or dressed.

Tow of flax, or hemp.
Hemp, manila, and other like substitutes for hemp.
Jute-butts.
Jute.
Sunn, sisal-grass, and other vegetable fibers.
Burlaps, not exceeding 60 inches in width, of flax, jute, or hemp, or of which flax, jute, or hemp, or either of them, shall be the component material of chief value.
Bags of jute for grain.
Machinery designed for the conversion of jute or jute-butts into cotton bagging, to wit, cards, roving-frames, winding-frames, and softeners.
Iron or steel sheets, or plates, or taggers iron, coated with tin or lead, or with a mixture of which these metals is a component part, by the dipping or any other process, and commercially known as tin-plates, terne-plates, and taggers tin.
Beeswax.
Glycerine, crude, brown, or yellow, of the specific gravity of 1.25 or less at a temperature of sixty degrees Fahrenheit, not purified by refining or distilling.
Phosphorus.
Soap-stocks, fit only for use as such.
Soap, hard and soft, all which are not otherwise specially enumerated or provided for.
Sheep-dip.
Extract of hemlock, and other bark used for tanning.
Indigo, extracts of, and carmined.
Iodine, resublimed.
Oil, croton.
Hemp-seed and rape-seed oil.
Petroleum.
Alumina—alum, patent alum, alum substitute, sulphate of alumina, and aluminous cake, and alum in crystals or ground.
All imitations of natural mineral waters, and all artificial mineral waters.
Baryta, sulphate of, or barytes, unmanufactured.
Boracic acid, borate of lime, and borax.
Copper, sulphate of, or blue vitriol.
Iron, sulphate of, or copperas.
Potash, crude, carbonate of, or fused, and caustic potash.
Chlorate of potash and nitrate of potash, or saltpeter crude.
Sulphate of potash.
Sulphate of soda, known as salt cake, crude or refined, or niter cake, crude or refined, and Glauber's salt.
Nitrate of soda.
Sulphur, refined, in rolls.
Wood-tar.
Coal-tar, crude.
Aniline oil and its homologues.
Coal-tar, products of, such as naphtha, benzine, benzole, dead oil, and pitch.
All preparations of coal-tar not colors or dyes, and not acids of colors and dyes.
Log-wood and other dyewoods, extracts and decoctions of.
Alizarine, natural or artificial.
Spirits of turpentine.
Ocher and ochery earths, umber and umber earths.
Olive-oil, salad oil, cottonseed oil, whale oil, seal oil and neats-foot oil.
All barks, beans, berries, balsams, buds, bulbs, bulbous roots, and excrescences, such as nut-galls, fruits, flowers, dried fibers, grains, gums, and gum resins, herbs, leaves, lichens, mosses, nuts, roots, and stems, vegetables, seeds, and seeds of morbid growth, weeds, woods used expressly for dyeing, and dried insects, any of the foregoing which are not edible and not specially enumerated or provided for.
All non-dutiable crude minerals, but which have been advanced in value or condition by refining or grinding, or by other process of manufacture, not specially enumerated or provided for.
All earths or clays unwrought or unmanufactured.
Glass plates or discs unwrought, for use in the manufacture of optical instruments, spectacles, and eye glasses.
Opium, crude and not adulterated, containing 9 per cent. and over of morphia, for medicinal purposes.
Iron and steel cotton ties or hoops, for baling or other purposes, not thinner than No. 20 wire gauge.
Needles, sewing, darning, knitting, and all others not specially enumerated or provided for in this act.
Copper, imported in the form of ores, regulus of, and black or coarse copper and copper cement, old copper fit only for remanufacture.
Antimony, as regulus or metal.
Quicksilver.
Chromate of iron or chromic ore.
Mineral substances in a crude state and metals unwrought not specially enumerated or provided for.
Brick, other than fire-brick.
German looking-glass plates, made of blown glass and silvered.
Vegetables in their natural state or in salt or brine, not specially enumerated or provided for.
Chicory root, ground or unground, burnt or prepared.
Acorns and dandelion root, raw or prepared, and all other articles used, or intended to be used, as coffee or substitutes therefor, not specially enumerated or provided for.
Cocoa, prepared or manufactured.
Dates.
Currants, Zante or other.
Figs.
Meats, game and poultry.
Milk, fresh.
Egg yelks.
Beans, pease, and split pease.
Bibles, books, and pamphlets, printed in other languages than English, and books and pamphlets and all publications of foreign governments, and publications of foreign societies, historical or scientific, printed for gratuitous distribution.
Bristles.
Bulbs and bulbous roots, not medicinal.
Feathers of all kinds, crude or not dressed, colored, or manufactured.
Finishing powder.
Grease.
Grindstones, finished or unfinished.
Curled hair, for beds or mattresses.
Human hair, raw, uncleaned and not drawn.
Hemp and rape seed, and other oil-seeds of like character.
Garden seeds.
Osier or willow, prepared for basket-makers' use.
Broom-corn.
Brush-wood.
Rags, of whatever material composed.
Rattans and reeds, manufactured but not made up into finished articles.
Stones, manufactured or undressed, freestone, granite, sandstone, and all building or monumental stone.
All strings of gut or any other like material.
Tallow.
Waste, all not specially enumerated or provided for.

SEC. 2. That on the 1st day of October, 1888, in lieu of the duties heretofore imposed on the articles hereinafter mentioned, there shall be levied, collected, and paid the following rates of duty on said articles severally:

Glycerine, refined, 3 cents per pound.
Acid, acetic, acetous, or pyroligneous acid, exceeding the specific gravity of 1.047, 5 cents per pound.
Castor beans or seeds, 25 cents per bushel of 50 pounds.
Castor oil, 40 cents per gallon.
Flaxseed or linseed oil, 15 cents per gallon.
Licorice, paste or rolls, 5 cents per pound.
Licorice juice, 35 per cent. ad valorem.
Baryta, sulphate of, or barytes, manufactured, one-eighth of 1 cent per pound.
Chromate of potash, 2½ cents per pound.
Bichromate of potash, 2½ cents per pound.
Acetate of lead, brown, 2 cents per pound.
Acetate of lead, white, 3 cents per pound.
White lead, when dry or in pulp, or when ground or mixed in oil, 2 cents per pound.
Orange, mineral, and read lead, 1½ cents per pound.
Litharge, 1½ cents per pound.
Nitrate of lead, 2 cents per pound.
Magnesia, medicinal, carbonate of, 3 cents per pound.
Magnesia, calcined, 7 cents per pound.
Magnesia, sulphate of, or Epsom salts, one-fourth of 1 cent per pound.
Prussiate of potash, red, 7 cents per pound.
Prussiate of potash, yellow, 3 cents per pound.
Nitrate of potash, refined, or refined saltpeter, 1 cent per pound.
Sal soda, or soda crystals, one-eighth of 1 cent per pound.
Bicarbonate of or super-carbonate of soda, and saleratus, calcined or pearl ash, three-fourths of 1 cent per pound.
Hydrate or caustic soda, one-half of 1 cent per pound.
Soda silicate or other alkaline silicate, one-fourth of 1 cent per pound.
Sulphur, sublimed or flowers of, $12 per ton.
Ultramarine, 3 cents per pound.
Paris green, 12½ per cent. ad valorem.
Colors and paints, including lakes, whether dry or mixed, or ground with water or oil, not specially enumerated or provided for, 20 per cent. ad valorem.
Zinc, oxide of, when dry, 1 cent per pound; when ground in oil, 1½ cents per pound.

All medicinal preparations known as cerates, conserves, decoctions, emulsions, extracts, solid or fluid, infusions, juices, liniments, lozenges, mixtures, mucilages, ointments, oleo-resins, pills, plasters, powders, resins, suppositories, sirups, vinegars, and waters, of any of which alcohol is not a component part, which are not specially enumerated or provided for, 20 per cent. ad valorem.
All ground or powdered spices not specially enumerated or provided for, 3 cents per pound.
Proprietary preparations, to wit: All cosmetics, pills, powders, troches or lozenges, sirups, cordials, bitters, anodynes, tonics, plasters, liniments, salves, ointments, pastes, drops, waters, essences, spirits, oils, or preparations or compositions recommended to the public as proprietary articles or prepared according to some private formula as remedies or specifics for any disease or diseases or affections affecting the human or animal body, including all toilet preparations whatever used as applications to the hair, mouth, teeth, or skin, not specially enumerated or provided for, 30 per cent. ad valorem.
Morphia or morphine and all salts thereof, 50 cents per ounce.
Acid, tannic or tannin, 50 cents per pound.
China, porcelain, parian, and bisque, earthen, stone, or crockery ware composed of earthy or mineral substance, including plaques, ornaments, charms, vases, and statuettes, painted, printed, enameled, or gilded, or otherwise decorated in any manner, 50 per cent. ad valorem.
China, porcelain, parian, and bisque ware not decorated in any manner, 40 per cent. ad valorem.
White granite, common ware, plain white or cream-colored, lustered or printed under glaze in a single color; sponged, dipped, or edged ware, 35 per per cent. ad valorem.
Brown earthenware, common stoneware, gas-retorts, and roofing tiles, not specially enumerated or provided for, and not decorated in any manner, 20 per cent. ad valorem.
All other earthen, stone, and crockery ware, white, colored, or bisque, composed of earthy or mineral substances, not specially enumerated or provided for in this act, and not decorated in any manner, 35 per cent. ad valorem.
Paving tiles, not encaustic, 20 per cent. ad valorem.
Encaustic tiles, not glazed or enameled, 30 per cent. ad valorem.
All glazed or enameled tiles, 40 per cent. ad valorem.
Slates, slate pencils, slate chimney-pieces, mantels, slabs for tables, and all other manufactures of slate, 20 per cent. ad valorem.
Green and colored glass bottles, vials, demijohns and carboys (covered or uncovered), pickle or preserve jars, and other plain, molded, or pressed green and colored bottle glass, not cut, engraved, or painted, and not specially enumerated or provided for, 1 cent per pound; if filled, and not otherwise provided for, and the contents are subject to an ad valorem duty, or to a rate of duty based on their value, the value of such bottles, vials, or other vessels shall be added to the value of the contents for the ascertainment of the dutiable value of the latter; but if filled and not otherwise provided for, and the contents are not subject to an ad valorem duty or to a rate of duty based on their value, they shall pay a duty of 1 cent per pound in addition to the duty, if any, on their contents.
Cylinder and crown glass, polished, above 24 by 30 inches square and not exceeding 24 by 60 inches square, 20 cents per square foot; all above that 30 cents per square foot.
Unpolished cylinder, crown, and common window-glass, not exceeding 16 by 15 inches square, 1½ cents per pound; above that, and not exceeding 16 by 24 inches square, 1½ cents per pound; above that, and not exceeding 24 by 30 inches square, 2 cents per pound; all above that 2½ cents per pound: *Provided*, That unpolished cylinder, crown, and common window-glass, imported in boxes containing 50 square feet as nearly as sizes will permit, now known and commercially designated as 50 feet of glass, single thick and weighing not to exceed 55 pounds of glass per box, shall be entered and computed as 50 pounds of glass only; and that said kinds of glass imported in boxes containing, as nearly as sizes will permit, 50 feet of glass, now known and commercially designated as 50 feet of glass, double thick and not exceeding 90 pounds in weight, shall be entered and computed as 80 pounds of glass only; but in all other cases the duty shall be computed according to the actual weight of glass.
Cast polished plate-glass, silvered, or looking-glass plates, above 24 by 30 inches square and not exceeding 24 by 60 inches square, 25 cents per square foot; all above that, 45 cents per square foot.
Porcelain and Bohemian glass, chemical glassware, painted glassware, stained glass, and all other manufactures of glass, or of which glass shall be the com-

ponent material of chief value, not specially enumerated or provided for, 40 per cent. ad valorem.

Iron in pigs, iron kentledge, $6 per ton.

Iron railway bars, weighing more than 25 pounds to the yard, $11 per ton.

Steel railway bars and railway bars made in part of steel, weighing more than 25 pounds to the yard, $11 per ton.

Bar-iron, rolled or hammered, comprising flats not less than 1 inch wide nor less than three-eighths of 1 inch thick, seven-tenths of 1 cent per pound; comprising round iron not less than three-fourths of 1 inch in diameter, and square iron not less than three-fourths of 1 inch square, and flats less than 1 inch wide or less than three-eighths of 1 inch thick, round iron less than three-fourths of 1 inch and not less than seven-sixteenths of 1 inch in diameter, and square iron less than three-fourths of 1 inch square, 1 cent per pound: *Provided*, That all iron in slabs, blooms, loops, or other forms less finished than iron in bars, and more advanced than pig-iron, except castings, shall be rated as iron in bars, and pay a duty accordingly; and none of the above iron shall pay a less rate of duty than 35 per cent. ad valorem: *Provided further*, That all iron bars, blooms, billets, or sizes or shapes of any kind, in the manufacture of which charcoal is used as fuel, shall be subject to a duty of not less than $20 per ton.

Iron or steel tee-rails, weighing not over 25 pounds to the yard $14 per ton; iron or steel flat rails, punched, $15 per ton.

Round iron, in coils or rods, less than seven-sixteenths of 1 inch in diameter, and bars or shapes of rolled iron, not specially enumerated or provided for, 1 cent per pound.

Iron or steel flat with longitudinal ribs, for the manufacture of fencing, four-tenths of a cent per pound.

Sheet-iron, common or black, thinner than 1 inch and not thinner than No. 20 wire gauge, 1 cent per pound; thinner than No. 20 wire gauge and not thinner than No. 25 wire gauge, one and one-tenth of 1 per cent. per pound; thinner than No. 25 wire gauge and not thinner than No. 29 wire gauge, one and one-fourth of 1 cent per pound; thinner than No. 29 wire gauge, and all iron commercially known as common or black taggers iron, whether put up in boxes or bundles or not, 30 per cent. ad valorem: *Provided*, That on all such iron and steel sheets or plates aforesaid excepting on what are known commercially as tin-plates, terne plates, and taggers tin, when galvanized or coated with zinc or spelter, or other metals, or any alloy of those metals, one-fourth of 1 cent per pound additional when not thinner than No. 20 wire gauge; thinner than No. 20 wire gauge and not thinner than No. 25 wire gauge, one-half cent per pound additional, and when thinner than 25 wire gauge, three-fourths of 1 cent per pound additional.

Hoop, or band, or scroll, or other iron, 8 inches or less in width, and not thinner than No. 10 wire gauge, 1 cent per pound; thinner than No. 10 wire gauge and not thinner than No. 20 wire gauge, 1.1 cents per pound; thinner than No. 20 wire gauge, 1.3 cents per pound: *Provided*, That all articles not specially enumerated or provided for, whether wholly or partly manufactured, made from sheet, plate, hoop, band, or scroll iron herein provided for, or of which such sheet, plate, hoop, band, or scroll iron shall be the material of chief value, shall pay one-fourth of 1 cent per pound more duty than that imposed on the iron from which they are made, or which shall be such material of chief value.

Cast-iron pipe of every description, six-tenths of 1 cent per pound.

Cut nails and spikes, of iron or steel, 1 cent per pound.

Cut tacks, brads, or sprigs, 35 per cent. ad valorem.

Iron or steel railway fish-plates or splice-bars, eight-tenths of 1 cent per pound.

Wrought-iron or steel spikes, nuts, and washers, and horse, mule, or ox shoes, 1½ cents per pound.

Anvils, anchors, or parts thereof, mill-irons and mill-cranks, of wrought-iron, and wrought-iron for ships, and forgings of iron and steel, for vessels, steam-engines and locomotives, or parts thereof, weighing each 25 pounds or more, 1½ cents per pound.

Iron or steel rivets, bolts, with or without threads or nuts, or bolt blanks, and finished hinges or hinge blanks, 1½ cents per pound.

Iron or steel blacksmiths' hammers and sledges, track-tools, wedges, and crowbars, 1½ cents per pound.

Iron or steel axles, parts thereof, axle bars, axle blanks, or forgings for axles, without reference to the stage or state of manufacture, 1½ cents per pound.

Horseshoe nails, hob-nails, and wire nails, and all other wrought-iron or steel nails, not specially enumerated or provided for, 2½ cents per pound.

Boiler-tubes, or other tubes, or flues, or stays, of wrought-iron or steel, 1½ cents per pound.

Chain or chains, of all kinds, made of iron or steel, less than three-fourths of 1 inch in diameter, 1½ cents per pound; less than three-fourths of 1 inch and not less than three-eighths of 1 inch in diameter, 1½ cents per pound; less than three-eighths of 1 inch in diameter, 2 cents per pound.

Hand, back, and all other saws, not specially enumerated or provided for, 30 per centum ad valorem.

Files, file-blanks, rasps, and floats of all cuts and kinds, 35 per cent. ad valorem.

Iron or steel beams, girders, joists, angles, channels, car-truck channels, TT columns and posts, or parts or sections of columns and posts, deck and bulb beams, and building forms, together with all other structural shapes of, iron or steel, six-tenths of 1 cent per pound.

Steel wheels and steel-tired wheels for railway purposes, whether wholly or partly finished, and iron or steel locomotive, car, and other railway tires, or parts thereof, wholly or partly manufactured, 2 cents per pound; iron or steel ingots, cogged ingots, blooms or blanks for the same without regard to the degree of manufacture, 1½ cents per pound.

Iron and steel wire and iron and steel wire, galvanized, and all manufactures of iron and steel wire and of iron and steel wire galvanized shall pay the duties now provided by law: *Provided*, That no such duty shall be in excess of 60 per cent. ad valorem.

Clippings from new copper, fit only for manufacture, 1 cent per pound.

Copper in plates, bars, ingots, Chili or other pigs, and in other forms, not manufactured, 2 cents per pound; in rolled plates, called braziers' copper, sheets, rods, pipes, and copper bottoms, 30 per cent. ad valorem.

Lead ore and lead dross, three-fourths of 1 cent per pound.

Lead, in pigs and bars, molten and old refuse lead run into blocks, and bars and old scrap lead fit only to be remanufactured, 1½ cents per pound. Lead in sheets, pipes, or shot, 2½ cents per pound.

Sheathing or yellow metal, 30 per cent. ad valorem.

Nickel, in ore or matte, 10 cents per pound on the nickel contained therein.

Zinc ores, 20 per cent. ad valorem.

Zinc spelter, or tutenegue, in blocks or pigs, and old worn-out zinc fit only to be remanufactured, 1½ cents per pound; zinc, spelter or tutenegue, in sheets, 2 cents per pound.

Hollowware, coated, glazed, or tinned, 2½ cents per pound.

Needles for knitting and sewing-machines, 20 per cent. ad valorem.

Pens, metallic, 35 per cent. ad valorem.

Type metal, 15 per cent. ad valorem.

New type for printing, 15 per cent. ad valorem.

Manufactures, articles, or wares, not specially enumerated or provided for, composed wholly or in part of copper, 35 per cent. ad valorem; manufactures, articles, or wares, not specially enumerated or provided for, composed of iron, steel, lead, nickel, pewter, tin, zinc, gold, silver, platinum, or any other metal, or of which any of the foregoing metals may be the component material of chief value, and whether partly or wholly manufactured, 40 per cent. ad valorem.

Cabinet and house furniture of wood, finished, 30 per cent. ad valorem.

Manufactures of cedar wood, granadilla, ebony, mahogany, rosewood, and satinwood, 30 per cent. ad valorem.

Manufactures of wood, or of which wood is the chief component part, not specially enumerated or provided for, 30 per cent. ad valorem.

All sugars not above No. 13 Dutch standard in color shall pay duty on their polariscopic test as follows, namely:

All sugars not above No. 13 Dutch standard in color, all tank bottoms, sirups of cane-juice or of beet-juice, melada, concentrated melada, concrete and concentrated molasses, testing by the polariscope not above seventy-five degrees, shall pay a duty of 1.15 cents per pound, and for every additional degree or fraction of a degree shown by the polariscopic test they shall pay thirty-two thousandths of a cent per pound additional.

All sugars above No. 13 Dutch standard in color shall be classified by the Dutch standard of color and pay duty as follows, namely:

All sugars above No. 13 and not above No. 16 Dutch standard, 2.20 cents per pound.

All sugar above No. 16 and not above No. 20 Dutch standard, 2.40 cents per pound.

All sugars above No. 20 Dutch standard, 2.80 cents per pound.

Molasses testing not above fifty-six degrees by the polariscope, shall pay a duty of 2½ cents per gallon; molasses testing above fifty-six degrees shall pay a duty of 6 cents per gallon: *Provided*, That if an export duty shall hereafter be laid upon sugar or molasses by any country from whence the same may be imported, such sugar or molasses so imported shall be subject to duty as provided by law at the date of the passage of this act.

Sugar candy, not colored, 5 cents per pound.

All other confectionery, 40 per cent. ad valorem.

Potato or corn starch, rice-starch, and other starch, 1 cent per pound.

Rice, cleaned, 2 cents per pound; uncleaned, or rice free of the outer hull, and still having the inner cuticle on, 1½ cents per pound.

Rice-flour and rice-meal 15 per cent. ad valorem.

Paddy, or rice having the outer hull on, 1 cent per pound.

Raisins, 1½ cents per pound.

Peanuts or ground-beans, three-fourths of 1 cent per pound; shelled, 1 cent per pound.

Mustard, ground or preserved, in bottles or otherwise, 6 cents per pound.

Cotton thread, yarn, warps, or warp yarn, whether single or advanced beyond the condition of single by twisting two or more single yarns together, whether on beams or in bundles, skeins, or cops, or in any other form, valued at not exceeding 40 cents per pound, 35 per cent. ad valorem; valued at over 40 cents per pound, 40 per cent. ad valorem.

On all cotton cloth, 40 per cent. ad valorem.

Spool-thread of cotton, 40 per cent. ad valorem.

Flax, hackled, known as dressed line, $10 per ton.

Brown and bleached linens, ducks, canvas, paddings, cot bottoms, diapers, crash, huckabacks, handkerchiefs, lawns, or other manufactures of flax, jute, or hemp, or of which flax, jute, or hemp shall be the component material of chief value, not specially enumerated or provided for, 25 per cent. ad valorem: *Provided*, That cuffs, collars, shirts, and other manufactures of wearing apparel, made in whole or in part of linen, and not otherwise provided for, and hydraulic hose, 35 per cent. ad valorem.

Flax, hemp, and jute yarns, and all twines of hemp, jute, jute-butts, sunn, sisal grass, ramie, and China grass, 15 per cent. ad valorem.

Flax or linen thread, twine, and packed thread and all manufactures of flax, or of which flax shall be the component material of chief value, not specially enumerated or provided for, 25 per cent. ad valorem.

Oil-cloth foundations, or floor-cloth canvass, or burlaps, exceeding 60 inches in width, made of flax, jute, or hemp, or of which flax, jute, or hemp, or either of them, shall be the component material of chief value, 25 per cent. ad valorem.

Oil-cloths for floors, stamped, painted, or printed, and on all other oil-cloth (except silk oil-cloth), and on water-proof cloth, not otherwise provided for, 25 per cent. ad valorem.

Gunny-cloth, not bagging, 15 per cent. ad valorem.

Bags and bagging, and like manufactures, not specially enumerated or provided for, including bagging for cotton composed wholly or in part of flax, hemp, jute, gunny cloth, gunny bags, or other material, three-eighths cent per pound.

Tarred cables or cordage, 25 per cent. ad valorem.

Untarred manila cordage, 25 per cent. ad valorem.

All other untarred cordage, 25 per cent. ad valorem.

Seines and seine and gilling twine, 25 per cent. ad valorem.

Sail duck, or canvas for sails, 25 per cent. ad valorem.

Russia and other sheetings, of flax or hemp, brown or white, 25 per cent. ad valorem.

All other manufactures of hemp or manila, or of which hemp or manila shall be a component material of chief value, not specially enumerated or provided for, 25 per cent. ad valorem.

Grass-cloth, and other manufactures of jute, ramie, China, and sisal grass, not specially enumerated or provided for, 25 per cent. ad valorem: *Provided*, That as to jute, jute-butts, sunn, and sisal grass, and manufactures thereof, except burlaps, not exceeding 60 inches in width, this act shall take effect January 1, 1889; and as to flax, hemp, manila, and other like substitutes for hemp, and the manufactures thereof, upon July 1, 1889.

SEC. 3. On and after October 1, 1888, there shall be admitted, when imported, free of duty:

All wools, hair of the alpaca, goat, and other like animals.

Wools on the skin.

Woolen rags, shoddy, mungo, waste, and flocks.

And on and after January 1, 1889, in lieu of the duties heretofore imposed on the articles hereinafter mentioned in this section, there shall be levied, collected, and paid the following rates of duty on said articles severally:

Woolen and worsted cloths, shawls, and all manufactures of wool of every description, made wholly or in part of wool or worsted, not specially enumerated or provided for, 40 per cent. ad valorem.

Flannels, blankets, hats of wool, knit goods, and all goods made on knitting-frames, balmorals, woolen and worsted yarns, and all manufactures of every description, composed wholly or in part of wool or worsted, the hair of the alpaca, goat, or other animals, not specially enumerated or provided for, 40 per cent. ad valorem: *Provided*, That from and after the passage of this act, and until the 1st day of October, 1888, the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to classify as woolen cloth all imports of worsted cloth, whether known under the name of worsted cloth or under the names of "worsteds" or "diagonals," or otherwise.

Bunting, 40 per cent. ad valorem.

Women's and children's dress goods, coat linings, Italian cloths, and goods of like description, composed in part of wool, worsted, the hair of the alpaca, goat, or other animals, 40 per cent. ad valorem.

Clothing, ready-made, and wearing apparel of every description, not specially enumerated or provided for, and balmoral skirts and skirting and goods of similar description or used for like purposes, composed wholly or in part of

wool, worsted, the hair of the alpaca, goat, or other animals, made up or manufactured wholly or in part by the tailor, seamstress, or manufacturer, except knit goods, 45 per cent. ad valorem.

Cloaks, dolmans, jackets, talmas, ulsters, or other outside garments for ladies' and children's apparel, and goods of similar description or used for like purposes, composed wholly or in part of wool, worsted, the hair of the alpaca, goat, or other animals, made up or manufactured wholly or in part by the tailor, seamstress, or manufacturer (except knit goods), 45 per cent. ad valorem.

Webbings, gorings, suspenders, braces, beltings, bindings, braids, galloons, fringes, gimps, cords, cords and tassels, dress trimmings, head nets, buttons, or barrel buttons, or buttons of other forms for tassels or ornaments wrought by hand or braided by machinery, made of wool, worsted, the hair of the alpaca, goat, or other animals, or of which wool, worsted, the hair of the alpaca, goat, or other animals is a component material, 50 per cent. ad valorem.

Hemp and jute carpeting 6 cents per square yard.

Floor matting and floor mats exclusively of vegetable substances 20 per cent. ad valorem.

"All other carpets and carpetings, druggets, bockings, mats, rugs, screens, covers, hassocks, bedsides of wool, flax, cotton or parts of either or other material, 40 per cent. ad valorem."

Endless belts or felts for paper or printing machines, 30 per cent. ad valorem.

SEC. 4. That on and after the 1st day of October, 1888, in lieu of the duties heretofore imposed on the articles hereinafter mentioned, there shall be levied, collected, and paid the following rates of duty on said articles severally:

Paper, sized or glued, suitable only for printing paper, 15 per cent. ad valorem.

Printing paper, unsized, used for books and newspapers exclusively, 12 per cent. ad valorem.

Paper boxes, and all other fancy boxes, not otherwise provided for, 25 per cent. ad valorem.

Paper envelopes, 20 per cent. ad valorem.

Paper hangings, and paper for screens or fire-boards, surface-coated paper, and all manufactures of which surface-coated paper is a component material not otherwise provided for, and card-board, paper antiquarian, demy, drawing, elephant, foolscap, imperial, letter, note, and all other paper not specially enumerated or provided for, 25 per cent. ad valorem.

Beads and bead ornaments of all kinds, except amber, 40 per cent. ad valorem.

Blacking of all kinds, 20 per cent. ad valorem.

Bonnets, hats, and hoods for men, women, and children, composed of hair, whalebone, or any vegetable material, and not specially enumerated or provided for, 30 per cent. ad valorem.

Brooms of all kinds, 20 per cent. ad valorem.

Brushes of all kinds, 20 per cent. ad valorem.

Canes and sticks, for walking, finished, 20 per cent. ad valorem.

Card clothing, 20 cents per square foot; when manufactured from tempered steel wire, 40 cents per square foot.

Carriages, and parts of, not specially enumerated or provided for, 30 per cent. ad valorem.

Dolls and toys, 30 per cent. ad valorem.

Fans of all kinds, except palm-leaf fans, of whatever material composed, 30 per cent. ad valorem.

Feathers of all kinds, when dressed, colored, or manufactured, including dressed and finished birds and artificial and ornamental feathers and flowers, or parts thereof, of whatever material composed, not specially enumerated or provided for, 35 per cent. ad valorem.

Friction and lucifer matches of all descriptions, 25 per cent. ad valorem.

Gloves of all descriptions, wholly or partially manufactured, 40 per cent. ad valorem: *Provided*, That gloves made of silk taffeta shall be taxed 50 per cent. ad valorem.

Gun wads of all descriptions, 25 per cent. ad valorem.

Gutta-percha, manufactured, and all articles of hard rubber not specially enumerated or provided for, 30 per cent. ad valorem.

Hair, human, if clean or drawn, but not manufactured, 20 per cent. ad valorem.

Bracelets, braids, chains, rings, curls, and ringlets composed of hair, or of which hair is the component material of chief value, and all manufactures of human hair, 25 per cent. ad valorem.

Hats, materials for: Braids, plaits, flats, willow sheets and squares, fit only for use in making or ornamenting hats, bonnets, and hoods, composed of straw, chip, grass, palm-leaf, willow, hair, whalebone, or any vegetable material, not specially enumerated or provided for, 20 per cent. ad valorem.

Hat bodies of cotton, 30 per cent. ad valorem.

Hatters' plush, composed of silk or of silk and cotton, 15 per cent. ad valorem.

Inks of all kinds, and ink powders, 20 per cent. ad valorem.

Japanned ware of all kinds not specially enumerated or provided for, 30 per cent ad valorem.

Kaolin crude, $1 per ton.

China clay or wrought kaolin, $2 per ton.

Marble of all kinds, in block rough or squared, 40 cents per cubic foot.

Marble, sawed, dressed, or otherwise, including marble slabs and marble paving-tiles, 85 cents per cubic foot.

All manufactures of marble not specially enumerated or provided for, 20 per cent. ad valorem.

Papier-maché, manufactures, articles, and wares of, 25 per cent. ad valorem.

Percussion caps, 30 per cent. ad valorem.

Philosophical apparatus and instruments, 25 per cent. ad valorem.

Umbrella and parasol ribs, and stretcher frames, tips, runners, handles, or other parts thereof, when made in whole or chief part of iron, steel, or any other metal, 30 per cent. ad valorem; umbrellas, parasols, and shades, when covered with silk or alpaca, 50 per cent. ad valorem; all other umbrellas, 30 per cent. ad valorem.

Watches, watch-cases, watch-movements, parts of watches, watch-glasses, and watch-keys, whether separately packed or otherwise, and watch materials not specially enumerated or provided for in this act, 25 per cent. ad valorem.

Webbing, composed of cotton, flax, or a mixture of these materials, not specially enumerated or provided for in this act, 30 per cent. ad valorem.

SEC. 5. That the following amendments to and provisions for existing laws shall take effect on and after the passage and approval of this act:

Section 6 of the act of March 3, 1883, entitled "An act to reduce internal revenue taxation, and for other purposes," providing a substitute for title 33 of the Revised Statutes of the United States, is hereby amended as to certain of the sections and parts of sections or schedules in such substituted title so that they shall be as follows, respectively:

"SEC. 2499. Each and every imported article not enumerated or provided for in any schedule in this title, which is similar, either in material, quality, textures or the use to which it may be applied, to any article enumerated in this title as chargeable with duty, shall pay the same rate of duty which is levied on the enumerated article which it most resembles in any of the particulars before mentioned; and if any non-enumerated article equally resembles two or more enumerated articles on which different rates of duty are chargeable, there shall be levied on such non-enumerated article the same rate of duty as is chargeable on the article which it resembles paying the highest rate of duty; and on articles, not otherwise provided for, manufactured from two or more materials, the duty shall be assessed at the rate at which the dutiable component material of chief value may be chargeable; and the words "component material of chief value," whenever used in this title, shall be held to mean that dutiable component material which shall exceed in value any other single component material found in the article; and the value of each component material shall be determined by the ascertained value of such material in its last form and condition before it became a component material of such article. If two or more rates of duty shall be applicable to any imported article, it shall pay duty at the highest of such rates: *Provided*, That any non-enumerated article similar in material, and quality, and texture, and the use to which it may be applied to any article on the free-list, and in the manufacture of which no dutiable materials are used, shall be free of duty."

SEC. 2502. Schedule A—Chemical products.—By striking out from this schedule the words "distilled spirits containing 50 per cent. of anhydrous alcohol, $1 per gallon;" also, by striking out the words "alcohol containing 94 per cent. anhydrous alcohol, $2 per gallon."

THE FREE-LIST.

SEC. 2503. By striking out the clause in this section commencing with the words "articles the growth, produce, and manufacture of the United States," and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"Articles the growth, produce, and manufacture of the United States, when returned after having been exported without having been advanced in value by any process of manufacture or by labor thereon; casks, barrels, carboys, bags, and other vessels of American manufacture exported filled with American products, or exported empty and returned filled with foreign products, including shooks when returned as barrels or boxes; but proof of the identity of such articles shall be made under general regulations to be prescribed by the Secretary of the Treasury; and if any of such articles are subject to internal tax at the time of exportation, such tax shall be proved to have been paid before exportation, and not refunded: *Provided*, That this clause shall not include any article upon which an allowance of drawback has been made, the reimportation of which is hereby prohibited except upon payment of duties equal to the drawbacks allowed."

The clause relating to "wearing-apparel," etc. (tariff, paragraph 815), is hereby amended so that it shall read as follows:

"Wearing-apparel, implements, instruments, and tools of trade, occupation, or employment, professional books, and other personal effects (not merchandise) of persons arriving in the United States, not exceeding in value $500, and not intended for the use of any other person or persons, nor for sale; but this exemption shall not be construed to include machinery or other articles imported for use in any manufacturing establishment or for sale: *Provided, however*, That the limitation in value above specified shall not apply to wearing apparel and other personal effects which may have been taken from the United States to foreign countries by the persons returning therefrom; and such last-named articles shall, upon production of evidence satisfactory to the collector or officer acting as such that they have been previously exported from the United States by such persons, and have not been advanced in value or improved in condition by any process of manufacture or labor thereon since so exported, be exempt from the payment of duty: *And provided further*, That all articles of foreign production or manufacture which may have been once imported into the United States and subjected to the payment of duty shall, upon reimportation, if not improved in condition, except by repairs, by any means, since their exportation from the United States, be entitled to exemption from duty upon their identity being established, under such rules and regulations as may be prescribed by the Secretary of the Treasury."

"Theatrical scenery and actors' and actresses' wardrobes brought by theatrical managers and professional actors and actresses arriving from abroad for their temporary use in the United States; works of art, drawings, engravings, photographic pictures, and philosophical and scientific apparatus brought by professional artists, lecturers, or scientists arriving from abroad for use by them temporarily for exhibition and in illustration, promotion, and encouragement of art, science, or industry in the United States; and wearing apparel and other personal effects of tourists from abroad visiting the United States shall be admitted to free entry under such regulations as the Secretary of the Treasury may prescribe; and bonds shall be given, whenever required by the Secretary of the Treasury, for the payment to the United States of such duties as may be imposed by law upon any and all such articles as shall not be exported within six months after such importation: *Provided, however*, That the Secretary of the Treasury may, in his discretion, extend such period for a further term of six months in cases where application therefor shall be made."

"Wearing-apparel, old and worn, not exceeding $100 in value, upon production of evidence satisfactory to the collector and naval officer (if any) that the same has been donated and imported in good faith for the relief or aid of indigent or needy persons residing in the United States, and not for sale."

SEC. 6. That section 7 of the act approved March 3, 1883, entitled "An act to reduce internal-revenue taxation, and for other purposes," is hereby amended so that it shall read as follows:

"Whenever imported merchandise is subject to an ad valorem rate of duty, or to a duty based upon or regulated in any manner by the value thereof, the duty shall be assessed upon the actual market value or wholesale price of such merchandise, at the time of exportation to the United States, in the principal markets of the country from whence imported, and in the condition in which such merchandise is there bought and sold for exportation to the United States or consigned to the United States for sale, including the value of all cartons, cases, crates, boxes, sacks, and coverings of any kind, and all other costs, charges, and expenses incident to placing the merchandise in condition packed, ready for shipment to the United States: *Provided*, That if there be used for covering or holding imported merchandise, whether dutiable or free, any material or article, other than the ordinary, usual, and necessary coverings used for covering or holding such merchandise, duty shall be levied and collected thereon at the rate to which such material or article would be subject if imported separately:" *Provided, further*, That so much of the foregoing as relates to boxes, sacks, or coverings shall not apply to boxes, sacks, or such other boxing or covering as may be the usual and necessary covering for machinery or parts thereof.

SEC. 7. That section 8 of the act of March 3, 1883, entitled "An act to reduce internal-revenue taxation, and for other purposes," amending section 2841 of the Revised Statutes of the United States, is hereby further amended so that said section of the Revised Statutes shall be as follows:

"SEC. 2841. Whenever merchandise imported into the United States is entered by invoice, one of the following declarations, according to the nature of the case, shall be filed with the collector of the port, at the time of entry, by the owner, importer, consignee, or agent; which declaration so filed shall be duly signed by the owner, importer, consignee, or agent, before the collector, or before a notary public or other officer duly authorized by law to administer oaths and take acknowledgments, who may be designated by the Secretary of the Treasury to receive such declarations and to certify to the identity of the persons making them; and every officer so designated shall file with the collector of the port a copy of his official signature and seal: *Provided*, That if any of the invoices or bills of lading of any merchandise imported in any one vessel, which should otherwise be embraced in said entry, have not been received at the date of the entry, the declaration may state the fact, and thereupon such merchandise of which the invoices or bills of lading are not produced shall not be included in such entry, but may be entered subsequently."

"Declaration of consignee, importer, or agent.

"I, ——— ———, do solemnly and truly declare that the invoice and bill of lading now presented by me to the collector of ——— are the true and only invoice and bill of lading by me received of all the goods, wares, and merchandise imported in the ———, whereof ——— ——— is master, from ———, for account of any person whomsoever for whom I am authorized to enter the same; that the said invoice and bill of lading are in the state in which they were actually received by me, and that I do not know nor believe in the existence of any other invoice or bill of lading of the said goods, wares, and merchandise; that the entry now delivered to the collector contains a just and true account of the said goods, wares, and merchandise, according to the said invoice and bill of lading; that nothing has been, on my part, nor to my knowledge on the part of any other person, concealed or suppressed, whereby the United States may be defrauded of any part of the duty lawfully due on the said goods, wares, and merchandise; that the said invoice and the declaration therein are in all respects true, and were made by the person by whom the same purports to have been made; and that if at any time hereafter I discover any error in the said invoice, or in the account now rendered of the said goods, wares, and merchandise, or receive any other invoice of the same, I will immediately make the same known to the collector of this district. And I do further solemnly and truly declare that to the best of my knowledge and belief [insert the name and residence of the owner or owners] is [or are] the owner [or owners] of the goods, wares, and merchandise mentioned in the annexed entry; that the invoice now produced by me exhibits the actual cost [if purchased] or the actual market value or wholesale price [if otherwise obtained], at the time of exportation in the principal markets of the country where procured, of the said goods, wares, and merchandise, including the value of all cartons, cases, crates, boxes, sacks, and covering of any kind, and all other costs, charges, and expenses incident to placing said goods, wares, and merchandise in condition packed ready for shipment to the United States, and no other or different discount, bounty, or drawback but such as has been actually allowed on the same."

"Declaration of owner in cases where merchandise has been actually purchased.

"I, ——— ———, do solemnly and truly declare that the entry now delivered by me to the collector of ——— contains a just and true account of all the goods, wares, and merchandise imported by or consigned to me, in the ———, whereof ——— ——— is master, from ———; that the invoice and entry which I now produce contain a just and faithful account of the actual cost of the said goods, wares, and merchandise, including the value of all cartons, cases, crates, boxes, sacks, and coverings of any kind, and all other costs, charges, and expenses incident to placing said goods, wares, and merchandise in condition packed, ready for shipment to the United States, and no other discount, drawback, or bounty but such as has been actually allowed on the same; that I do not know nor believe in the existence of any invoice or bill of lading other than those now produced by me, and that they are in the state in which I actually received them. And I further solemnly and truly declare that I have not in the said entry or invoice concealed or suppressed anything whereby the United States may be defrauded of any part of the duty lawfully due on the said goods, wares, and merchandise; that the said invoice and the declaration thereon are in all respects true, and were made by the person by whom the same purports to have been made; and that if at any time hereafter I discover any error in the said invoice or in the account now produced of the said goods, wares, and merchandise, or receive any other invoice of the same, I will immediately make the same known to the collector of this district."

"Declaration of manufacturer or owner in cases where merchandise has not been actually purchased."

"I, ——— ———, do solemnly and truly declare that the entry now delivered by me to the collector of ——— contains a just and true account of all the goods, wares, and merchandise imported by or consigned to me in the ———, whereof ——— ——— is master, from ———; that the said goods, wares, and merchandise were not actually bought by me, or by my agent, in the ordinary mode of bargain and sale, but that nevertheless the invoice which I now produce contains a just and faithful valuation of the same, at their actual market value or wholesale price at the time of exportation, in the principal markets of the country where procured for my account [or for account of myself or partners]; that the said invoice contains also a just and faithful account of all the cost of finishing said goods, wares, and merchandise to their present condition, including the value of all cartons, cases, crates, boxes, sacks, and coverings of any kind, and all other costs and charges incident to placing said goods, wares, and merchandise in condition packed, ready for shipment to the United States, and no other discount, drawback, or bounty but such as has been actually allowed on the said goods, wares, and merchandise; and the said invoice and the declaration thereon are in all respects true, and were made by the person by whom the same purports to have been made; that I do not know nor believe in the existence of any invoice or bill of lading other than those now produced by me, and that they are in the state in which I actually received them. And I do further solemnly and truly declare that I have not in the said entry or invoice concealed or suppressed anything whereby the United States may be defrauded of any part of the duty lawfully due on the said goods, wares, and merchandise; and that if at any time hereafter I discover any error in the said invoice, or in the account now produced of the said goods, wares, and merchandise, or receive any other invoice of the same, I will immediately make the same known to the collector of this district."

SEC. 8. That any person who shall knowingly make any false or untrue statement in the declarations provided for in the preceding section, or shall aid or procure the making of any such false statement as to any matter material thereto, shall, on conviction thereof, be punished by a fine of not exceeding $5,000, or by imprisonment at hard labor not more than three years, or both, within the discretion of the court: *Provided*, That nothing in this section shall be construed to relieve imported merchandise from forfeiture for any cause elsewhere provided by law.

SEC. 9. That sections 2970 and 2983 of the Revised Statutes of the United States are hereby amended so that the same shall be, respectively, as follows:

"SEC. 2970. Any merchandise deposited in bond in any public or private bonded warehouse may be withdrawn for consumption within three years from the date of original importation, on payment of the duties and charges to which it may be subject by law at the time of such withdrawal: *Provided*, That nothing herein shall affect or impair existing provisions of law in regard to the disposal of perishable or explosive articles."

"SEC. 2983. In no case shall there be any abatement of the duties or allowance made for any injury, damage, or deterioration sustained by any merchandise while deposited in any public or private bonded warehouse: *Provided*, That the duty assessed on merchandise withdrawn from any such warehouse shall be assessed on the quantity withdrawn therefrom at the time of such withdrawal; but no greater allowance for leakage or evaporation of wines, liquors, and distilled spirits shall be made than is or may be allowed by law on domestic spirits or wines in bond: *And provided further*, That nothing in this section as amended shall restrict or in any way affect the liability of the proprietors of bonded warehouses on their bonds: *And provided further*, That nothing herein shall restrain or limit the exercise of the authority conferred on the Secretary of the Treasury by section 2984 of the Revised Statutes."

SEC. 10. That sections 2803 and 3058 of the Revised Statutes be amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 2803. Any baggage or personal effects arriving in the United States in transit to any foreign country may be delivered by the parties having it in charge to the collector of the proper district, to be by him retained, without the payment or exaction of any import duty, or to be forwarded by such collector to the collector of the port of departure, and to be delivered to such parties on their departure for their foreign destination, under such rules, regulations, and fees as the Secretary of the Treasury may prescribe."

"SEC. 3058. All merchandise imported into the United States shall, for the purpose of this title, be deemed and held to be the property of the person to whom the merchandise may be consigned; but the holder of any bill of lading consigned to order and properly indorsed shall be deemed the consignee thereof; and in case of the abandonment of any merchandise to the underwriters, the latter may be recognized as the consignee."

SEC. 11. That authority is hereby given to the Secretary of the Treasury, in his discretion to dispense whenever expedient with the triplicate invoices and consular certificates now required by sections 2853, 2854, 2855 of the Revised Statutes of the United States; and triplicate invoices and consular certificates shall in no case be required when the value of the merchandise shipped by any one consignor, in any one vessel, at one and the same time does not exceed $100; and the Secretary of the Treasury, with the concurrence of the Secretary of State, is hereby authorized to make such general regulations in regard to invoices and consular certificates as in his judgment the public interest may require.

SEC. 12. That all fees exacted and oaths administered by officers of the customs, under or by virtue of existing laws of the United States, upon the entry of imported goods and the passing thereof through the customs, and also upon all entries of domestic goods, wares, and merchandise for exportation, be, and the same are hereby, abolished; and in case of entry of merchandise for exportation, a declaration, in lieu of an oath, shall be filed, in such form and under such regulations as may be prescribed by the Secretary of the Treasury; and the penalties for false statements in such declaration provided in the fourth section of this act shall be applicable to declarations made under this section: *Provided*, That where such fees, under existing laws, constitute, in whole or in part, the compensation of any officer, such officer shall receive, from and after the passage of this act, a fixed sum for each year equal to the amount which he would have been entitled to receive as fees for such services.

SEC. 13. That section 2900 of the Revised Statutes be, and hereby is, amended so as to read as follows:

"SEC. 2900. The owner, consignee, or agent of any imported merchandise which has been actually purchased may at the time, and not afterward, when he shall make and verify his written entry of his merchandise, make such addition in the entry to the cost or value given in the invoice, or *pro forma* invoice, or statement in form of an invoice, which he shall produce with his entry, as in his opinion may raise the same to the actual market value or wholesale price of such merchandise, at the period of exportation to the United States, in the principal markets of the country from which the same has been imported; and the collector within whose district any merchandise, whether the same has been actually purchased or procured otherwise than by purchase, may be imported or entered, shall cause such actual market value or wholesale price thereof to be appraised; and if such appraised value shall exceed by 10 per cent. or more the entered value, then, in addition to the duties imposed by law on the same, there shall be levied and collected a duty of 20 per cent. ad valorem on such appraised value. The duty shall not, however, be assessed upon an amount less than the invoice or entered value, except as elsewhere especially provided in this act."

SEC. 14. That all invoices of imported merchandise shall, at or before the shipment of the merchandise, be produced to the consul, vice-consul, or commercial agent of the United States of the consular district from which the merchandise is imported to the United States, and if there be no consul, vice-consul, or commercial agent for said district, then said invoices shall be produced to the consul, vice-consul, or commercial agent of the district nearest thereto, and shall have indorsed thereon, when so produced, a declaration signed by the purchaser, manufacturer, owner, or agent, setting forth that the invoice is in all respects correct and true; that it contains, if the merchandise was obtained by purchase, a true and full statement of the time when, and the place where, the same was purchased, and the actual cost thereof and of all charges thereon; and that no discounts, bounties, or drawbacks are contained in the invoice but such as have actually been allowed thereon; and when obtained in any other manner than by purchase, the actual market value or wholesale price thereof at the time of exportation to the United States in the principal markets of the country from whence exported; and that no different invoice of the merchandise mentioned in the invoice so produced, has been or will be furnished to any one. If the merchandise was actually purchased, the declaration shall also contain a statement that the currency in which such invoice is made out is the currency which was actually paid for the merchandise by the purchaser.

SEC. 15. That section 2931 of the Revised Statutes be, and hereby is, amended so as to read as follows:

"SEC. 2931. The decision of the collector of customs or officer acting as such at the port of importation and entry, as to the rate and amount of duties to be paid on any merchandise, and the dutiable costs and charges thereon, shall be final and conclusive against all persons interested in such merchandise, unless the owner, importer, consignee, or agent of the merchandise shall, within ten days after and not on any day before the ascertainment and liquidation of the duties by the proper officers of the customs, as well in cases of merchandise entered in bond as for consumption, give notice in writing to the collector if dissatisfied with the aforesaid decision, setting forth therein, distinctly and specifically, and in respect to each entry, the reasons of his objection thereto, and shall also, within thirty days after the date of such ascertainment and liquidation, appeal therefrom to the Secretary of the Treasury, who, on receiving such appeal, shall forthwith call upon the collector for a report thereon; and the collector shall thereupon, if he adheres to his decision, set forth, specifically and in detail, to the Secretary, the reasons therefor; and the decision of the Secretary on such appeal shall be final and conclusive, and such merchandise, or costs and charges, shall be liable to duty accordingly, unless suit shall be brought, within ninety days after the decision of the Secretary of the Treasury on such appeal, for any duties which shall have been paid before the date of such decision on such merchandise, or costs and charges, or within ninety days after the payment of duties paid after the decision of the Secretary. No suit shall be begun or maintained for the recovery of any duties alleged to have been erroneously or illegally exacted, until the decision of the Secretary of the Treasury shall have been first had on such appeal, unless the decision of the Secretary shall be delayed more than ninety days from the date of such appeal. And when a suit shall be brought by the United States to recover the additional duties found due on any ascertainment and liquidation thereof, and not paid, the defendant or defendants shall not be permitted to set up any plea or matter in defense excepting such as shall have been set forth in a protest and appeal made as herein prescribed."

SEC. 16. That the section of the Revised Statutes numbered 3012 shall be, and hereby is, amended by adding at the end of said section the following words:

"And there shall be attached to the said bill of particulars, when served as aforesaid, a copy of each and every such protest or notice of dissatisfaction, and of every appeal relied upon by the plaintiff or plaintiffs in said suit; and the said bill of particulars shall declare the date of liquidation; and a bill of particulars, having been served as aforesaid, shall not thereafter be amended by the plaintiff, or by the court on the plaintiff's motion, so as to increase the total sum claimed therein as having been exacted in excess."

SEC. 17. That no suit which by this act, or by any law of the United States, is

permitted to be begun against a collector of customs to recover money alleged to have been illegally exacted by him on imported merchandise, shall hereafter be begun or maintained in any court of any State of the United States, but each and every such suit shall be begun in the circuit court of the United States for the district in which such alleged illegal action shall have been made.

SEC. 18. That section 3012½ of the Revised Statutes shall be, and hereby is, amended so as to read as follows:

"Whenever it shall be shown to the satisfaction of the Secretary of the Treasury (first) that, in any case of unascertained or estimated duties, more money has been paid to or deposited with a collector of customs than the law required to be paid or deposited; and also (second) whenever the Secretary of the Treasury shall have decided, on an appeal to him as herein provided, that more money has been paid to or deposited with a collector of customs than the law required; and also (third) whenever any judgment shall have been recovered and entered, in any court of the United States, against a collector of customs, for duties illegally exacted by him on imported merchandise, and a certificate of probable cause shall have been entered in said suit, in compliance with the provisions and requirements of section 989 of the Revised Statutes, from which judgment the Attorney-General shall certify, in conformity with the act of March 3, 1875 (chapter 136), that no appeal or writ of error will be taken by the United States, and from which judgment the Secretary of the Treasury shall also be satisfied that no such appeal or writ of error ought to be taken; and also (fourth) whenever any suit or suits have been begun against a collector of customs to recover money exacted by him and paid under protest, and an appeal, as required by law, and a bill of particulars has been served therein on the defendant or his attorney, as required by law, and when by the legal effect of any judgment of a court of the United States, satisfactory to the Attorney-General and the Secretary of the Treasury as aforesaid, the said exaction of such duties shall have been declared illegal, and protests, appeals, and bills of particulars have been made according to the law in force at the time of importation, and the proper officers of the customs shall, under the instructions of the Secretary of the Treasury, have reliquidated the entries covered, by said suit or suits, and bill or bills of particulars, according to the principles and rules of law prescribed by said judgment, and the district attorney appearing of record for the defendant shall certify that such suits have been discontinued, the Secretary of the Treasury shall, in each and all of the before-mentioned cases, always excepting judgments or 'judgment cases' in suits commonly known as 'charges and commission' suits, which last named shall only be paid in pursuance of a specific appropriation therefor, draw his warrant upon the Treasurer in favor of the person or persons entitled to the overpayment, or the sum expressed in said judgment, or the sum thus found due on reliquidation of the entries in discontinued suits, including costs payable by law, directing the Treasurer to refund and pay the same out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated. The necessary moneys therefor are hereby appropriated, and this appropriation shall be deemed a permanent indefinite appropriation."

SEC. 19. That section 2927 of the Revised Statutes is hereby amended by the addition of the following words thereto:

"No allowances for damages to goods, wares, and merchandise imported into the United States shall hereafter be made in the estimation and liquidation of duties thereon; but the importer thereof may abandon to the Government all or any portion of goods, wares, and merchandise included in any invoice, and be relieved from the payment of the duties on the portion so abandoned: *Provided*, That the portion so abandoned shall amount to 10 per cent. or over of the total value of the invoice."

SEC. 20. That any person who shall give or offer to give or promise to give, excepting for such duties or fees as have been levied or required according to the forms of law, any money or thing of value, directly or indirectly, to any officer or servant of the customs or of the United States, in connection with or pertaining to the importation, or appraisement, or entry, or examination, or inspection of goods, wares, or merchandise, including herein any baggage, or of the liquidation of the entry thereof, shall, on conviction thereof, be fined not less than $100 nor more than $5,000, or be imprisoned at hard labor not more than two years, or both, at the discretion of the court; and evidence of such giving, or offering, or promising to give, satisfactory to the court in which such trial is had, shall be regarded as *prima facie* evidence that such giving, or offering, or promising was contrary to law, and shall put upon the accused the burden of proving that such act was innocent and not done with an unlawful intention.

SEC. 21. That any officer or servant of the customs or of the United States who shall, excepting for lawful duties or fees, demand, exact, or receive from any person, directly or indirectly, any money or thing of value in connection with or pertaining to the importation, appraisement, entry, examination, or inspection of goods, wares, or merchandise, including herein any baggage or liquidation of the entry thereof, shall, on conviction thereof, be fined not less than $100 nor more than $5,000, or be imprisoned at hard labor not more than two years, or both, at the discretion of the court; and evidence of such demanding, exacting, or receiving satisfactory to the court in which such trial is had, shall be *prima facie* evidence that such demanding, exacting, or receiving was contrary to law, and shall put upon the accused the burden of proving that such act was innocent and not with an unlawful intention.

SEC. 22. That section 2864 of the Revised Statutes be, and hereby is, amended so as to read as follows:

"SEC. 2864. That any owner, importer, consignee, agent, or other person who shall, with intent to defraud the revenue, make or attempt to make any entry of imported merchandise by means of any fraudulent or false invoice, affidavit, letter, or paper, or by means of any false statement, written or verbal, or who shall be guilty of any willful act or omission by means whereof the United States shall be deprived of the lawful duties, or any portion thereof, accruing upon the merchandise, or any portion thereof, embraced or referred to in such invoice, affidavit, letter, paper, or statement, or affected by such act or omission, shall for each offense be fined in any sum not exceeding $5,000 nor less than $50, or be imprisoned for any time not exceeding two years, or both; and, in addition to such fine, such merchandise, or the value thereof, shall be forfeited, which forfeiture shall only apply to the whole of the merchandise, or the value thereof, in the case or package containing the particular article or articles of merchandise to which such fraud or alleged fraud relates; and anything contained in any act which provides for the forfeiture or confiscation of an entire invoice in consequence of any item or items contained in the same being undervalued be, and the same is hereby, repealed."

SEC. 23. That all imported goods, wares, and merchandise which may be in the public stores or bonded warehouses or on shipboard within the limits of any port of entry, or remaining in the customs offices, on the day and year when this act, or any provision thereof, shall go into effect, except as otherwise provided in this act, shall be subject to no other duty, upon the entry thereof for consumption, than if the same were imported respectively after that day; and all goods, wares, and merchandise remaining in bonded warehouses on the day and year this act, or any provision thereof, shall take effect, and upon which the duties shall have been paid, shall be entitled to a refund of the difference between the amount of duties paid and the amount of duties said goods, wares, and merchandise would be subject to if the same were imported respectively after that date.

SEC. 24. That sections 3011 and 3013 of the Revised Statutes be, and hereby are, repealed as to all importations made after the date of this act.

SEC. 25. That on and after the 1st day of October, 1888, all taxes on manufactured chewing-tobacco, smoking-tobacco, and snuff, all special taxes upon manufacturers of and dealers in said articles, and all taxes upon wholesale and retail dealers in leaf-tobacco be, and are hereby, repealed: *Provided*, That there shall be allowed a drawback or rebate of the full amount of tax on all original and unbroken factory packages of smoking and manufactured tobacco and snuff held by manufacturers, factors, jobbers, or dealers on said 1st day of October, if claim therefor shall be presented to the Commissioner of Internal Revenue prior to the 1st day of January, 1889, and not otherwise. No claim shall be allowed and no drawback shall be paid for an amount less than $5, and all sums required to satisfy claims under this act shall be paid out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated. It shall be the duty of the Commissioner of Internal Revenue, with the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury, to adopt such rules and regulations, and to prescribe and furnish such blanks and forms as may be necessary to carry this section into effect.

SEC. 26. That on and after the 1st day of October, 1888, manufacturers of cigars shall each pay a special tax of $3 annually, and dealers in tobacco shall each pay a special tax of $1 annually. Every person whose business it is to sell or offer for sale cigars, cheroots, or cigarettes shall, on and after the 1st day of October, 1888, be regarded as a dealer in tobacco, and the payment of any other special tax shall not relieve any person who sells cigars, cheroots, or cigarettes from the payment of this tax: *Provided*, That no manufacturer of cigars, cheroots, or cigarettes shall be required to pay a special tax as a dealer in tobacco, as above defined, for selling his own products at the place of manufacture: *Provided*, That the bond required to be given in conformity with the provisions of Title XXXV of the Revised Statutes of the United States, by every person engaging in the manufacture of cigars in the internal-revenue districts of the United States, shall be in such penal sum as the collector of internal revenue may require, not less than $100, with an addition of $10 for each person proposed to be employed by such person in making cigars.

SEC. 27. That the sum of $20,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary, be, and the same is hereby appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for the alteration of dies, plates, and stamps, for furnishing blanks and forms, and for such other expenses as shall be incident to the collection of special taxes at the reduced rates provided in this act.

SEC. 28. That section 3361 of the Revised Statutes of the United States, and all laws and parts of laws which impose restrictions upon the sale of leaf-tobacco, be, and are hereby, repealed.

SEC. 29. That whenever in any statute denouncing any violation of the internal-revenue laws as a felony, crime, or misdemeanor, there is prescribed in such statute a minimum punishment, less than which minimum no fine, penalty, imprisonment, or punishment is authorized to be imposed, every such minimum punishment is hereby abolished; and the court or judge in every such case shall have discretion to impose any fine, penalty, imprisonment, or punishment not exceeding the limit authorized by such statute, whether such fine, penalty, imprisonment, or punishment be less or greater than the said minimum so prescribed.

SEC. 30. That no warrant, in any case under the internal-revenue laws, shall be issued upon an affidavit making charges upon information and belief, unless such affidavit is made by a collector or deputy collector of internal revenue or by a revenue agent; and, with the exception aforesaid, no warrant shall be issued except upon a sworn complaint, setting forth the facts constituting the offense and alleging them to be within the personal knowledge of the affiant. And the United States shall not be liable to pay any fees to marshals, clerks, commissioners, or other officers for any warrant issued or arrest made in prosecutions under the internal-revenue laws, unless there be a conviction or the prosecution has been approved, either before or after such arrest, by the attorney of the United States for the district where the offense is alleged to have been committed, or unless the prosecution was commenced by information or indictment.

SEC. 31. That whenever a warrant shall be issued by a commissioner or other judicial officer having jurisdiction for the arrest of any person charged with a criminal offense, such warrant, accompanied by the affidavit on which the same was issued, shall be returnable before some judicial officer named in section 1014 of the Revised Statutes residing in the county of arrest, or if there be no such judicial officer in that county, before some such judicial officer residing in another county nearest to the place of arrest; and the judicial officer, before whom the warrant is made returnable as herein provided, shall have exclusive authority to make the preliminary examination of every person arrested as aforesaid, and to discharge him, admit him to bail, or commit him to prison, as the case may require: *Provided*, That this section shall not apply to the Indian Territory.

SEC. 32. That the circuit courts of the United States, and the district courts or judges thereof exercising circuit-court powers, and the district courts of the Territories, are authorized to appoint, in different parts of the several districts in which said courts are held, as many discreet persons to be commissioners of the circuit courts as may be deemed necessary; and said courts, or the judges thereof, shall have authority to remove at pleasure any commissioners heretofore or hereafter appointed in said districts.

SEC. 33. That the Commissioner of Internal Revenue, with the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury, may compromise any civil or criminal case, and may reduce or remit any fine, penalty, forfeiture, or assessment under the internal-revenue laws.

SEC. 34. That section 3176 of the Revised Statutes be amended so as to read as follows:

"SEC. 3176. The collector or any deputy collector in any district shall enter into and upon the premises, if it be necessary, of any person therein who has taxable property and who refuses or neglects to render any return or list required, or who renders a false or fraudulent return or list, and make, according to the best information which he can obtain, including that derived from the evidence elicited by the examination of the collector, and on his own view and information, such list or return, according to the form prescribed, of the objects liable to tax owned or possessed or under the care or management of such person, and the Commissioner of Internal Revenue shall assess the tax thereon, including the amount, if any, due for special tax, and a penalty of 25 per cent., and he may add to such tax interest at the rate of 10 per cent. per annum thereon from and after the date when such tax became due and payable. The interest so added to the tax shall be collected at the same time and in the same manner as the tax. And the list or return so made and subscribed by such collector or deputy collector shall be deemed good and sufficient for all legal purposes."

SEC. 35. That nothing in this act shall in any way change or impair the force or effect of any treaty between the United States and any other government, or any laws passed in pursuance of or for the execution of any such treaty, so long as such treaty shall remain in force in respect of the subjects embraced in this act; but whenever any such treaty, so far as the same respects said subjects, shall expire or be otherwise terminated, the provisions of this act shall be in force in all respects in the same manner and to the same extent as if no such treaty had existed at the time of the passage hereof.

SEC. 36. That section 3255 of the Revised Statutes of the United States be amended by striking out all after said number and substituting therefor the following:

"And the Commissioner of Internal Revenue, with the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury, may exempt distillers of brandy made exclusively from apples, peaches, grapes, or other fruits from any provision of this title relating to the manufacture of spirits, except as to the tax thereon, when in his judgment it may seem expedient to do so.

"The Secretary of the Treasury may exempt all distilleries which mash less than 25 bushels of grain per day from the operations of the provisions of this title relating to the manufacture of spirits, except as to the payment of the tax, which said tax shall then be levied and collected on the capacity of said distilleries; and said distilleries may, at the discretion of said Secretary, then be run and operated without storekeepers, or 'storekeepers and gaugers.' And the Commissioner of Internal Revenue, with the approval of said Secretary, may establish special warehouses in which he may authorize to be deposited the product of any number of said distilleries to be designated by him, and in which any distiller operating any such distillery may deposit his product, which, when so deposited, shall be subject to all the laws and regulations as to bonds, tax, removals, and otherwise as other warehouses. The Commissioner of Internal Revenue, with the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury, is hereby authorized and directed to make such rules and regulations as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this section: *Provided*, That such regulations shall be adopted as will require that all the spirits manufactured shall be subject to the payment of the tax according to law."

SEC. 37. That the provisions of an act entitled "An act relating to the production of fruit brandy, and to punish frauds connected with the same," approved March 3, 1877, be extended and made applicable to brandy distilled from apples or peaches, or from any other fruit the brandy distilled from which is not now required, or hereafter shall not be required, to be deposited in a distillery warehouse: *Provided*, That each of the warehouses established under said act, or which may hereafter be established, shall be in charge either of a storekeeper or a storekeeper and gauger, at the discretion of the Commissioner of Internal Revenue.

SEC. 38. That section 3332 of the Revised Statutes, and the supplement thereto, shall be amended so that said section shall read as follows:

"When a judgment of forfeiture, in any case of seizure, is recovered against any distillery used or fit for use in the production of distilled spirits, because no bond has been given, or against any distillery used or fit for use in the production of spirits, having a registered producing capacity of less than 150 gallons a day, every still, doubler, worm, worm-tub, mash-tub, and fermenting-tub therein shall be sold, as in case of other forfeited property, without being mutilated or destroyed. And in case of seizure of a still, doubler, worm, worm-tub, fermenting-tub, mash-tub, or other distilling apparatus of any kind whatsoever, for any offense involving forfeiture of the same, it shall be the duty of the seizing officer to remove the same from the place where seized to a place of safe storage; and said property so seized shall be sold as provided by law, but without being mutilated or destroyed."

SEC. 39. That whenever it shall be made to appear to the United States court or judge having jurisdiction that the health or life of any person imprisoned for any offense, in a county jail or elsewhere, is endangered by close confinement, the said court or judge is hereby authorized to make such order and provision for the comfort and well-being of the person so imprisoned as shall be deemed reasonable and proper.

SEC. 40. That all clauses of section 3244 of the Revised Statutes, and all laws amendatory thereof, and all other laws which impose any special taxes upon manufacturers of stills, retail dealers in liquors, and retail dealers in malt liquors, are hereby repealed.

SEC. 41. That this act is intended and shall be construed as an act supplementary and amendatory to existing laws, and the rates of duty and modification of clauses, provisions, and sections as herein specifically made are intended and shall be construed as a repeal of all clauses, provisions, and sections in conflict herewith, but as to all clauses, provisions, and sections in existing laws not herein specifically changed, modified, or amended the rates of duty now existing shall be and remain in full force and effect. This act shall be in force from and after October 1, 1888, except as herein otherwise provided.

The amendment reported by the Committee on Finance is to strike out all after the enacting clause of the bill and to insert in lieu of the matter stricken out:

TOBACCO.

That on and after the 1st day of February, 1889, manufacturers of cigars shall each pay a special tax of $3 annually: *Provided*, That the bond required to be given in conformity with the provisions of Title XXXV of the Revised Statutes of the United States, by every person engaging in the manufacture of cigars in the internal-revenue districts of the United States, shall be in such penal sum as the collector of internal revenue may require, not less than $100, with an addition of $10 for each person proposed to be employed by such person in making cigars.

That on and after the 1st day of February, 1889, the internal-revenue taxes on cigars, cheroots, and on all cigarettes weighing more than 3 pounds per thousand, which shall be manufactured and sold or removed for consumption or sale after that date shall be $1.50 per thousand, and on cigarettes weighing less than 3 pounds to the thousand, 50 cents per thousand, and shall be paid by the manufacturer thereof.

That all laws now in force whereby farmers and producers of tobacco are restricted in the sale and disposition of the same, and all laws and parts of laws so far as the same relate to the internal-revenue taxes on the articles hereinafter specified, whether imported or manufactured in the United States, be, and the same are hereby, repealed, to take effect on the 1st day of February, 1889, namely: The taxes on manufactured tobacco and snuff, and the special taxes required by law to be paid by manufacturers of and dealers in leaf-tobacco, retail dealers in leaf-tobacco, dealers in manufactured tobacco, snuff, and cigars, peddlers of tobacco, snuff, and cigars, and manufacturers of snuff: *Provided*, That on all original and unbroken factory packages of smoking and manufactured tobacco, snuff, cigars, cheroots, and cigarettes, held by manufacturers, or dealers, at the time such repeal or reduction shall go into effect, upon which the tax has been paid, there shall be a rebate in favor of said manufacturer or dealer, to the full amount and extent of the tax so paid thereon or to the full amount of the tax so reduced, as the case may be; but the same shall not apply in any case where the claim has not been presented within ninety days following the date when such repeal shall take effect; and no claim shall be allowed for a less amount than $10; and any special-tax stamp covering taxes repealed by this act may be redeemed for the portion of the special-tax year unexpired at the time of the repeal, when the amount claimed for such stamp shall not be less than $10; and all sums required to satisfy claims under this act shall be paid out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated; and it shall be the duty of the Secretary of the Treasury to adopt such rules and regulations and to prescribe and furnish such blanks and forms as may be necessary to carry this section into effect.

The sum of $20,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary, be, and the same is hereby, appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for the alteration of dies, plates, and stamps, for furnishing blanks and forms, and for such other expenses as shall be incident to the collection of special taxes at the reduced rates provided in this act.

SEC. 2. That all internal-revenue laws limiting, restricting, or regulating the manufacture, sale, or exportation of all tobacco and snuff, except as herein provided, are hereby repealed, to take effect on the 1st day of February, 1889; and that there shall be no drawback allowed upon any such articles which shall be entered for export on or after that date: *Provided*, That all laws now in force shall remain and have full force and effect in respect to all offenses committed, liabilities incurred, or rights accruing or accrued prior to the date when the repeal of the taxes specified in this act shall take effect.

ALCOHOL IN THE INDUSTRIAL ARTS.

SEC. 3. That the Commissioner of Internal Revenue be, and hereby is, authorized, with the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury, upon the filing of such bond as he may prescribe, to establish warehouses, to be designated as bonded alcohol warehouses, to be used exclusively for the storing of distilled spirits, of an alcoholic strength of not less than 180 per cent. of proof spirit as defined by section 3249 of the Revised Statutes of the United States, and in the distillers' original casks or packages, each of which warehouses shall be in the charge of a storekeeper, or storekeeper and gauger, to be appointed, assigned, transferred, and paid in the same manner that storekeepers and storekeepers and gaugers for distillery warehouses are now appointed, assigned, transferred, and paid. Every such warehouse shall be under the control of the collector of internal revenue of the district in which such warehouse is located, shall be in the joint custody of the storekeeper, or storekeeper and gauger, and the proprietor thereof, and kept securely locked, and shall at no time be unlocked or opened, or remain open, except in the presence of such storekeeper, or storekeeper and gauger, or other person who may be designated to act for him, as provided in the case of distillery warehouses. And such warehouses shall be under such further regulations as the Commissioner of Internal Revenue, with the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury, may prescribe.

SEC. 4. That distilled spirits of an alcoholic strength of not less than 180 per cent. of proof spirit as defined by section 3249 of the Revised Statutes of the United States may, after having been properly gauged, marked, stamped, and branded in distillery warehouses, under regulations to be prescribed by the Commissioner of Internal Revenue, and approved by the Secretary of the Treasury, and also stamped as hereinafter provided, be removed in bond from distillery bonded warehouses to a bonded alcohol warehouse, under such regulations and after making such entries, and executing and filing with the collector of the district in which such spirits were manufactured such bonds and bills of lading, and giving such other additional security as may be prescribed by the Commissioner of Internal Revenue and approved by the Secretary of the Treasury.

SEC. 5. That such distilled spirits, after being deposited in such bonded alcohol warehouse, may, under such regulations as the Commissioner of Internal Revenue, with the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury, shall prescribe, be removed to secure store-rooms, and used in manufacturing establishments, as hereinafter provided, without payment of the internal-revenue tax, in the industrial arts, and in the manufacture of articles, preparations, compounds, acetic and other acids, and medicinal drugs, or chemicals made according to the direction of the United States or other national pharmacopœia or according to formulas, as published in any of the dispensatories in common use among physicians or apothecaries in the United States. But nothing herein contained shall be held or construed as authorizing the use of any distilled spirits upon which the internal-revenue tax has not been paid, in the manufacture of tinctures, proprietary articles, wines, liquors, cordials, bitters, or other alcoholic compounds which are used or sold as beverages, or which, in the opinion of the Commissioner of Internal Revenue, may be so used or sold. All articles excluded from the provisions of this act, manufactured or stored on any premises to which distilled spirits have been removed free of tax under the provisions of this act, and all articles manufactured or stored in violation of this act shall be forfeited to the United States. Every person desiring to have a bonded alcohol warehouse or store-room established, intending to commence or continue business herein, shall file with the collector of internal revenue of the district in which the building or room to be used as such warehouse or store-room is located a notice in duplicate of his desire and intention, stating the location of the building or room, and such other information as the Commissioner of Internal Revenue, with the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury, may require; and at the time of the filing of such notice shall execute a bond in duplicate in the form prescribed by the Commissioner of Internal Revenue, conditioned that he will comply with all the provisions of law and regulations made in pursuance thereof pertaining to the business to be carried on by him, and that he will not use, or allow to be used, any distilled spirits entered into or removed from his warehouse or store-room, by any person or persons whatsoever for any of the uses not authorized by this act, and that in case any such spirits shall be so used he shall pay, or cause to be paid, to the United States a sum double the amount of the tax on all such spirits so used, and shall pay all penalties incurred or fines imposed on him for violation of any of the provisions of this act. Said bonds shall each be with at least two sureties, approved by the collector of the district, and for the penal sum of not less than double the amount of the tax on the estimated quantity of such spirits that are intended to be entered in such warehouse or store-room as the case may be, during a period of sixty days, but in no case shall the penal sum of said warehouse bond be less than $100,000, nor that of the store-room bond be less than $5,000, and the said bonds shall be strengthened and renewed at such times, and shall contain such other conditions as the Commissioner of Internal Revenue may require. The collector may refuse to approve said bond when, in his judgment, the situation of the warehouse or store-room is such as will enable the warehouse proprietor or the manufacturer to defraud the United States; and in case of such refusal the proprietor or manufacturer may appeal to the Commissioner of Internal Revenue, whose decision in the matter shall be final. One copy of the notice and application and bond will be forwarded to the Commissioner of Internal Revenue and one of each will be retained by the collector.

SEC. 6. That all distilled spirits intended to be entered for deposit in a bonded alcohol warehouse, before being removed from the distillery warehouse, shall have affixed to each cask or package an engraved stamp indicative of such intention, to be provided and furnished to the several collectors as in the case of other stamps, and to be charged to them and accounted for in the same manner, and for the expense attending the providing and affixing such stamps 10 cents for each stamp shall be paid to the collector of the district on making the entry for such removal.

SEC. 7. That any manufacturer, after having provided, at his own expense, on the premises, and connected with his manufactory, a secure store-room, in which all spirits used in the manufactory shall be exclusively entered and stored, and to be separated by a secure wall from all other parts of such manufactory, and with one door only entering therein, and all other openings secured and fastened, and approved by the collector of the district and the Commissioner of Internal Revenue, after the filing of the notice and bond as required by this act, may, under such bonds and securities as the Commissioner of Internal Revenue, with the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury, may prescribe, remove distilled spirits of an alcoholic strength of not less than 180 per cent. of proof spirit as defined by section 3249 of the Revised Statutes of the United States, in distillers' original casks or packages, without payment of the internal-revenue tax, from a bonded alcohol warehouse, as defined in this act, to his store-room for use in his manufactory as hereinbefore provided. But such spirits shall remain in the original packages until withdrawn for immediate use. Every such store-room shall be under the control of the collector of internal revenue of the district in which such manufactory is located, and shall be in the charge of a storekeeper, or storekeeper and gauger, and in the joint custody of the storekeeper, or storekeeper and gauger, and the proprietor thereof, and kept securely locked, and shall at no time be unlocked or opened, or remain open, except in the presence of such storekeeper, or storekeeper and gauger, or other person who may be designated to act for him, as provided in the case of distillery warehouses, and such storekeeper, or storekeeper and gauger shall be appointed, assigned, transferred, and paid in the same manner that storekeepers or storekeepers and gaugers for distillery warehouses are now appointed, as signed, transferred, and paid. And in case the official bond of the storekeeper, or storekeeper and gauger has been approved before the passage

of this act, such officer shall file a new official bond, which must be approved by the Commissioner of Internal Revenue before he is assigned to duty under the provisions of this act.

SEC. 8. The storekeeper or storekeeper and gauger assigned to such store-room shall, in addition to keeping such books and making such reports, concerning spirits entered in, and delivered and removed from such store-room, as may be prescribed by the Commissioner of Internal Revenue, with the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury, have access to every part of such manufactory in which such distilled spirits are used, and make a report each month to the Commissioner of Internal Revenue, stating the kind and quantity of distilled spirits used during the month, the purpose for which used, and furnish such other information as the Commissioner of Internal Revenue, with the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury, may require and prescribe; and such store-rooms shall be under such further regulations as the Commissioner of Internal Revenue, with the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury, may prescribe.

SEC. 9. That under such regulations as the Commissioner of Internal Revenue, with the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury, may prescribe, any proprietor of a bonded alcohol warehouse, who has filed with the collector a bond with at least two sureties, and in the form and sum specified in this act, may admix with the distilled spirits entered in his warehouse, in the presence of the storekeeper, methylic alcohol, wood alcohol, or wood naphtha, which shall cause such distilled spirits to be unfit for use as a beverage; and such distilled spirits, after being so methylated, and drawn off in the presence of the storekeeper, or storekeeper and gauger, and under the supervision of a gauger to be designated by the collector, into packages of a form and material to be prescribed by the Commissioner of Internal Revenue, and different from those of casks in which distilled spirits are usually contained, such packages to be gauged, marked, stamped, and branded by the gauger as the Commissioner of Internal Revenue, with the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury, may prescribe, may be sold and removed from such warehouse without the payment of the internal-revenue tax. But distilled spirits produced in different months shall not be drawn into the same package, and each package shall not be of less capacity than 5 wine gallons, nor of greater capacity than 25 wine gallons, nor contain more than 39 proof gallons of spirits. Methylated spirits may be used in the arts and manufactures, and for burning, and in the manufacture of articles and compounds, except wines, liquors, cordials, bitters, and other alcoholic compounds used and sold as beverages, or in the opinion of the Commissioner of Internal Revenue calculated or intended to be so used or sold. And the methylation of such spirits shall be by the addition of methylic alcohol, wood alcohol, or wood naptha in such quantities, and in such manner, in the presence of the storekeeper, or storekeeper and gauger, as the Commissioner of Internal Revenue, with the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury, may prescribe. And no such methylated spirits shall be permitted on any premises in which the business of a distiller, rectifier, wholesale liquor dealer, or retail liquor dealer is carried on, or in premises connected therewith by any private or internal communication. Every person intending to withdraw methylated spirits from any bonded alcohol warehouse shall file with the collector of the district in which the spirits are to be used an application, under oath, setting forth the purpose for which the spirits are to be withdrawn, the estimated quantity to be so withdrawn and used during a period of one year; the place where the spirits are to be stored, and a full description of the premises on which the spirits are to be so used; also, the name and residence of every person interested, or to be interested, in the business to be carried on at said premises; and the application shall be in such form, and shall contain such further information as the Commissioner of Internal Revenue may by regulation require.

Upon the receipt of such application and after making such inquiries as will satisfy him that the statements therein contained are true, the collector shall, upon the applicant filing with him a bond with satisfactory sureties and in a penal sum of not less than double the amount of the tax on the spirits intended to be withdrawn during the period of one year, issue a permit, under seal, for the withdrawal of said spirits for the purpose or purposes to be therein specified; said bond and permit shall be in such form as the Commissioner of Internal Revenue may prescribe, and may be renewed, and shall be canceled, or revoked at his discretion.

And the Commissioner of Internal Revenue is authorized to have such permits printed from engraved plates and with serial numbers, as in the case of special tax stamps.

No methylated spirits shall be withdrawn from any bonded alcohol warehouse except upon a permit issued as aforesaid, which permit shall, at the time each withdrawal of spirits is made thereunder, be presented by the person to whom it is issued, or by his duly authorized agent, to the storekeeper in charge of the warehouse, who shall indorse upon the permit the quantity of spirits withdrawn, giving the number of packages, the serial numbers of packages and stamps, the number of proof gallons, the date when tax is due by three years' limit, and the date of withdrawal in each case. But in no case shall the quantity of spirits withdrawn under any permit during the period for which the permit is issued exceed the quantity of spirits specified therein. And the sale, removal, and use of such methylated spirits shall be under such regulations and restrictions as the Commissioner of Internal Revenue, with the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury, may prescribe. And said Commissioner may, in his discretion, exact bonds and returns of persons who purchase or receive, use, or transport methylated spirits. And any internal-revenue officer shall, at all times, have right of access to all premises on which such methylated spirits are received, stored, or used. And the provisions of sections 3276 and 3277 of the Revised Statutes of the United States, so far as applicable, are hereby made to apply to such premises and to the proprietors or occupants thereof. And any person who shall demethylate, or separate methylic alcohol, wood alcohol, or wood naphtha from any such distilled spirits, or use, or by willful neglect, cause to be used, any such methylated spirits for any of the uses not authorized by this act, or who shall separate or recover, or cause the separation or recovery of any alcohol permitted to be used in the manufacture of any of the articles by the provisions of this act free of tax, shall on conviction pay a penalty of not less than $500 nor more than $5,000, and be imprisoned not less than six months nor more than three years.

SEC. 10. That every proprietor of any such bonded alcohol warehouse who shall have filed the application and bond, and every manufacturer who shall have provided a suitable store-room, which have been approved by the collector of the district and the Commissioner of Internal Revenue, shall provide a book to be prepared and kept in such form as the Commissioner of Internal Revenue may prescribe, and shall make daily entries therein of all spirits received, with the name of the person from whom the spirits were purchased, and the name of the distiller by whom and the district in which the spirits were produced, the serial number of each cask or package, and the actual contents of each when received by him. He shall also, in like manner, enter in said book the quantity of spirits removed each day, and the name, occupation, and address of the person to whom the spirits are sold; and if a manufacturer, he shall enter in said book the quantity removed from the store-room, and if less than a cask or package, the actual quantity removed from any cask or package; and he shall also enter the name of all articles in the manufacture of which such spirits have been used, as authorized in this act. And every person keeping the book herein required shall, on or before the 10th day of each month, make a full and accurate transcript of all entries made during the preceding month, and shall, after verifying the same by oath, forward the same, through the collector of the district, to the Commissioner of Internal Revenue. The book herein required shall be kept on the premises described in the application, and shall at all times be open for the inspection of any revenue officer; and such officer shall at all times have access to said premises for the purpose of inspecting the same, or any stock, utensil, apparatus, or appliances therein, where such spirits are used, and the owner or occupant of said premises shall, on demand of such officer, furnish needful assistance to enable the said officer to make such examination and report. And any person who shall willfully use, or by neglect cause to be used, any distilled spirits, entered in his bonded alcohol warehouse or store-room established under this act, in any manner except as expressly provided and permitted in this act, shall, on conviction, pay a penalty of not less than $1,000 nor more than $5,000, and be imprisoned not less than six months nor more than three years.

SEC. 11. That any person who, under the provisions of this act, or under any regulation issued in pursuance hereof, shall neglect or refuse to make or render any entry, bond, or account, or shall make or render any false or fraudulent entry, bond, or account, or shall, in qualifying as a surety to any bond required by this act, make any false or fraudulent statement or representation as to the property owned by him, and any person who shall fail to use any stamp, label, tag, mark, caution-notice, or any other device prescribed by this act, or by any regulation issued in pursuance of this act, or shall fraudulently use or re-use the same, shall for any such offense, on conviction had, be fined not less than $500, nor more than $5,000, and be imprisoned not less than six months, nor more than three years; and any vessel, package, or other inclosure not stamped, marked, or branded as required by law and this act, all spirits or other materials contained in such vessel, cask, or package, or inclosure, shall be forfeited to the United States. Nothing in this act shall be construed as extending the time within which the tax on distilled spirits shall be paid beyond the limit fixed by law within which such spirits must be withdrawn from distillery warehouses upon payment of the tax. And, in case any spirits withdrawn from a distillery warehouse under the provisions of this act are not used as authorized by this act within the time fixed by the distiller's warehousing bond for the payment of the tax, the Commissioner of Internal Revenue shall assess the tax against the person liable, under bond as warehouse proprietor or manufacturer at the time, for the proper use and custody of the spirits, and such tax shall be collected as in the case of other assessed taxes.

It shall not be lawful for any person to receive, use, or store any methylated distilled spirits free of internal-revenue tax under the provisions of this act on any premises within 600 feet in a direct line from any premises used as a distillery or for rectifying distilled spirits.

Any person who shall receive or use distilled spirits free of tax under the provisions of this act, and shall knowingly or willfully omit, neglect, or refuse to do, or cause to be done, any of the things required to be done by this act, or any regulation made pursuant thereto, or shall do anything by this act prohibited, or declared thereby to be unlawful, if there be no specific penalty or punishment imposed by this act for the neglecting, omitting, or refusing to do the thing required, or for the doing, or causing to be done, the thing prohibited, or declared unlawful, he shall, on conviction, pay a penalty at the discretion of the court, not exceeding $5,000. And the Commissioner of Internal Revenue is authorized to determine the quality and strength of the methylic alcohol, wood alcohol, or wood naphtha that may be used in methylating spirits. And the Commissioner of Internal Revenue may also, at his discretion, require the maker of methylated spirit to provide a separate store-room and vats, with suitable locks and fastenings, for keeping and storing methylic alcohol, wood alcohol, or wood naphtha, used in methylating and mixing, and may require samples to be furnished from such vats, or other receptacles, for chemical analysis and for his approval.

SEC. 12. That on and after the 1st day of February, 1889, the following sections shall constitute and be a substitute for Title XXXIII of the Revised Statutes of the United States.

TITLE XXXIII.

DUTIES UPON IMPORTS.

SEC. 2502. There shall be levied, collected, and paid upon all articles imported from foreign countries, and mentioned in the schedules herein contained, the rates of duty which are, by the schedules and paragraphs, respectively prescribed, namely:

SCHEDULE A.—CHEMICAL PRODUCTS.

1. Acids.—Acetic or pyroligneous acid, not exceeding the specific gravity of one and forty-seven one thou-andths, 1½ cents per pound; exceeding the specific gravity of one and forty-seven one-thousandths, 4 cents per pound.
2. Boracic acid, 5 cents per pound.
3. Chromic acid, 10 cents per pound.
4. Citric acid, 10 cents per pound.
5. Tannic acid or tannin, 25 cents per pound.
6. Tartaric acid, 10 cents per pound.
7. Alcoholic perfumery, including cologne-water and other toilet waters and all alcoholic compounds not specially enumerated or provided for in this act, $2 per gallon and 25 per cent. ad valorem.
8. Alizarine assistant, or soluble oil, or oleate of soda, or Turkey-red oil, 8 cents per pound.
9. Alumina, alum, alum cake, patent alum, sulphate of alumina, and aluminous cake, and alum in crystals or ground, six-tenths of 1 cent per pound.
10. Ammonia.—Carbonate of ammonia, 1½ cents per pound.
11. Muriate of ammonia, or sal-ammoniac, three-fourths of 1 cent per pound.
12. Sulphate of ammonia, one-half of 1 cent per pound.
13. Amylic alcohol, or fusel oil, 10 per cent. ad valorem.
14. Blacking of all kinds, 25 per cent. ad valorem.
15. Blue-vitriol, or sulphate of copper, 2 cents per pound.
16. Bone-char, suitable for use in decolorizing sugars, 25 per cent. ad valorem.
17. Borax.—Crude borax, or borate of soda or borate of lime, 3 cents per pound; refined borax, 5 cents per pound.
18. Camphor, refined, 4 cents per pound.
19. Cement.—Roman, Portland, and other hydraulic cement, in barrels, sacks, or other packages, 8 cents per 100 pounds; in bulk, 7 cents per 100 pounds; other cement, 20 per cent. ad valorem.
20. Chalk.—Prepared, precipitated, French, and red chalk, 1 cent per pound; all other chalk preparations not specially enumerated or provided for in this act, 20 per cent. ad valorem.
21. Clays or earths.—Unwrought or unmanufactured, not specially enumerated or provided for in this act, $1.50 per ton; wrought or manufactured, not specially enumerated or provided for in this act, $3 per ton; China clay, or kaolin, $3 per ton.
22. Chloroform, 30 cents per pound.
23. Cobalt, oxide of, 40 cents per pound.
24. Collodion and all compounds of pyroxyline, by whatever name known, 30 cents per pound; rolled or in sheets, but not made up into articles, 60 cents per pound; if in finished or partly finished articles, 40 cents per pound and 25 per cent. ad valorem.
25. Coloring for brandy, wine, beer, or other liquors, 50 per cent. ad valorem.
26. Copperas or sulphate of iron, three-tenths of 1 cent per pound.
27. Dextrine, burnt starch, gum substitute, or British gum, 1 cent per pound.
28. Drugs, such as barks, beans, berries, balsams, buds, bulbs, and bulbous roots, and excrescences, such as nutgalls, fruits, flowers, dried fibers, grains, gums, and gum resins, herbs, leaves, lichens, mosses, nuts, roots and stems, spices, vegetables, seeds (aromatic, not garden seeds), and seeds of morbid

growth, weeds, woods used expressly for dyeing, and dried insects, any of the foregoing which are not edible, but which have been advanced in value or condition by refining or grinding, or by other process of manufacture, and not specially enumerated or provided for in this act, 10 per cent. ad valorem.

29. Coal-tar preparations.—All coal-tar colors or dyes, by whatever name known, and not specially enumerated or provided for in this act, 35 per cent. ad valorem.

30. All preparations of coal-tar, not colors or dyes, not specially enumerated or provided for in this act, 20 per cent. ad valorem.

31. Ethers.—Sulphuric ether and spirits of nitrous ether, 50 cents per pound.

32. Butyric ether and other fruit ether, oils or essences, $1.25 per pound.

33. Ethers of all kinds not specially enumerated or provided for in this act, 75 cents per pound.

34. Extracts and decoctions of logwood and other dye-woods, extract of sumac, and extracts of hemlock and other barks, such as are commonly used for dyeing or tanning, not specially enumerated or provided for in this act, 1 cent per pound.

35. Gelatine, glue, and isinglass or fish-glue, valued at not above 7 cents per pound, 1½ cents per pound; valued above 7 cents per pound, 25 per cent. ad valorem.

36. Glycerine.—Unrefined, of the specific gravity of 1.25 or less at a temperature of 60° Fahrenheit, 1 cent per pound; refined, 4½ cents per pound.

37. Indigo.—Extracts of or pastes of, three-fourths of 1 cent per pound; carmined, 10 cents per pound.

38. Ink.—Writing-ink in casks, or in bottles or jugs holding 1 pint or more, 40 cents per gallon; in bottles or jugs holding less than 1 pint, 50 cents per gallon; otherwise than in casks, bottles, or jugs, 60 cents per gallon.

39. Ink-powders, printers' ink, and all other ink, not specially enumerated or provided for in this act, 30 per cent. ad valorem.

40. Iodine, resublimed, 30 cents per pound.

41. Iodoform, $1.20 per pound.

42. Lead products.—Acetate of lead, white, 5½ cents per pound; acetate of lead, brown, 3½ cents per pound.

43. Litharge, 3 cents per pound.

44. Nitrate of lead, 3 cents per pound.

45. Orange mineral, 3½ cents per pound.

46. Red lead, 3 cents per pound.

47. White lead, dry or in pulp, or ground or mixed with oil, 3 cents per pound.

48. Licorice, extracts of, in paste, rolls, or other forms, 5 cents per pound.

49. Magnesia.—Carbonate of magnesia, medicinal, 4 cents per pound.

50. Calcined magnesia, 8 cents per pound.

51. Sulphate of magnesia, or Epsom salts, one-half of 1 cent per pound.

52. Morphia, or morphine, and all salts thereof, 50 cents per ounce.

53. Oils.—Castor oil, 50 cents per gallon.

54. Cod-liver oil, 15 cents per gallon.

55. Croton oil, 30 cents per pound.

56. Flaxseed or linseed oil, 25 cents per gallon of 7½ pounds weight.

57. Cotton-seed oil, 10 cents per gallon of 7½ pounds weight.

58. Hemp-seed oil and rape-seed oil, 10 cents per gallon.

59. Olive oil, fit for salad purposes, 35 cents per gallon.

60. Seal, whale, and other fish oil not specially enumerated or provided for in this act, 8 cents per gallon.

61. Opium, aqueous extract of, for medicinal uses, and tincture of, as laudanum, and all other liquid preparations of opium, not specially enumerated or provided for in this act, 40 per cent. ad valorem.

62. Paints and colors.—Baryta, sulphate of, or barytes, manufactured, one-fourth of 1 cent per pound.

63. Blues, such as Berlin, Prussian, Chinese, and all others, containing ferrocyanide of iron, dry or ground in water or oil, 6 cents per pound.

64. Blanc-fixe, or satin white, or artificial sulphate of barytes, three-fourths of 1 cent per pound.

65. Black, made from bone, ivory, or vegetable, under whatever name known, including bone-black and lamp-black, dry or ground in oil or water, 25 per cent. ad valorem.

66. Chrome yellow, chrome green, and all other chromium colors in which lead and bichromate of potash or soda are component parts, dry, or ground in water or oil, 4½ cents per pound.

67. Ocher and ochery earths, sienna and sienna earths, umber and umber earths, not specially enumerated or provided for in this act, dry, one-fourth of 1 cent per pound; ground in oil, 1½ cents per pound.

68. Ultramarine blue, 4½ cents per pound.

69. Wash blue, containing ultramarine, 3 cents per pound.

70. Vermilion red, or colors containing quicksilver, dry or ground in oil or water, 12 cents per pound.

71. Whiting and Paris white, dry, one-half of 1 cent per pound; ground in oil, or putty, 1 cent per pound.

72. Zinc, oxide of, dry, 1½ cents per pound; ground in oil, 1¾ cents per pound.

73. All other paints and colors, whether dry or mixed, or ground with water or oil, including lakes, crayons, smalts, and frostings, not specially enumerated or provided for in this act, and artists' colors of all kinds, in tubes or otherwise, 25 per cent. ad valorem.

74. Phosphorus, 10 cents per pound.

75. Plaster of Paris, ground or calcined, $1.50 per ton.

76. Potash.—Bichromate and chromate of potash, 3 cents per pound.

77. Hydriodate, iodide, and iodate of potash, 50 cents per pound.

78. Nitrate of potash or saltpeter, refined, 1 cent per pound.

79. Prussiate of potash, red, 10 cents per pound; prussiate of potash, yellow, cents per pound.

80. Preparations.—All medical preparations, known as essences, ethers (solid or fluid extracts), mixtures, spirits, tinctures, and medicated wines, including medicinal proprietary preparations, of which alcohol is a component part, not specially enumerated or provided for in this act, 40 cents per pound.

81. All medicinal preparations, including medicinal proprietary preparations, such as anodynes, cerates, conserves, cordials, decoctions, drops, emulsions, essences, extracts (solid or fluid), infusions, juices, liniments, lozenges, mixtures, mucilages, oils, ointments, oleo-resins, pastes, pastilles, pills, plasters, powders, resins, salves, sirups, suppositories, tonics, troches, vinegars, wafers, or waters of any of which alcohol is not a component part, and not specially enumerated or provided for in this act, 25 per cent. ad valorem.

82. Preparations known as alkalies, alkaloids, distilled oils, essential oils, expressed oils, rendered oils, and all combinations of the foregoing, and all chemical compounds and salts, not specially enumerated or provided for in this act, 25 per cent. ad valorem.

83. Preparations used as applications to the hair, mouth, teeth, or skin, such as cosmetics, dentifrices, pastes, pomades, powders, and tonics, including all known as toilet preparations, not specially enumerated or provided for in this act, 50 per cent. ad valorem.

84. Santonine, $1 per pound.

85. Soap.—Castile-soap, 1½ cents per pound; fancy, perfumed, and all descriptions of toilet-soap, 15 cents per pound; all other soaps, not specially enumerated or provided for in this act, 20 per cent. ad valorem.

86. Soda.—Bicarbonate of soda or supercarbonate of soda or saleratus, 1½ cents per pound.

87. Hydrate or caustic soda, 1 cent per pound.

88. Bichromate and chromate of soda, 3 cents per pound.

89. Sal-soda, or soda crystals, and soda-ash, one-fourth of 1 cent. per pound.

90. Silicate of soda, or other alkaline silicate, one-half of 1 cent per pound.

91. Sulphate of soda, or salt cake or niter-cake, 20 per cent. ad valorem.

92. Strychnia, or strychnine, and all salts thereof, 50 cents per ounce.

93. Sulphur.—Refined, in rolls, $8 per ton; sublimed, or flowers of, $10 per ton.

94. Sumac, ground, three-tenths of 1 cent per pound.

95. Tartar, cream of, and patent tartar, 6 cents per pound.

96. Tartars and lees crystals, partly refined, 4 cents per pound.

97. Tartrate of soda and potassa, or Rochelle salts, 3 cents per pound.

98. Varnishes, including so-called gold size or japan, 40 per cent. ad valorem; and on spirit varnishes for the alcohol contained therein, $2 per gallon additional.

SCHEDULE B.—EARTHENWARE AND GLASSWARE.

99. Common brown earthenware, stoneware, and crucibles, not ornamented or decorated, 20 per cent. ad valorem.

100. China, porcelain, parian, and bisque, earthen, stone and crockery ware, including plaques, ornaments, charms, vases, and statuettes, painted, tinted, enameled, printed, or gilded, or otherwise decorated or ornamented in any manner, 55 per cent. ad valorem; if plain white and not ornamented or decorated in any manner, 50 per cent. ad valorem.

101. All other earthen, stone, and crockery ware, white, glazed, or edged, and other manufactures composed of earthy or mineral substances, not specially enumerated or provided for in this act, 50 per cent. ad valorem.

102. Tiles and brick, other than fire-brick, not glazed, ornamented, painted, enameled, or decorated, 20 per cent. ad valorem; ornamented, glazed, painted, enameled, or decorated and encaustic, 45 per cent. ad valorem.

103. Fire-brick, not glazed, enameled, ornamented, or decorated in any manner, $1.25 per ton; glazed, enameled, ornamented, or decorated, 45 per cent. ad valorem.

104. Gas-retorts, $3 each.

105. Slate.—Slates, slate-pencils, slate chimney-pieces, mantels, slabs for tables, and all other manufactures of slate, not specially enumerated or provided for in this act, 30 per cent. ad valorem.

106. Roofing-slates, 25 per cent. ad valorem.

GLASS.

107. Plain green, and colored, molded or pressed, and plain flint, and lime glass bottles, holding not less than 1 pint, and demijohns, and carboys (covered or uncovered), and other plain molded or pressed green and colored and flint or lime glassware, not specially enumerated or provided for in this act, 1 cent per pound. Plain green, and colored, molded or pressed, and plain flint, and lime glass bottles, and vials holding less than 1 pint, 1½ cents per pound.

108. All articles enumerated in the preceding paragraph, if filled, and not otherwise provided for in this act, and the contents are subject to an ad valorem rate of duty, or to a rate of duty based upon the value, the value of such bottles, vials, or other vessels shall be added to the value of the contents for the ascertainment of the dutiable value of the latter; but if filled, and not otherwise provided for in this act, and the contents are not subject to an ad valorem rate of duty, or to rate of duty based on the value, or are free of duty, such bottles, vials, or other vessels shall pay, in addition to the duty, if any, on their contents, the rates of duty prescribed in the preceding paragraph: *Provided*, That no article manufactured from glass described in the preceding paragraph shall pay a less rate of duty than 40 per cent. ad valorem.

109. Glass and glassware of all kinds (not including plate-glass, silvered or looking-glass plates, or cylinder crown or common window-glass, hereinafter specially provided for), when cut, engraved, painted, colored, printed, stained, gilded, or otherwise ornamented or decorated, and hand, pocket, or table mirrors not exceeding in size 144 square inches, with frames or cases, of whatever material composed, or without frames or cases, 45 per cent. ad valorem.

110. All cut, engraved, painted, or otherwise ornamented or decorated glass bottles, decanters, or other vessels of glass shall, if filled, pay duty, in addition to any duty chargeable on the contents, as if not filled, unless otherwise specially provided for in this act.

111. Unpolished cylinder, crown, and common window-glass, not exceeding 10 by 15 inches square, 1¼ cents per pound; above that, and not exceeding 16 by 24 inches square, 1⅝ cents per pound; above that, and not exceeding 24 by 30 inches square, 2¼ cents per pound; all above that, 2½ cents per pound.

112. Cylinder and crown glass, polished, not exceeding 16 by 24 inches square, 4 cents per square foot; above that, and not exceeding 24 by 30 inches square, 6 cents per square foot; above that, and not exceeding 24 by 60 inches square, 20 cents per square foot; above that, 40 cents per square foot.

113. Fluted, rolled, or rough plate-glass, not including crown, cylinder, or common window-glass, not exceeding 10 by 15 inches square, three-fourths of 1 cent per square foot; above that, and not exceeding 16 by 24 inches square, 1 cent per square foot; above that, and not exceeding 24 by 30 inches square, 1½ cents per square foot; all above that, 2 cents per square foot; and all fluted, rolled, or rough plate-glass, weighing over 100 pounds per 100 square feet, shall pay an additional duty on the excess at the same rates herein imposed.

114. Cast polished plate-glass, unsilvered, not exceeding 10 by 15 inches square, 3 cents per square foot; above that, and not exceeding 16 by 24 inches square, 5 cents per square foot; above that, and not exceeding 24 by 30 inches square, 8 cents per square foot; above that, and not exceeding 24 by 60 inches square, 25 cents per square foot; all above that, 50 cents per square foot.

115. Cast polished plate-glass, silvered, or looking-glass plates, not exceeding 10 by 15 inches square, 4 cents per square foot; above that, and not exceeding 16 by 24 inches square, 6 cents per square foot; above that, and not exceeding 24 by 30 inches square, 10 cents per square foot; above that, and not exceeding 24 by 60 inches square, 35 cents per square foot; all above that, 60 cents per square foot.

116. But no looking-glass plates, or plate-glass silvered, when framed, shall pay a less rate of duty than that imposed upon similar glass of like description not framed, but shall pay in addition thereto 30 per cent. ad valorem upon such frames.

117. Plate-glass, silvered or unsilvered, and cylinder, crown, or common window-glass, when beveled, etched, engraved, stained, colored, or otherwise ornamented or decorated, shall be subject to a duty of 10 per cent. ad valorem in addition to the rates otherwise chargeable thereon.

118. All manufactures of glass, or of which glass shall be the component material of chief value, not especially enumerated or provided for in this act, 45 per cent. ad valorem.

SCHEDULE C.—METALS.

Iron and steel:

119. Iron ore, including manganiferous iron ore, also the dross or residuum from burnt pyrites, 75 cents per ton. Sulphur ore, as pyrites, or sulphuret of iron in its natural state, containing not more 3½ per cent. of copper, 75 cents per ton; *Provided*, That ore containing more than 2 per cent. of copper shall pay, in addition thereto, 1½ cents per pound for the copper contained therein: *And provided further*, That in levying and collecting the duty on iron ore no deduction shall be made from the weight of the ore on account of moisture which may be chemically or physically combined therewith.

120. Iron in pigs, iron kentledge, spiegeleisen, wrought and cast scrap iron, and scrap-steel, three-tenths of 1 cent per pound; but nothing shall be deemed

scrap-iron or scrap-steel except waste or refuse iron or steel that has been in actual use and is fit only to be remanufactured.

121. Bar-iron, rolled or hammered, comprising flats not less than 1 inch wide, nor less than three-eighths of 1 inch thick, eight-tenths of 1 cent per pound; round iron not less than three-fourths of 1 inch in diameter, and square iron not less than three-fourths of 1 inch square, nine-tenths of 1 cent per pound; flats less than 1 inch wide or less than three-eighths of 1 inch thick; round iron less than three-fourths of 1 inch and not less than seven-sixteenths of 1 inch in diameter; and square iron less than three-fourths of 1 inch square, 1 cent per pound.

122. Round iron, in coils or rods, less than seven-sixteenths of 1 inch in diameter, and bars or shapes of rolled iron, not specially enumerated or provided for in this act, 1.1 cents per pound: *Provided*, That all iron in slabs, blooms, loops, or other forms less finished than iron in bars, and more advanced than pig-iron, except castings, shall be rated as iron in bars, and pay duty accordingly; and none of the above iron shall pay a less rate of duty than 35 per cent. ad valorem: *Provided further*, That all iron bars, blooms, billets, or sizes or shapes of any kind, in the manufacture of which charcoal is used as fuel, shall be subject to a duty of not less than $22 per ton.

123. Cast-iron pipe of every description, nine-tenths of 1 cent per pound.

124. Cast-iron vessels, plates, stove-plates, andirons, sadirons, tailors' irons, hatters' irons, and castings of iron, not specially enumerated or provided for in this act, 1.2 cents per pound.

125. Castings of malleable iron, not specially enumerated or provided for in this act, 1¼ cents per pound.

126. Anvils, or parts thereof, of iron or steel, 2 cents per pound.

127. Iron or steel anchors, or parts thereof of iron or steel, mill-irons and mill-cranks of wrought-iron, and wrought-iron for ships, and forgings of iron or steel, or of combined iron and steel, for vessels, steam-engines, and locomotives, or parts thereof, weighing each 25 pounds or more, 1.8 cents per pound.

128. Axles, parts thereof, axle bars, axle blanks, or forgings for axles, whether of iron or steel, without reference to the stage or state of manufacture, 2 cents per pound.

129. Blacksmiths' hammers and sledges, track tools, wedges, and crowbars, whether of iron or steel, 2½ cents per pound.

130. Beams, girders, joists, angles, channels, car-truck channels, TT columns and posts, or parts or sections of columns and posts, deck and bulb beams, and building forms together with all other structural shapes of iron or steel, 1.1 cents per pound.

131. Boiler or other plate, iron or steel, except saw-plates herein after provided for, not thinner than No. 10 wire gauge, sheared or unsheared, and skelp iron or steel, sheared or rolled in grooves, valued at 2 cents per pound or less, 1 cent per pound; valued above 2 cents and not above 3 cents per pound, 1.2 cents per pound; valued above 3 cents and not above 4 cents per pound, 1.6 cents per pound; valued above 4 cents and above 7 cents per pound, 2 cents per pound; valued above 7 cents and not above 10 cents per pound, 2.8 cents per pound; valued above 10 cents and not above 13 cents per pound, 3½ cents per pound: valued above 13 cents per pound, 45 per cent. ad valorem: *Provided*, That all plate-iron or steel thinner than No. 10 wire gauge shall pay duty as iron or steel sheets.

132. Boiler or other tubes or pipes, or flues, or stays of wrought-iron or steel, 2½ cents per pound.

133. Bolts, with or without threads or nuts, or bolt-blanks, and finished hinges or hinge-blanks, whether of iron or steel, 2½ cents per pound.

134. Chain or chains of all kinds, made of iron or steel, not less than three-fourths of 1 inch in diameter, 1.6 cents per pound; less than three-fourths of 1 inch and not less than three-eighths of 1 inch in diameter, 1.8 cents per pound; less than three-eighths of 1 inch in diameter, 3 cents per pound.

135. Forged shotgun barrels, rough-bored, 10 per cent. ad valorem.

136. Forging of iron or steel, or forged iron and steel combined of whatever shape, or in whatever stage of manufacture, not specially enumerated or provided for in this act, 2.3 cents per pound: *Provided*, That no forgings of iron or steel, or forgings of iron and steel combined, by whatever process made, shall pay a less rate of duty than 45 per cent. ad valorem.

137. Hoop, or band, or scroll, or other iron or steel, valued at 3 cents per pound or less, 8 inches or less in width, and less than three-eighths of 1 inch thick and not thinner than No. 10 wire gauge, 1 cent per pound; thinner than No. 10 wire gauge and not thinner than No. 20 wire gauge, 1.1 cents per pound; thinner than No. 20 wire gauge, 1.3 cents per pound: *Provided*, That hoop or band iron, or hoop or band steel, cut to length, or wholly or partially manufactured into hoops or ties, for baling purposes, barrel hoops of iron or steel, and hoop or band iron or hoop or band steel flared or splayed, shall pay two-tenths of 1 cent per pound more duty than that imposed on the hoop or band iron or steel from which they are made.

138. Nails.—Cut nails and cut spikes of iron or steel, 1 cent per pound.

139. Horseshoe nails, heb nails, and all other wrought iron or steel nails, not specially enumerated or provided for in this act, 4 cents per pound.

140. Wire nails made of wrought iron or steel, 2 inches and longer, not lighter than No. 12 wire gauge, 2 cents per pound; from 1 inch to 2 inches in length, and lighter than No. 12 and not lighter than No. 16 wire gauge, 2½ cents per pound; shorter than 1 inch and lighter than No. 16 wire gauge, 4 cents per pound.

141. Railway-bars, made of iron and steel, and railway-bars made in part of steel, T-rails, and punched iron or steel flat rails, seven-tenths of 1 cent per pound.

142. Railway fish-plates or splice-bars, made of iron or steel, 1 cent per pound.

143. Rivets of iron or steel, 2½ cents per pound.

144. Sheets, of iron or steel, common or black, including all iron or steel commercially known as common or black taggers iron or steel, and skelp iron or steel; valued at 3 cents per pound or less: Thinner than No. 10 and not thinner than No. 20 wire gauge, 1.1 cents per pound; thinner than No. 20 wire gauge and not thinner than No. 25 wire gauge, 1.2 cents per pound; thinner than No 25 wire gauge and not thinner than No. 29 wire gauge, 1.4 cents per pound; thinner than No. 29 wire gauge, 1.5 cents per pound: *Provided*, That all common or black sheet-iron or sheet-steel not thinner than No. 10 wire gauge shall pay a duty as plate-iron or plate-steel.

145. Sheets, of iron or steel, corrugated or crimped, 1.4 cents per pound: *Provided*, That on all iron or steel sheets or plates and on all hoop, band, or scroll iron or steel, excepting on what are known commercially as tin-plates, terne-plates, and taggers tin, and hereafter provided for, when galvanized or coated with zinc or spelter, or other metals, or any alloy of those metals, three-fourths of 1 cent per pound additional duty shall be paid.

146. Sheet-iron or sheet-steel, polished, planished, or glanced, by whatever name designated, 2½ cents per pound: *Provided*, That plate or sheet or taggers iron or steel, by whatever name designated, other than the polished, planished, or glanced herein provided for, which has been pickled or cleaned by acid, or by any other material or process, or which is cold rolled, shall pay one-quarter of 1 cent per pound more duty than the corresponding gauges of common or black sheet or taggers iron or steel.

147. Sheets or plates, of iron or steel, or taggers iron or steel coated with tin or lead, or with a mixture of which these metals, or either of them, is a component part, by the dipping or any other process, and commercially known as tin-plates, terne-plates, and taggers tin, 1 cent per pound.

148. Spikes, nuts, and washers, and horse, mule, or ox shoes, of wrought iron or steel, 1.8 cents per pound.

149. Wheels, or parts thereof, made of iron or steel, and steel-tired wheels for railway purposes, whether wholly or partly finished, and iron or steel locomotive, car, or other railway tires, or parts thereof, wholly or partly manufactured, 2½ cents per pound; and ingots, cogged ingots, blooms, or blanks for the same, without regard to the degree of manufacture, 1½ cents per pound.

150. Wire rods.—Rivet, screw, nail, fence, and other iron or steel wire rods, whether round, oval, flat, or square, in coils or loops or in any other shape, not smaller than No. 6 wire gauge, valued at 3 cents or less per pound, six-tenths of 1 cent per pound; and iron or steel flat, with longitudinal ribs for the manufacture of fencing, valued at 3 cents or less per pound, six-tenths of 1 cent per pound: *Provided*, That all iron or steel rods, whether rolled or drawn, smaller than No. 6 wire gauge, shall be classed and dutiable as wire.

151. Wire.—Wire made of iron or steel not smaller than No. 10 wire gauge, 1½ cents per pound; smaller than No. 10 and not smaller than No. 16 wire gauge, 1¾ cents per pound; smaller than No. 16 and not smaller than No. 26 wire gauge, 2½ cents per pound; smaller than No. 26 wire gauge, 3 cents per pound: *Provided*, That iron or steel wire covered with cotton, silk, or other material, and wire commonly known as crinoline, corset, and hat wire, shall pay 4 cents per pound in addition to the foregoing rates: *And provided further*, That no article made from iron or steel wire, or of which iron or steel wire is a component part of chief value, shall pay a less rate of duty than the iron or steel wire from which it is made either wholly or in part: *And provided further*, That iron or steel wire cloths, and iron or steel wire nettings made in meshes of any form, shall pay a duty equal in amount to that imposed on iron or steel wire of the same gauge and 2 cents per pound in addition thereto. There shall be paid on galvanized iron or steel wire (except fence-wire) one-half of 1 cent per pound in addition to the rate imposed on the wire of which it is made; on iron wire-rope and wire-strand, 1 cent per pound in addition to the rate imposed on the wire of which it is made; on steel wire-rope and wire-strand, 2 cents per pound in addition to the rates imposed on the wire of which it is made: *Provided further*, That all iron or steel wire valued at more than 10 cents per pound shall pay a duty of not less than 45 per cent. ad valorem.

152. Files, file-banks, rasps, and floats, of all cuts and kinds: Four inches in length and under, 25 cents per dozen; over 4 inches in length and under 9 inches, 75 cents per dozen; 9 inches in length and under 14 inches, $1.30 per dozen; 14 inches in length and over, $2 per dozen.

153. Steel ingots, cogged ingots, blooms, and slabs by whatever process made; die blocks or blanks; billets and bars and tapered or beveled bars; steamer, crank, and other shafts; shafting; wrist or crank pins; connecting rods and piston rods; pressed, sheared, or stamped shapes; saw plates, wholly or partially manufactured; hammer molds or swaged steel; gun-barrel molds not in bars; alloys used as substitutes for steel tools; all descriptions and shapes of dry land, loam, or iron-molded steel castings; sheets and plates not specially enumerated or provided for in this act; steel in all forms and shapes not specially enumerated or provided for in this act; all of the above valued at 1 cent per pound or less, five-tenths of 1 cent per pound; valued above 1 cent and not above 1.4 cents per pound, six-tenths of 1 cent per pound; valued above 1.4 cents and not above 1.8 cents per pound, eight-tenths of 1 cent per pound; valued above 1.8 cents and not above 2.2 cents per pound, nine-tenths of 1 cent per pound; valued above 2.2 cents and not above 3 cents per pound, 1.2 cents per pound; valued above 3 cents and not above 4 cents per pound, 1.6 cents per pound; valued above 4 cents and not above 7 cents per pound, 2 cents per pound; valued above 7 cents and not above 10 cents per pound, 2.8 cents per pound; valued above 10 cents and not above 13 cents per pound, 3½ cents per pound; valued above 13 cents per pound, 45 per cent. ad valorem.

154. Plates.—Steel plates engraved, stereotype plates, electrotype plates, and plates of other materials, engraved or lithographed, for printing, 25 per cent. ad valorem.

155. Saws.—Cross-cut saws, 6 cents per linear foot; mill, pit, and drag saws, not over 9 inches wide, 8 cents per linear foot; over 9 inches wide, 13 cents per linear foot; circular saws, 30 per cent. ad valorem; hand, back, and all other saws, not especially enumerated or provided for in this act, 40 per cent. ad valorem.

GENERAL PROVISIONS.

156. No allowance or reduction of duties for partial loss or damage in consequence of rust or of discoloration shall be made upon any description of iron or steel, or upon any partly manufactured article of iron or steel, or upon any manufacture of iron and steel.

157. All metal produced from iron or its ores, which is cast and malleable, of whatever description or form, without regard to the percentage of carbon contained therein, whether produced by cementation, or converted, cast, or made from iron or its ores, by the crucible, Bessemer, Clapp-Griffiths, pneumatic, Thomas-Gilchrist, basic, Siemens-Martin, or open-hearth process, or by the equivalent of either, or by a combination of two or more of the processes, or their equivalents, or by any fusion or other process which produces from iron or its ores a metal either granular or fibrous in structure, which is cast and malleable, excepting what is known as malleable-iron castings, shall be classed and denominated as steel.

158. All articles not specially enumerated or provided for in this act, wholly or partly manufactured, made from sheet, plate, hoop, band, or scroll iron or steel herein provided for, or of which such sheet, plate, hoop, band, or scroll iron or steel shall be the material of chief value, shall not pay a lower rate of duty than that imposed on the sheet, plate, hoop, band or scroll iron or steel from which they are made, or which shall be the material of chief value.

159. On all iron or steel bars, rods, strips, or steel sheets, of whatever shape, other than the polished, planished, or glanced sheet-iron or sheet-steel hereinbefore provided for, and on all iron or steel bars of irregular shape or section, which are cold rolled, cold hammered, or polished in any way in addition to the ordinary process of hot rolling or hammering, there shall be paid one-fourth of 1 cent, per pound in addition to the rates provided in this act; and on steel circular saw plates there shall be paid 1 cent per pound in addition to the rate provided in this act.

Miscellaneous:

160. Antimony, as regulus or metal, three-fourths of 1 cent per pound.

161. Argentine, albata, or German silver, unmanufactured, 25 per cent. ad valorem.

162. Brass, in bars or pigs, old brass, clippings from brass or Dutch-metal, and old sheathing, or yellow metal, fit only for remanufacture, 1½ cents per pound.

163. Bronze powder, 15 cents per pound; bronze or Dutch metal, in leaf, 10 per cent. ad valorem.

164. Bouillons, or cannetille, metal thread, filé or gespinst, and epaulets, galloons, laces, knots, stars, tassels, and wings of gold, silver, or other metal, 25 per cent. ad valorem.

165. Chromate of iron, or chromic ore, 15 per cent. ad valorem.

166. Copper.—Copper imported in the form of ores, 1½ cents per pound on each pound of fine copper contained therein.

167. Regulus of copper and black or coarse copper and copper cement, 1¼ cents per pound on each pound of fine copper contained therein.

168. Old copper, fit only for remanufacture, clippings from new copper, and all composition metal of which copper is a component material of chief value, not specially enumerated or provided for in this act, 1¼ cents per pound.

169. Copper in plates, bars, ingots, Chili or other pigs, and in other forms, not manufactured, not specially enumerated or provided for in this act, 2 cents per pound.

170. Copper in rolled plates called braziers' copper, sheets, rods, pipes, and copper bottoms, and all manufactures of which copper shall be the component material of chief value, not specially enumerated or provided for in this act, also sheathing or yellow metal of which copper is not the component material of chief value, and not composed wholly or in part of iron ungalvanized, 35 per cent. ad valorem.

171. Cutlery.—Swords, sword-blades, and side-arms, 35 per cent. ad valorem.

172. Table knives, forks, steels, and all carving, butchers', cooks', hunting, kitchen, bread, butter, vegetable, fruit, cheese, plumbers', painters', palette, and artists' knives of all sizes, finished or unfinished, valued at not more than $1 per dozen pieces, 20 cents per dozen; valued at more than $1 and not more than $3, 50 cents per dozen; valued at more than $3 and not more than $8, $1 per dozen; valued at more than $8, $2 per dozen; and in addition upon all the above named articles 30 per cent. ad valorem.

173. Penknives or pocket-knives of all kinds, knife-blades, razors, and razor-blades, 50 cents per dozen blades, and 25 per cent. ad valorem.

174. Gold-leaf, $2 per package of 500 leaves.

175. Hollow-ware, coated, glazed, or tinned, 2½ cents per pound.

176. Lead.—Lead ore and lead dross, 1½ cents per pound: *Provided*, That lead ore containing silver or silver ore containing lead shall pay a duty of 1½ cents per pound.

177. Lead in pigs and bars, glazier's lead, lead wire, molten and old refuse lead run into blocks and bars, and old scrap-lead fit only to be remanufactured, 2 cents per pound.

178. Lead in sheets, pipes, or shot, 2½ cents per pound.

179. Metallic mineral substances in a crude state and metals unwrought, not specially enumerated or provided for in this act, 20 per cent. ad valorem.

180. Muskets and sporting rifles, 25 per cent. ad valorem.

181. All double-barrelled, sporting, breech-loading shot guns, $10 each, and 25 per cent. ad valorem.

182. Needles for knitting or sewing machines, and tape-needles and bodkins of metal, 35 per cent. ad valorem.

183. Needles, sewing, darning, knitting, and all other not specially enumerated or provided for in this act, 25 per cent. ad valorem.

184. Nickel.—Nickel in ore, 5 cents per pound for the nickel contained therein;

185. Nickel in matte, or other crude form not ready for consumption in the arts, 10 cents per pound on the nickel contained therein;

186. Nickel, nickel oxide, alloy of any kind in which nickel is the component material of chief value, 15 cents per pound.

187. Pens, metallic, except gold pens, 12 cents per gross.

188. Pen-holder tips, pen-holders or parts thereof, and gold pens, 30 per cent. ad valorem.

189. Pins, metallic, solid-head or other, including hair-pins, safety-pins, and hat, bonnet, shawl, and belt pins, 30 per cent. ad valorem.

190. Quicksilver, 6 cents per pound.

191. Screws, commonly called wood-screws, more than 2 inches in length, 5 cents per pound; over 1 inch and not more than 2 inches in length, 7 cents per pound; over one-half inch and not more than 1 inch in length, 10 cents per pound; one-half inch and less in length, 14 cents per pound.

192. Silver-leaf, 75 cents per package of five hundred leaves.

193. Cut tacks, brads, or sprigs, not exceeding 16 ounces to the thousand, 2½ cents per thousand; exceeding 16 ounces to the thousand, 2½ cents per pound.

194. Type-metal, 1½ cents per pound for the lead contained therein; new types, 25 per cent. ad valorem.

195. Zinc or spelter.—Zinc in blocks or pigs, 1½ cents per pound.

196. Zinc in sheets, 2½ cents per pound.

197. Zinc, old and worn out, fit only to be remanufactured, 1½ cents per pound.

198. Manufactures, articles, or wares, not specially enumerated or provided for in this act, composed wholly or in part of iron, steel, lead, copper, nickel, pewter, tin, zinc, gold, silver, platinum, or any other metal, and whether partly or wholly manufactured, 45 per cent. ad valorem.

SCHEDULE D.—WOOD AND WOODEN WARES.

199. Timber, hewn and sawed, and timber used for spars and in building wharves, 20 per cent. ad valorem.

200. Timber, squared or sided, not specially enumerated or provided for in this act, 1 cent per cubic foot.

201. Sawed boards, plank, deals, and other lumber of hemlock, white-wood, sycamore, and bass-wood, $1 per thousand feet board measure; sawed lumber, not specially enumerated or provided for in this act, $2 per thousand feet board measure; but when lumber of any sort is planed or finished, in addition to the rates herein provided, there shall be levied and paid for each side so planed or finished 50 cents per thousand feet board measure; and if planed on one side and tongued and grooved, $1 per thousand feet board measure; and if planed on two sides, and tongued and grooved, $1.50 per thousand feet, board measure.

202. Hubs for wheels, posts, last-blocks, wagon-blocks, oar-blocks, gun-blocks, heading-blocks, and all like blocks or sticks, rough-hewn or sawed only, 20 per cent. ad valorem.

203. Staves of wood of all kinds, 10 per cent. ad valorem.

204. Pickets and palings, 20 per cent. ad valorem.

205. Laths, 15 cents per 1,000 pieces.

206. Shingles, 35 cents per 1,000.

207. Pine clapboards, $2 per 1,000.

208. Spruce clapboards, $1.50 per 1,000.

209. House or cabinet furniture, of wood, in piece or rough, and not finished, 30 per cent. ad valorem.

210. Cabinet ware and house furniture, of wood, finished, 35 per cent. ad valorem.

211. Casks and barrels (empty), sugar-box shooks, and packing-boxes, and packing-box shooks, of wood, not specially enumerated or provided for in this act, 30 per cent. ad valorem.

212. Manufactures of cedar wood, granadilla, ebony, mahogany, rosewood, and satin-wood, 35 per cent. ad valorem.

213. Manufactures of wood, or of which wood is the component material of chief value, not specially enumerated or provided for in this act, 35 per cent. ad valorem.

214. Wood, unmanufactured, not specially enumerated or provided for in this act, 20 per cent. ad valorem.

215. Sawed boards, plank, deals, and blocks, or posts of mahogany, rosewood, satin-wood, granadilla, or other cabinet wood, 15 per cent. ad valorem.

216. Veneering, and briar-root or briar-wood, and similar wood, unmanufactured, or not further manufactured than cut into forms or shapes suitable for the articles into which they are intended to be converted, 20 per cent. ad valorem.

SCHEDULE E.—SUGAR.

All sugars not above No. 13 Dutch standard in color shall pay duty on their polariscopic test as follows, namely:

217. All sugars not above No. 13 Dutch standard in color, all tank bottoms, sirups of cane juice or of beet juice, melada, concentrated melada, concrete and concentrated molasses, testing by the polariscope not above 75 degrees, seven-tenths of 1 cent per pound; and for every additional degree or fraction of a degree shown by the polariscopic test, two-hundredths of 1 cent per pound additional.

218. All sugars above No. 13 Dutch standard in color shall be classified by the Dutch standard of color, and pay duty as follows, namely: All sugar above No. 13 and not above No. 16 Dutch standard of color, 1½ cents per pound.

219. All sugar above No. 16 and not above No. 20 Dutch standard of color, 1½ cents per pound.

220. All sugars above No. 20 Dutch standard of color, 2 cents per pound.

221. Molasses testing above 56 degrees, 4 cents per gallon: *Provided*, That if an export duty shall hereafter be laid upon sugar or molasses by any country from whence the same may be imported, such sugar or molasses so imported shall be subject to duty as provided by law prior to the passage of this act.

222. Sugar drainings and sugar sweepings shall be subject to duty either as molasses or sugar, as the case may be, according to polariscopic test.

223. Sugar candy and all confectionery, including chocolate confectionery, made wholly or in part of sugar, valued at 12 cents or less per pound, and on sugars after being refined, when tinctured, colored, or in any way adulterated, 5 cents per pound.

224. All other confectionery, including chocolate confectionery, not specially enumerated or provided for in this act, 50 per cent. ad valorem.

225. Glucose, or grape sugar, three-fourths of 1 cent per pound.

SCHEDULE F.—TOBACCO, CIGARS, ETC.

226. Cigars, cigarettes, and cheroots of all kinds, $3.50 per pound; but paper cigars and cigarettes, including wrappers, shall be subject to the same duties as are herein imposed upon cigars.

227. Leaf-tobacco suitable for wrappers: If not stemmed, 75 cents per pound; if stemmed, $1 per pound: *Provided*, That if any portion of any tobacco imported in any package or in bulk shall be suitable for wrappers, the entire quantity of tobacco contained in such importation shall be dutiable; if not stemmed, at 75 cents per pound; if stemmed, at $1 per pound.

228. All other tobacco in leaf, unmanufactured and not stemmed, 20 cents per pound; if stemmed, 25 cents per pound.

229. Tobacco stems, 15 cents per pound.

230. Tobacco, manufactured, of all descriptions, not specially enumerated or provided for in this act, 40 cents per pound.

231. Snuff and snuff flour, manufactured of tobacco, ground dry, or damp, and pickled, scented, or otherwise, of all descriptions, 50 cents per pound.

SCHEDULE G.—PROVISIONS, ETC.

232. Animals, live.—Horses and mules, $20 per head.

233. Cattle, more than one year old, $5 per head.

234. Hogs, 50 cents per head.

235. Sheep, 50 cents per head.

236. All other live animals, not specially enumerated or provided for in this act, 20 per cent. ad valorem.

237. Bacon and hams, 2 cents per pound.

238. Barley and rye, 10 cents per bushel.

239. Barley-malt, per bushel of 34 pounds, 20 cents.

240. Barley, pearled, patent, or hulled, one-half of 1 cent per pound.

241. Beans, per bushel of 60 pounds, 25 cents.

242. Beans, pease, and mushrooms, prepared or preserved, in tins, jars, bottles, or otherwise, 25 cents per gallon.

243. Beef, mutton, and pork, 1 cent per pound.

244. Butter, and substitutes thereof, 4 cents per pound.

245. Cabbages, 1 cent each.

246. Cheese, 4 cents per pound.

247. Chicory-root.—Burnt or roasted, 1 cent per pound; ground or granulated, or in rolls, or otherwise prepared, and not specially enumerated or provided for in this act, 2 cents per pound.

248. Chocolate, other than chocolate confectionery, 2 cents per pound.

249. Cocoa, prepared or manufactured, not specially enumerated or provided for in this act, 2 cents per pound.

250. Cocoa-butter or cocoa-butterine, 3½ cents per pound.

251. Comfits, sweetmeats, or fruits preserved in sugar, sirup, molasses, or spirits, not specially enumerated or provided for in this act, and jellies of all kinds, 35 per cent. ad valorem.

252. Corn-meal, per bushel of 48 pounds, 10 cents.

253. Dandelion-root and acorns, prepared, and other articles used as coffee, or as substitutes for coffee, not specially enumerated or provided for in this act, 1½ cents per pound.

254. Extract of meat, all not specially provided for in this act, 35 cents per pound; fluid extract of meat, 15 cents per pound; but the dutiable weight shall include the extract and the tins, jars, bottles, or other articles containing the same, and no separate or additional duty shall be collected on such coverings unless as such they are suitable and apparently designed for use other than in the importation of meat extracts.

255. Fruits.—Dates, grapes, plums, and prunes, 1 cent per pound.

256. Figs, 2 cents per pound.

257. Oranges, lemons, or limes, in packages of capacity of 1½ cubic feet or less, 10 cents per package; in packages of capacity exceeding 1½ cubic feet and not exceeding 2½ cubic feet, 20 cents per package; in packages of capacity exceeding 2½ cubic feet and not exceeding 5 cubic feet, 40 cents per package; in packages of capacity exceeding 5 cubic feet, for every additional cubic foot or fractional part thereof, 8 cents; in bulk, $1.50 per one thousand.

258. Raisins, 2 cents per pound.

259. Fruits preserved in their own juices, 20 per cent. ad valorem.

260. Ginger or ginger-root, preserved in sugar or otherwise, and citron preserved or candied, 4 cents per pound.

261. Orange-peel and lemon-peel, preserved or candied, 2 cents per pound.

262. Fish.—Mackerel, pickled or salted, 1 cent per pound.

263. Herrings, pickled or salted, one-half of 1 cent per pound.

264. Salmon, pickled, 1 cent per pound.

265. Other fish, pickled, in barrels, 1 cent per pound.

266. Anchovies and sardines, packed in oil or otherwise, in tin boxes measuring not more than 5 inches long, 4 inches wide, and 3½ inches deep, 10 cents per whole box; in half-boxes, measuring not more than 5 inches long, 4 inches wide, and 1½ inches deep, 5 cents each; in quarter-boxes, measuring not more than 4½ inches long, 3½ inches wide, and 1½ inches deep, 2½ cents each; when imported in any other form, 40 per cent. ad valorem.

267. Foreign-caught fish (imported otherwise than in barrels or half-barrels), smoked, dried, salted, pickled, frozen, packed in ice, or otherwise prepared for preservation, not specially enumerated or provided for in this act, one-half of 1 cent per pound.

268. Fish preserved in oil, except anchovies and sardines, 30 per cent. ad valorem.

269. Salmon and all other fish, prepared or preserved, and prepared meats of all kinds, not specially enumerated or provided for in this act, 25 per cent. ad valorem.

270. Cans or packages made of tin or other material containing fish or other kind admitted free of duty under any existing law or treaty, not exceeding 1 quart in contents, shall be subject to a duty on each can or package of 1½ cents; and when exceeding 1 quart, shall be subject to an additional duty, for each additional quart or fractional part thereof, of 1½ cents.

271. Hay, $2 per ton.

272. Honey, 20 cents per gallon.

273. Hops, 10 cents per pound.

274. Indian corn or maize, 10 cents per bushel.

275. Lard, 2 cents per pound.

276. Macaroni, vermicelli, and all similar preparations, 2 cents per pound.

277. Milk, preserved or condensed, including weight of packages, 3 cents per pound.
278. Mustard, ground or preserved, in bottles or otherwise, 10 cents per pound.
279. Spices, ground or powdered, not specially enumerated or provided for in this act, 4 cents per pound.
280. Nuts.—Almonds, not shelled, 5 cents per pound; clear almonds, shelled, 7½ cents per pound.
281. Filberts and walnuts of all kinds, 2 cents per pound.
282. Peanuts or ground beans, unshelled, 1 cent per pound; shelled, 1½ cents per pound.
283. Nuts of all kinds, shelled or unshelled, not specially enumerated or provided for in this act, 1½ cents per pound.
284. Oats, 10 cents per bushel.
285. Oatmeal, one-half of 1 cent per pound.
286. Pease, green or dried, in bulk or in barrels, sacks, or similar packages, per bushel of 60 pounds, 10 cents; split pease, per bushel of 60 pounds, 20 cents; pease in cartons, papers, or other small packages, one-half of 1 cent per pound.
287. Rice.—Cleaned, 1 cent per pound; uncleaned rice and rice flour and meal, one-half of 1 cent per pound; rice, broken, which will pass through a sieve known commercially as No. 12 wire sieve, and paddy, one-fourth of 1 cent per pound.
288. Rye-flour, one-half of 1 cent per pound.
289. Salt.—Salt in bags, sacks, barrels, or other packages, 12 cents per 100 pounds; in bulk, 8 cents per 100 pounds: *Provided*, That exporters of meats, whether packed or smoked, which have been cured in the United States with imported salt, shall, upon satisfactory proof, under such regulations as the Secretary of the Treasury shall prescribe, that such meats have been cured with imported salt, have refunded to them from the Treasury the duties paid on the salt so used in curing such exported meats, in amounts not less than $100: *And provided further*, That imported salt in bond may be used in curing fish taken by vessels licensed to engage in the fisheries, and in curing fish on the shores of the navigable waters of the United States, under such regulations as the Secretary of the Treasury shall prescribe; and upon proof that the salt has been used for either of the purposes stated in this proviso, the duties on the same shall be remitted.
290. Seeds.—Castor beans or seeds, 25 cents per bushel of 50 pounds.
291. Garden-seeds, agricultural seeds, and other seeds, not specially enumerated or provided for in this act, 20 per cent. ad valorem.
292. Flaxseed or linseed, and other oil seeds, not specially enumerated or provided for in this act, 20 cents per bushel of 56 pounds; but no drawback shall be allowed on oil-cake made from imported seed.
293. Starch, including all preparations, from whatever substance produced, fit for use as starch, 2 cents per pound.
294. Tallow, 1 cent per pound.
295. Vegetables of all kinds, prepared or preserved, including pickles and sauces of all kinds, not specially enumerated or provided for in this act, 35 per cent. ad valorem.
296. Vegetables in their natural state, not specially enumerated or provided for in this act, 10 per cent. ad valorem.
297. Potatoes, per bushel of 60 pounds, 15 cents.
298. Vinegar, 7½ cents per gallon. The standard for vinegar shall be taken to be that strength which requires 35 grains of bicarbonate of potash to neutralize 1 ounce Troy of vinegar.
299. Wheat, 20 cents per bushel.
300. Wheat-flour, 20 per cent. ad valorem.

SCHEDULE H.—WINES, LIQUORS, ETC.

301. Champagne and all other sparkling wines, in bottles containing each not more than 1 quart and more than 1 pint, $7 per dozen; containing not more than 1 pint each and more than one-half pint, $3.50 per dozen; containing one-half pint each or less, $1.75 per dozen; in bottles or other vessels containing more than 1 quart each, in addition to $7 per dozen bottles, on the quantity in excess of 1 quart, at the rate of $2.25 per gallon.
302. Still wines, including ginger wine or ginger cordial and vermuth, in casks, 60 cents per gallon; in bottles or jugs, per case of one dozen bottles or jugs, containing each not more than one quart and more than one pint, or twenty-four bottles or jugs containing each not more than one pint, $1.60 per case; and any excess beyond these quantities found in such bottles or jugs shall be subject to a duty of 5 cents per pint or fractional part thereof: *Provided*, That any wines, ginger cordial, or vermuth imported containing more than 24 per cent. of alcohol shall be forfeited to the United States: *And provided further*, That there shall be no constructive or other allowance for breakage, leakage, or damage on wines, liquors, cordials, or distilled spirits. Wines, cordials, brandy, and other spirituous liquors imported in bottles or jugs shall be packed in packages containing not less than one dozen bottles or jugs in each package; and all such bottles or jugs shall pay an additional duty of 3 cents for each bottle or jug.
303. Brandy and other spirits manufactured or distilled from grain or other materials, and not specially enumerated or provided for in this act, $2 per proof gallon.
304. Each and every gauge or wine-gallon of measurement shall be counted as at least one proof gallon, and the standard for determining the proof of brandy and other spirits or liquors of any kind imported shall be the same as that which is defined in the laws relating to internal revenue; but any brandy or other spirituous liquors imported in casks of less capacity than 14 gallons or in bottles of less capacity than 1 quart shall be forfeited to the United States: *Provided*, That it shall be lawful for the Secretary of the Treasury, in his discretion, to authorize the ascertainment of the proof of wines, cordials, or other liquors, by distillation or otherwise, in case where it is impracticable to ascertain such proof by the means prescribed by existing law or regulations.
305. On all compounds or preparations of which distilled spirits are a component part of chief value not specially enumerated or provided for in this act there shall be levied a duty not less than that imposed upon distilled spirits.
306. Cordials, liquors, arrack, absinthe, kirchwasser, ratafia, and other similar spirituous beverages or bitters containing spirits, and not specially enumerated or provided for in this act, $2 per proof gallon.
307. No lower rate or amount of duty shall be levied, collected, and paid on brandy, spirits, and other spirituous beverages than that fixed by law for the description of first proof; but it shall be increased in proportion for any greater strength than the strength of first proof, and all imitations of brandy or spirits or wines imported by any names whatever shall be subject to the highest rate of duty provided for the genuine articles respectively intended to be represented, and in no case less than $1 per gallon.
308. Bay-rum or bay-water, whether distilled or compounded, of first proof, and in proportion for any greater strength than first proof, $1 per gallon.
309. Ale, porter, and beer, in bottles or jugs, 35 cents per gallon; otherwise than in bottles or jugs, 20 cents per gallon.
310. Malt extract.—Fluid, in casks, 20 cents per gallon; in bottles or jugs, 40 cents per gallon; solid or condensed, 40 per cent. ad valorem.
311. Cherry juice and prune juice, or prune wine, and other fruit juice, not specially enumerated or provided for in this act, containing not more than 24 per cent. of alcohol, 60 cents per gallon; if containing more than 24 per cent. of alcohol, $2 per gallon.
312. Ginger-ale, ginger-beer, lemonade, soda-water, and other aerated waters in plain green or colored molded or pressed glass bottles, containing each not more than three-fourths of a pint, 25 cents per dozen; containing more than three-fourths of a pint each and not more than 1½ pints, 50 cents per dozen; but no separate or additional duty shall be assessed on the bottles; if imported otherwise than in plain green or colored molded or pressed glass bottles, or in such bottles containing more than 1½ pints each, 50 cents per gallon; and in addition thereto, duty shall be collected on the bottles, or other coverings, at the rates which would be chargeable thereon if imported empty.

SCHEDULE I.—COTTON MANUFACTURES.

313. Cotton thread, yarn, warps, or warp-yarn (not wound upon spools), whether single or advanced beyond the condition of single, by twisting two or more single yarns together, whether on beams or in bundles, skeins, or cops, or in any other form, valued at not exceeding 25 cents per pound, 10 cents per pound; valued at over 25 cents per pound and not exceeding 40 cents per pound, 18 cents per pound; valued at over 40 cents per pound and not exceeding 50 cents per pound, 23 cents per pound; valued at over 50 cents per pound and not exceeding 60 cents per pound, 28 cents per pound; valued at over 60 cents per pound and not exceeding 70 cents per pound, 33 cents per pound; valued at over 70 cents per pound and not exceeding 80 cents per pound, 38 cents per pound; valued at over 80 cents per pound and not exceeding $1 per pound, 43 cents per pound; valued at over $1 per pound, 50 per cent. ad valorem.
314. Spool-thread of cotton, containing on each spool not exceeding 100 yards of thread, 7 cents per dozen. Exceeding 100 yards on each spool, for every additional 100 yards of thread or fractional part thereof in excess of 100 yards, 7 cents per dozen spools.
315. Cotton cloth not bleached, dyed, colored, stained, painted, or printed, and not exceeding fifty threads to the square inch, counting the warp and filling, 2 cents per square yard; if bleached, 2½ cents per square yard; if dyed, colored, stained, painted, or printed, 4 cents per square yard.
316. Cotton cloth not bleached, dyed, colored, stained, painted, or printed, exceeding fifty and not exceeding one hundred threads to the square inch, counting the warp and filling, 2½ cents per square yard; if bleached, 3 cents per square yard; if dyed, colored, stained, painted, or printed, 4 cents per square yard: *Provided*, That on all cotton cloth not exceeding one hundred threads to the square inch, counting the warp and filling, not bleached, dyed, colored stained, painted, or printed, valued at over 6½ cents per yard; bleached, valued at over 9 cents per square yard; and dyed, colored, stained, painted, or printed, valued at over 12 cents per square yard, there shall be levied, collected, and paid a duty of 35 per cent. ad valorem.
317. Cotton cloth, not bleached, dyed, colored, stained, painted, or printed, exceeding one hundred and not exceeding one hundred and fifty threads to the square inch, counting the warp and filling, 3 cents per square yard; if bleached, 4 cents per square yard; if dyed, colored, stained, painted, or printed, 5 cents per square yard: *Provided*, That on all cotton cloth exceeding one hundred and not exceeding one hundred and fifty threads to the square inch, counting the warp and filling, not bleached, dyed, colored, stained, painted, or printed, valued at over 7½ cents per square yard; bleached, valued at over 10 cents per square yard; dyed, colored, stained, painted, or printed, valued at over 12½ cents per square yard, there shall be levied, collected, and paid a duty of 40 per cent. ad valorem.
318. Cotton cloth, not bleached, dyed, colored, stained, painted, or printed, exceeding one hundred and fifty and not exceeding two hundred threads to the square inch, counting the warp and filling, 3½ cents per square yard; if bleached, 4½ cents per square yard; if dyed, colored, stained, painted, or printed, 5½ cents per square yard: *Provided*, That on all cotton cloth exceeding one hundred and fifty and not exceeding two hundred threads to the square inch, counting the warp and filling, not bleached, dyed, colored, stained, painted, or printed, valued at over 8 cents per square yard; bleached, valued at over 10 cents per square yard; dyed, colored, stained, painted, or printed, valued at over 12 cents per square yard, there shall be levied, collected, and paid a duty of 45 per cent. ad valorem.
319. Cotton cloth not bleached, dyed, colored, stained, painted, or printed, exceeding two hundred threads to the square inch, counting the warp and filling, 4½ cents per square yard; if bleached, 5½ cents per square yard; if dyed, colored, stained, painted, or printed, 6½ cents per square yard: *Provided*, That on all such cotton cloths not bleached, dyed, colored, stained, painted, or printed, valued at over 10 cents per square yard; bleached, valued at over 12 cents per square yard, and dyed, colored, stained, painted, or printed, valued at over 15 cents per yard, there shall be levied, collected, and paid a duty of 45 per cent. ad valorem.
320. On stockings, hose, half-hose, gloves, shirts, drawers, and other goods made on knitting machines or frames, composed of cotton or other vegetable fiber, and not otherwise specially enumerated or provided for in this act, 35 per cent. ad valorem.
321. On stockings, hose, and half-hose, fashioned, narrowed, or shaped wholly or in part by knitting machines or frames, or knit by hand, and composed of cotton or other vegetable fiber, valued at not exceeding $3 per dozen pairs, 60 cents per dozen pairs and 20 per cent. ad valorem; valued above $3 per dozen pairs, and on all shirts, drawers, gloves, and other articles composed of like materials, and made and fashioned in like manner, 40 per cent. ad valorem.
322. On cotton damask and on clothing ready made, and articles of wearing apparel of every description, composed of cotton or other vegetable fiber, made up or manufactured wholly or in part by the tailor, seamstress, or manufacturer, including hemmed handkerchiefs, and not specially enumerated or provided for in this act, 40 per cent. ad valorem.
323. On goods heretofore known commercially as Hamburg edgings, embroideries, or insertings, and as Egyptian and Oriental laces, composed of cotton, and stitched or otherwise wrought by machines worked by hand or other power, 45 cents per pound and 15 per cent. ad valorem.
324. Plushes, velvets, velveteens, and all pile fabrics composed of cotton, or other vegetable fiber, 10 cents per square yard and 20 per cent. ad valorem.
325. Cotton cords, braids, gimps, galloons, webbing, goring, suspenders, and braces, any of the foregoing which are elastic or non-elastic, 35 per cent. ad valorem.
326. All manufactures of cotton not specially enumerated or provided for in this act, 35 per cent. ad valorem.

SCHEDULE J.—FLAX, HEMP, AND JUTE.

327. Flax straw, $5 per ton.
328. Flax, not hackled or dressed, $20 per ton.
329. Flax, hackled, known as "dressed line," $40 per ton.
330. Tow, of flax or hemp, $10 per ton.
331. Hemp, $20 per ton.
332. Cables or cordage, and twine, including binding twine, composed wholly of manila, or sisal grass, 1½ cents per pound.
333. All manufactures of flax, hemp, jute, or other vegetable fiber, except cotton, or of which flax, hemp, jute, or other vegetable fiber, except cotton, is the component material of chief value, not specially enumerated or provided for in this act, valued at 5 cents per pound or less, 2 cents per pound; valued above 5 cents per pound, 40 per cent. ad valorem.
334. Burlaps, not exceeding 60 inches in width, of flax, jute, or hemp, or of which flax, jute, or hemp, or either of them, shall be the component material of chief value (except such as may be suitable for bagging for cotton), 30 per cent. ad valorem.
335. Brown and bleached linen cloth containing not less than one hundred threads to the square inch, counting the warp and filling, 35 per cent. ad valorem.
336. On laces, embroideries, insertings, neck ruffling and ruchings, trim-

mings, lace window-curtains, and other completed articles of lace, and tamboured window-curtains and other similar tamboured articles, composed of flax, jute, cotton, or other vegetable fiber, not specially enumerated or provided for in this act, 50 per cent. ad valorem.

337. On collars and cuffs for men's wear, composed entirely of cotton, 15 cents per dozen pieces and 35 per cent. ad valorem; composed in whole or in part of linen, 30 cents per dozen pieces and 35 per cent. ad valorem.

338. Hemp or jute carpeting, 6 cents per square yard.

339. Bagging for cotton, gunny cloth, and all similar material suitable for covering cotton, composed in whole or in part of hemp, jute, or jute butts valued at not more than 3 cents per pound, three-fourths of 1 cent per pound.

340. Oil-cloth for floors, stamped, painted, or printed, including linoleum, corticene, cork-carpets, figured or plain, and on all other oil-cloth (except silk oil-cloth), and on water-proof cloth not specially enumerated or provided for in this act, 10 cents per square yard and 15 per cent. ad valorem.

SCHEDULE K.—WOOL AND MANUFACTURES OF WOOL.

All wools, hair of the alpaca, goat, and other like animals, shall be divided, for the purpose of fixing the duties to be charged thereon, into the three following classes:

341. Class 1, clothing wools; that is to say, merino, mestiza, metz, or metis wools or other wools of merino blood, immediate or remote, Down clothing wools and wools of like character with any of the preceding, including such as have been heretofore usually imported into the United States from Buenos Ayres, New Zealand, Australia, Cape of Good Hope, Russia, Great Britain, Canada, and elsewhere, and also including all wools not hereinafter described or designated in classes 2 and 3.

342. Class 2, combing wools; that is to say, Leicester, Cotswold, Lincolnshire, Down combing wools, Canada long wools, or other like combing wools of English blood, and usually known by the terms herein used, and also all hair of the alpaca, goat, and other like animals.

343. Class 3, carpet wools and other similar wools: Such as Donskoi, native South American, Cordova, Valparaiso, native Smyrna, and including all such wools of like character as have been heretofore usually imported into the United States from Turkey, Greece, Egypt, Syria, and elsewhere.

344. The duty on wools of the first class which shall be imported washed shall be twice the amount of duty to which they would be subjected if imported unwashed; and the duty on wools of all classes which shall be imported scoured shall be three times the duty to which they would be subjected if imported unwashed.

345. The duty upon wool of the sheep or hair of the alpaca, goat, and other like animals, which shall be imported in any other than ordinary condition, as now and heretofore practiced, or which shall be changed in its character or condition for the purpose of evading the duty, or which shall be reduced in value by the admixture of dirt or any other foreign substance, shall be twice the duty to which it would be otherwise subject.

346. Wools of the first and second class and all hair of the alpaca, goat, and other like animals, 11 cents per pound.

347. Wools of the third class, the value whereof, at the last port or place whence exported to the United States, excluding charges in such port, shall be 12 cents or less per pound, 2½ cents per pound.

348. Wools of the same class, the value whereof, at the last port or place whence exported to the United States, excluding charges in such port, shall exceed 12 cents per pound, 6 cents per pound.

349. Wools on the skin, the same rates as other wools, the quantity and value to be ascertained under such rules as the Secretary of the Treasury may prescribe.

350. Top waste, slubbing waste, roving waste, ring waste, yarn waste, garnetted waste, and all other wastes similar to them in character or description, composed wholly or in part of wool or worsted, 30 cents per pound.

351. Woolen rags, shoddy, mungo, flocks, and wool waste not otherwise provided for in this act, 10 cents per pound.

352. Noils shall pay the same rate of duty as the washed wools or hair from which they are made.

353. All wools and hair of the alpaca, goat, or other animals, which have been advanced by any process of manufacture beyond the washed or scoured condition, not otherwise enumerated or provided for in this act, shall be subject to the same duties as are imposed upon manufactures of wool not specially enumerated or provided for in this act.

354. Woolen cloths, woolen shawls, and all manufactures of wool of every description, made wholly or in part of wool, worsted, the hair of the goat, alpaca, or other animals, not especially enumerated or provided for in this act, valued at not exceeding 40 cents per pound, 35 cents per pound, and in addition thereto 35 per cent. ad valorem; valued at above 40 cents per pound, and not exceeding 60 cents per pound, 35 cents per pound and 40 per cent. ad valorem; valued at 60 cents per pound, 40 cents per pound and in addition thereto 40 per cent. ad valorem.

355. Flannels, blankets, and hats of wool, composed wholly or in part of wool, worsted, the hair of the goat, alpaca, or other animals, valued at not exceeding 30 cents per pound, 10 cents per pound; valued at above 30 cents per pound, and not exceeding 40 cents per pound, 12 cents per pound; valued at above 40 cents per pound, and not exceeding 60 cents per pound, 18 cents per pound; and in addition thereto, upon all the above-named articles, 35 per cent. ad valorem; valued at above 60 cents per pound, 40 cents per pound and in addition thereto 40 per cent. ad valorem.

356. Women's and children's dress goods, coat-linings, Italian cloths, and goods of similar character or description, composed in part of wool, worsted, the hair of the goat, alpaca, or other animals, valued at not exceeding 15 cents per square yard, 6 cents per square yard, and in addition thereto 40 per cent. ad valorem; on all the above-named goods, valued at above 15 cents per square yard, 7 cents per square yard, and in addition thereto 40 per cent. ad valorem; but such goods as are composed in part of silk, or which contain an admixture of silk, and in which silk is not the component material of chief value, and not otherwise provided for in this act, shall be dutiable at 11 cents per square yard, and in addition thereto 40 per cent. ad valorem: *Provided*, That all goods of the character enumerated or described in this paragraph, weighing over 4 ounces per square yard, shall pay a duty of 40 cents per pound and in addition thereto 40 per cent. ad valorem.

357. Women's and children's dress goods, coat linings, Italian cloths, bunting, and goods of like description, composed wholly of wool, worsted, the hair of the goat, alpaca, or other animals, or of a mixture of them, 11 cents per square yard and in addition thereto 40 per cent. ad valorem; and all such goods with selvedges made wholly or in part of other materials, and all such goods in which threads made wholly or in part of other materials have been introduced either in the warp or in the filling for the purpose of changing the classification for duty, shall be dutiable at 11 cents per square yard and in addition thereto 40 per cent. ad valorem: *Provided*, That all such goods weighing over 4 ounces per square yard shall pay a duty of 40 cents per pound and in addition thereto 40 per cent. ad valorem.

358. Clothing ready-made, and wearing apparel of every description, not specially enumerated or provided for in this act, balmoral skirts, and skirting, and goods of similar description, or used for like purposes, knit goods, all goods made on knitting-frames, and plushes, and all pile fabrics, composed wholly or in part of wool, worsted, the hair of the alpaca, goat, or other animals, made up or manufactured wholly or in part by the tailor, seamstress, or manufacturer, 40 cents per pound and in addition thereto 45 per cent. ad valorem.

359. Cloaks, dolmans, jackets, talmas, ulsters, or other outside garments for ladies' and children's apparel and goods of similar description, or used for like purposes (except knit goods), composed wholly or in part of wool, worsted, the hair of the alpaca, goat, or other animals, made up or manufactured wholly or in part by the tailor, seamstress, or manufacturer, 45 cents per pound and in addition thereto 45 per cent. ad valorem.

360. Webbings, gorings, suspenders, braces, beltings, bindings, braids, galloons, fringes, gimps, cords, cords and tassels, dress trimmings, head-nets, any of the foregoing which are elastic or non-elastic, buttons, or barrel buttons, or buttons of other forms for tassels or ornaments, wrought by hand, or braided by machinery, made of wool, worsted, the hair of the goat, alpaca, or other animals, or of which wool, worsted, the hair of the goat, alpaca, or other animals is a component material, 30 cents per pound and in addition thereto 50 per cent. ad valorem.

361. Aubusson, Axminster, Moquette, and chenille carpets, figured or plain, carpets woven whole for rooms, and all carpets or carpeting of like character or description, 45 cents per square yard and in addition thereto 30 per cent. ad valorem.

362. Saxony, Wilton, and Tournay velvet carpets, figured or plain, and all carpets or carpeting of like character or description, 45 cents per square yard and in addition thereto 30 per cent. ad valorem.

363. Brussels carpets, figured or plain, and all carpets or carpeting of like character or description, 30 cents per square yard and in addition thereto 30 per cent. ad valorem.

364. Patent velvet and tapestry velvet carpets, figured or plain, printed on the warp or otherwise, and all carpets or carpeting of like character or description, 25 cents per square yard, and in addition thereto 30 per cent. ad valorem.

365. Tapestry Brussels carpets, figured or plain, and all carpets or carpeting of like character or description, printed on the warp or otherwise, 20 cents per square yard, and in addition thereto 30 per cent. ad valorem.

366. Treble ingrain, three-ply, and worsted chain Venetian carpets, 12 cents per square yard, and in addition thereto 30 per cent. ad valorem.

367. Yarn Venetian, and two-ply ingrain carpets, 8 cents per square yard, and in addition thereto 30 per cent. ad valorem.

368. Druggets and bockings, printed, colored, or otherwise, 15 cents per square yard, and in addition thereto 30 per cent. ad valorem.

369. Carpets and carpetings of wool, flax, or cotton, or parts of either, or other materials not otherwise specially enumerated or provided for in this act, 40 per cent. ad valorem.

370. And mats, rugs, screens, covers, hassocks, bedsides, and other portions of carpets or carpetings shall be subjected to the rate of duty herein imposed on carpets or carpetings of like character or description. And the duty on all other mats not exclusively of vegetable material, screens, hassocks, and rugs shall be 40 per cent. ad valorem.

371. Endless belts or felts for paper or printing-machines, 20 cents per pound and 30 per cent. ad valorem.

SCHEDULE L.—SILK AND SILK GOODS.

372. Silk partially manufactured from cocoons or from waste-silk, and not further advanced or manufactured than carded or combed silk, 50 cents per pound.

373. Thrown silk, not more advanced than singles, tram, organzine, sewing-silk, twist, floss, spun silk, and silk threads or yarns of every description, 30 per cent. ad valorem.

374. Goods in the piece, including ribbons, not otherwise specially provided for in this act, weighing not less than 1 ounce nor more than 8 ounces per square yard, containing less than 25 per cent. and not less than 10 per cent. in weight of silk, 75 cents per pound and 15 per cent. ad valorem; the same containing less than 50 per cent. and not less than 25 per cent. in weight of silk, $1.25 per pound and 15 per cent. ad valorem; the same, containing 50 per cent. or more in weight of silk, if black, $1.60 per pound and 15 per cent. ad valorem; if white or colored, or partly black or partly colored, $2.25 per pound and 15 per cent. ad valorem.

375. Velvets, plushes, or other pile fabrics in the piece (including ribbons), not otherwise specially provided for in this act, weighing not less than 1 ounce nor more than 8 ounces per square yard, containing less than 25 per cent. and not less than 10 per cent. in weight of silk, $1 per pound and 15 per cent. ad valorem; the same, containing less than 50 per cent. and not less than 25 per cent. in weight of silk, $1.50 per pound and 15 per cent. ad valorem; the same, containing 50 per cent. or more in weight of silk, $3.50 per pound and 15 per cent. ad valorem. In ascertaining the percentage of silk under this act the weight of silk shall be taken as found in the goods.

376. Webbings, gorings, suspenders, braces, beltings, bindings, braids, galloons, fringes, cords, and tassels, any of the foregoing which are elastic or non-elastic, buttons, and ornaments, made of silk, or of which silk is the component material of chief value, 50 per cent. ad valorem.

377. Laces and embroideries, neck rufflings and ruchings, clothing ready made, and articles of wearing apparel of every description, made up or manufactured wholly or in part by the tailor, seamstress, or manufacturer, composed of silk, or of which silk is the component material of chief value, not specially enumerated or provided for in this act, 60 per cent. ad valorem.

378. All manufactures of silk, of which silk is the component material of chief value, not specially enumerated or provided for in this act, 50 per cent. ad valorem.

SCHEDULE M.—BOOKS, PAPERS, ETC.

379. Books, including blank-books of all kinds, pamphlets and engravings, bound or unbound, photographs, etchings, maps, charts, and all printed matter, not specially enumerated or provided for in this act, 25 per cent. ad valorem.

380. Paper envelopes, 25 cents per thousand.

381. Manufactures of paper, or of which paper is the component material of chief value, not specially enumerated or provided for in this act, 25 per cent. ad valorem.

382. Papers known commercially as surface-coated papers, and manufactures thereof, card-boards, albumenized and sensitized papers, lithographic prints from either stone or zinc, bound or unbound (except illustrations in printed books), and all articles produced either in whole or in part by lithographic process, 35 per cent. ad valorem.

383. Paper-hangings and paper for screens or fire-boards, writing paper, drawing paper, filtering-paper, letter-press copying paper, and all other paper not specially enumerated or provided for in this act, 25 per cent. ad valorem.

384. Printing paper, unsized, used for books and newspapers exclusively, 15 per cent. ad valorem.

385. Paper, sized or glued, suitable only for printing paper, 20 per cent. ad valorem.

386. Sheathing paper, 10 per cent. ad valorem.

387. Playing cards, 50 cents per pack.

388. Pulp, dried, for paper-makers' use, 10 per cent. ad valorem.

SCHEDULE N.—SUNDRIES.

389. Brushes, and brooms of all kinds, including feather dusters, 30 per cent. ad valorem; broom-corn, $4 per ton.

390. Button forms: Lastings, mohair cloth, silk twist, or other manufactures

of cloth, woven or made in patterns of such size, shape, or form, or cut in such manner as to be fit for buttons exclusively, 10 per cent. ad valorem.

391. Card-clothing: Manufactured from tempered steel wire, 45 cents per square foot; all other, 25 cents per square foot.

392. Chronometers, box or ship's, and parts thereof, 10 per cent. ad valorem.

393. Coal, bituminous, and shale, 75 cents per ton of 28 bushels, 80 pounds to the bushel.

394. Coke, 20 per cent. ad valorem.

395. Dice, draughts, chess-men, chess-balls, and billiard, pool, and bagatelle balls, of ivory, bone, or other materials, 50 per cent. ad valorem.

396. Dolls, 35 per cent. ad valorem.

397. Emery grains, and emery manufactured, ground, pulverized, or refined, 1 cent per pound.

398. Feathers and downs of all kinds, when dressed, colored, or manufactured, including quills of down and other manufactures of down, and also including dressed and finished birds suitable for millinery ornaments, and artificial and ornamental feathers and flowers, or parts thereof, of whatever material composed, not specially enumerated or provided for in this act, 40 per cent. ad valorem.

399. Fire-crackers of all kinds, 8 cents per pound, but no allowance shall be made for tare or damage thereon.

400. Fulminates, fulminating powders, and like articles, not specially enumerated or provided for in this act, 30 per cent. ad valorem.

401. Furs, dressed on the skin but not made up into articles, and furs not on the skin, prepared for hatters' use, 25 per cent. ad valorem.

402. Gloves, kid or leather, of all descriptions, wholly or partially manufactured, 50 per cent. ad valorem.

403. Gunpowder, and all explosive substances used for mining, blasting, artillery, or sporting purposes, when valued at 20 cents or less per pound, 5 cents per pound, valued above 20 cents per pound, 8 cents per pound.

404. Gun-wads of all descriptions, 35 per cent. ad valorem.

405. Hair, human, if clean or drawn but not manufactured, 20 per cent. ad valorem.

406. Hair-cloth, known as "crinoline-cloth," and hair pencils, 30 per cent. ad valorem.

407. Hair-cloth, known as "hair-seating," 30 cents per square yard.

408. Hair, curled, suitable for beds or mattresses, 15 per cent. ad valorem.

409. Hats, for men's, women's, and children's wear, composed of the fur of the rabbit, beaver, or other animals or of which such fur is the component material of chief value, wholly or partially manufactured, including fur hat bodies, 50 per cent. ad valorem.

410. Jewelry: All articles not elsewhere specially provided for in this act, composed of precious metals or imitations thereof, whether set with coral, jet, or pearls, or with diamonds, rubies, cameos, or other precious stones, or imitations thereof, or otherwise, and which shall be known commercially as "jewelry," 25 per cent. ad valorem.

411. Leather.—Bend or belting leather and sole-leather, and leather not specially enumerated or provided for in this act, 15 per cent. ad valorem.

412. Calf-skins, tanned, or tanned and dressed, dressed upper-leather, including patent enameled and Japanned leather, and skins of all kinds not specially enumerated or provided for in this act, and chamois-skins, dressed or undressed and finished, 25 cents per pound; sheep and goat skins, including lamb and kid skins, dressed and finished, 20 per cent. ad valorem; skins for morocco, tanned but unfinished, 10 per cent. ad valorem.

413. But leather cut into shoe uppers or vamps, or other forms, suitable for conversion into manufactured articles, shall be classified as manufactures of leather, and pay duty accordingly.

414. Lime, 5 cents per 100 pounds.

415. Manufactures of alabaster, amber, asbestos, bladders, coral, cork or cork bark, cat-gut or whip-gut or worm-gut, jet, paste, spar, or wax, or of which these substances or either of them is the component material of chief value, not specially enumerated or provided for in this act, 25 per cent. ad valorem.

416. Manufactures of bone, chip, fur, grass, horn, india-rubber, palm-leaf, straw, weeds, or whalebone, or of which these substances or either of them is the component material of chief value, not specially enumerated or provided for in this act, 30 per cent. ad valorem.

417. Manufactures of leather, gutta-percha, human hair, and papier-maché, or of which these substances or either of them is the component material of chief value, not specially enumerated or provided for in this act, 35 per cent. ad valorem.

418. Manufactures of ivory, vegetable ivory, mother-of-pearl, and shell, or of which these substances or either of them is the component material of chief value, not specially enumerated or provided for in this act, 40 per cent. ad valorem.

419. Marble of all kinds.—In block, rough or squared, 65 cents per cubic foot.

420. Veined marble, sawed, dressed, or otherwise, including marble slabs and marble paving-tiles, $1.10 per cubic foot (but in measurement no slab shall be computed at less than 1 inch in thickness).

421. Manufactures of marble not specially enumerated or provided for in this act, 50 per cent. ad valorem.

422. Matches.—Friction or lucifer, of all descriptions, per gross of one hundred and forty-four boxes, containing not more than one hundred matches per box, 10 cents per gross; when imported otherwise than in boxes containing not more than one hundred matches each, 1 cent per one thousand matches.

423. Cocoa matting and mats.—Matting, 10 cents per square yard; mats, 5 cents per square foot.

424. Paintings, in oil or water colors, and statuary, not otherwise provided for in this act, 30 per cent. ad valorem; but the term "statuary" as herein used shall be understood to include only such statuary as is cut, carved, or otherwise wrought by hand from a solid block or mass of marble, stone, or alabaster, or from metal, and as is the professional production of a statuary or sculptor only.

425. Pearls, 25 per cent. ad valorem.

426. Pencils of wood filled with lead or other material, and pencils of lead, 50 cents per gross and 30 per cent. ad valorem.

427. Pencil-leads not in wood, 10 per cent. ad valorem.

428. Percussion-caps, 40 per cent. ad valorem.

429. Pipes, pipe-bowls, and cigar-holders of wood, one-half of 1 cent each and 70 per cent. ad valorem.

430. All smokers' articles whatsoever, not specially enumerated or provided for in this act, including cigarette-books, cigarette-book covers, and cigarette-paper in all forms, 70 per cent. ad valorem.

431. All common tobacco-pipes of clay, 35 per cent. ad valorem.

432. Pearl and shell buttons, 2 cents per line button measure of one-fortieth of 1 inch per gross and in addition thereto 25 per cent. ad valorem.

433. Plush, black, known commercially as hatters' plush, composed of silk, or of silk and cotton, and used exclusively for making men's hats, 10 per cent. ad valorem.

434. Precious stones of all kinds, cut but not set, 10 per cent. ad valorem; if set, and not specially enumerated or provided for in this act, 25 per cent. ad valorem.

435. Stone.—Freestone, granite, sandstone, and all building or monumental stone, except marble, unmanufactured or undressed, not specially enumerated or provided for in this act, 14 cents per cubic foot.

436. Freestone, granite, sandstone, and other building or monumental stone, except marble, not specially enumerated or provided for in this act, hewn, dressed, or polished, and burr-stones manufactured or bound up into mill-stones, 25 per cent. ad valorem.

437. Grindstones, finished or unfinished, $1.75 per ton.

438. Umbrellas, parasols, and sun-shades: Covered with silk, alpaca, or similar material, 50 per cent. ad valorem; if covered with other material, 40 per cent. ad valorem.

439. Waste, not specially enumerated or provided for in this act, 10 per cent. ad valorem.

440. Watches, watch-cases, watch-movements, parts of watches, watch-glasses, and watch-keys, whether separately packed or otherwise, 25 per cent. ad valorem.

FREE LIST.

SEC. 2503. The following articles when imported shall be exempt from duty:

441. Acids used for medicinal, chemical, or manufacturing purposes, not specially enumerated or provided for in this act.

442. Aconite.

443. Acorns, raw, dried or undried, but unground.

444. Agates, unmanufactured.

445. Albumen.

446. Alizarine, natural.

447. Alizarine, artificial.

448. Amber, unmanufactured, or crude gum.

449. Ambergris.

450. Aniline salts.

451. Animals brought into the United States temporarily for a period not exceeding six months, for the purpose of exhibition or competition for prizes offered by any agricultural or racing association; but a bond shall be given in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Secretary of the Treasury; also, teams of animals, including their harness and tackle and the wagons or other vehicles actually owned by persons emigrating from foreign countries to the United States with their families, and in actual use for the purpose of such emigration, under such regulations as the Secretary of the Treasury may prescribe.

452. Annatto, roucou, rocoa, or orleans, and all extract of.

453. Antimony ore, crude sulphide of.

454. Apatite.

455. Argal, or argol, or crude tartar.

456. Arrow-root, raw or unmanufactured.

457. Arsenic and sulphide of, or orpiment.

458. Arseniate of aniline.

459. Articles in a crude state used in dyeing or tanning not specially enumerated or provided for in this act.

460. Articles specially imported for the use of the United States, provided that the price of the same did not include the duty.

461. Articles the growth, produce, and manufacture of the United States, when returned after having been exported, without having been advanced in value or improved in condition by any process of manufacture or other means; casks, barrels, carboys, bags, and other vessels of American manufacture exported filled with American products, or exported empty and returned filled with foreign products, including shooks when returned as barrels or boxes; but proof of the identity of such articles shall be made, under general regulations to be prescribed by the Secretary of the Treasury; and if any such articles are subject to internal tax at the time of exportation, such tax shall be proved to have been paid before exportation and not refunded: *Provided*, That this paragraph shall not apply to any article upon which an allowance of drawback has been made, the reimportation of which is hereby prohibited except upon payment of duties equal to the drawbacks allowed.

462. Asbestos, unmanufactured.

463. Ashes, wood and lye of, and beet-root ashes.

464. Asphaltum and bitumen, crude.

465. Asafetida.

466. Balm of Gilead.

467. Barks, cinchona or other.

468. Baryta, carbonite or witherite.

469. Baryta, sulphate of, or barytes, unmanufactured.

470. Bauxite, or beauxite.

471. Beeswax.

472. Bells, broken, and bell-metal, broken, and fit only to be remanufactured.

473. Birds, stuffed, not suitable for millinery ornaments.

474. Birds and land and water fowls.

475. Bismuth.

476. Bladders, including fish-bladders or fish-sounds, crude, and all integuments of animals not specially enumerated or provided for in this act.

477. Blood, dried.

478. Bologna sausages.

479. Bolting-cloths.

480. Bones, crude, or not burned, calcined, ground, steamed, or otherwise manufactured, and bone-dust or animal carbon, and bone-ash, fit only for fertilizing purposes.

481. Books, engravings, photographs, bound or unbound etchings, maps, and charts; which shall have been printed and bound or manufactured more than twenty years at the date of importation.

482. Books and pamphlets printed exclusively in languages other than English.

483. Books, engravings, photographs, etchings, bound or unbound, maps and charts imported by authority or for the use of the United States or for the use of the Library of Congress; but the duty shall not have been included in the contract or price paid.

484. Books, maps, and charts specially imported, not more than two copies in any one invoice, in good faith, for the use of any society incorporated or established for philosophical, literary, or religious purposes, or for the encouragement of the fine arts, or for the use or by order of any college, academy, school, or seminary of learning in the United States.

485. Books, or libraries, or parts of libraries, and other household effects of persons or families from foreign countries, if used abroad by them not less than one year, and not intended for any other person or persons, nor for sale.

486. Brazil paste.

487. Braids, plaits, flats, laces, and similar manufactures suitable for making or ornamenting hats, bonnets, and hoods, composed of straw, chip, grass, palm-leaf, willow, osier or rattan.

488. Brazilian pebbles, rough or unmanufactured.

489. Breccia, in blocks or slabs.

490. Bristles, raw or manufactured.

491. Bromine.

492. Bullion, gold or silver.

493. Bulbs and bulbous roots, not edible.

494. Burgundy pitch.

495. Cabinets of old coins and medals, and other collections of antiquities; but the term "antiquities" as used in this act shall include only such articles as are suitable for souvenirs or cabinet collections, and which shall have been produced at any period prior to the seventeenth century.

496. Cadmium.

497. Calamine.

498. Camphor, crude.

499. Castor or castereum.

500. Cassia, cassia vera, and cassia-buds, unground.
501. Catgut, whip-gut, or worm-gut, unmanufactured, or not further manufactured than in strings or cord.
502. Cerium.
503. Chalk, unmanufactured.
504. Charcoal.
505. Chicory-root, raw, dried, or undried, but unground.
506. Cinnamon, and chips of, unground.
507. Civet, crude.
508. Cloves and clove-stems, unground.
509. Coal, anthracite.
510. Coal slack or culm, such as will pass through a half-inch screen.
511. Coal stores of American vessels; but none shall be unloaded.
512. Coal-tar, crude.
513. Cobalt and cobalt ore.
514. Cocculus indicus.
515. Cochineal.
516. Cocoa, or cacao, crude, and fiber, leaves and shells of.
517. Coffee.
518. Coins, gold, silver, and copper.
519. Coir, and coir yarn.
520. Copper, old, taken from the bottom of American vessels compelled by marine disaster to repair in foreign ports.
521. Copper, when imported for the United States Mint.
522. Coral, marine, uncut, and unmanufactured.
523. Cork-wood, or cork-bark, unmanufactured.
524. Cotton, and cotton-waste or flocks.
525. Cryolite, or kryolith.
526. Cudbear.
527. Curling-stones, or quoits, and curling-stone handles.
528. Currants, Zante, or other dried.
529. Curry and curry-powder.
530. Cutch.
531. Cuttle-fish bone.
532. Dandelion roots, raw, dried, or undried, but unground.
533. Diamonds and other precious stones, rough or uncut (not including pearls), and diamond dust or bort.
534. Diamonds set for glaziers' use, and diamonds set as pencils or drills for engravers' use.
535. Divi-divi.
536. Dragon's blood.
537. Drugs, such as: barks, beans, berries, balsams, buds, bulbs, and bulbous roots, excrescences such as nut-galls, fruits, flowers, dried fibers, and dried insects, grains, gums, and gum-resin, herbs, leaves, lichens, mosses, nuts, roots, and stems, spices, vegetables, seeds aromatic, and seeds of morbid growth, weeds, and woods used expressly for dyeing—any of the foregoing which are not edible and are in a crude state, and not advanced in value or condition by refining or grinding, or by other process of manufacture, and not specially enumerated or provided for in this act.
538. Eggs of birds and fowls, and of fish and insects, and egg-yelks, unmanufactured.
539. Emery ore.
540. Ergot.
541. Fans, common palm-leaf, and palm-leaf, unmanufactured.
542. Farina.
543. Fashion-plates, engraved on steel or copper or on wood, colored or plain.
544. Feathers and downs of all kinds, crude and unmanufactured.
545. Feldspar.
546. Felt, adhesive, for sheathing vessels.
547. Fibrin, in all forms.
548. Fibers and grasses: China-grass.
549. Istle or Tampico fiber.
550. Jute.
551. Jute-butts.
552. Manila.
553. Ramie.
554. Sisal-grass.
555. Sunn.
556. And all other textile grasses or fibrous vegetable substances, unmanufactured or undressed, not specially enumerated or provided for in this act.
557. Fish, fresh, except when frozen or packed in ice, or otherwise prepared by any process for preservation.
558. Fish for bait.
559. Fish-skins.
560. Flint, flints, and ground flint stones.
561. Floor-matting manufactured from round or split straw, including what is commercially known as Chinese matting.
562. Fossils.
563. Fruit-plants, tropical and semi-tropical, for the purpose of propagation or cultivation.
564. Fruits, green, ripe, or dried, not specially enumerated or provided for in this act.
565. Furs, undressed.
566. Fur-skins of all kinds not dressed in any manner.
567. Gambier.
568. Ginger-root, unground, and not preserved or candied.
569. Glass, broken pieces, and old glass, which can not be cut for use, and fit only to be remanufactured.
570. Glass plates or disks, rough-cut and unwrought, for use in the manufacture of optical instruments, spectacles, and eye-glasses, and suitable only for such use.
571. Gold-beaters' molds and gold-beaters' skins.
572. Grease and oils, such as are commonly used in soap-making or in wire-drawing or for stuffing or dressing leather, and as are fit only for such uses, not specially enumerated or provided for in this act.
573. Guano, manures, and all substances expressly used for manure.
574. Gunny bags and gunny cloths, old or refuse, fit only for remanufacture.
575. Guts, salted.
576. Gutta-percha, crude.
577. Hair of horse, cattle, and other animals, cleaned or uncleaned, drawn or undrawn, but unmanufactured, not specially enumerated or provided for in this act; and human hair, raw, uncleaned, and not drawn.
578. Hide-cuttings, raw, with or without hair, and all other glue-stock.
579. Hide rope.
580. Hides, raw or uncured, whether dry, salted, or pickled, and skins of all kinds, raw or dried, salted, or pickled, but unmanufactured, except sheep-skins with dutiable wool on.
581. Hones and whetstones.
582. Hoofs, unmanufactured.
583. Hop roots for cultivation.
584. Horns and parts of, including horn strips and tips, unmanufactured.
585. Ice.
586. India rubber, crude, and milk of, and old scrap or refuse India rubber which has been worn out by use and is fit only for remanufacture.
587. Indigo.
588. Iodine, crude.
589. Ipecac.
590. Iridium.
591. Ivory and vegetable ivory, not sawed, cut, or otherwise manufactured.
592. Jalap.
593. Jet, unmanufacted.
594. Joss-stick, or Joss-light.
595. Junk, old.
596. Kelp.
597. Kieserite.
598. Kyanite, or cyanite, and kainite.
599. Lac-dye, crude, seed, button, stick, and shell.
600. Lac spirits.
601. Lactarine.
602. Lava, unmanufactured.
603. Leather, old scraps.
604. Leeches.
605. Lemon-juice, lime-juice, and sour-orange juice.
606. Licorice-root, unground.
607. Life-boats and life-saving apparatus specially imported by societies incorporated or established to encourage the saving of human life.
608. Lime, citrate of.
609. Lime, chloride of, or bleaching-powder.
610. Lithographic stones not engraved.
611. Litmus, prepared or not prepared.
612. Loadstones.
613. Mace.
614. Madder and munjeet, or Indian madder, ground or prepared, and all extracts of.
615. Magnesite, or native mineral carbonate of magnesia.
616. Magnesium.
617. Magnets.
618. Manganese, oxide and ore of.
619. Manna.
620. Manuscripts.
621. Marrow, crude.
622. Marsh mallows.
623. Medals of gold.
624. Medals of silver or copper.
625. Meerschaum, crude or unmanufactured.
626. Mica and mica waste.
627. Mineral waters, all not otherwise specially provided for in this act.
628. Minerals, crude, or not advanced in value or condition by refining or grinding, or by other process of manufacture, not specially enumerated or provided for in this act.
629. Models of inventions and of other improvements in the arts, including patterns for machinery, but no article shall be deemed a model or pattern which can be fitted for use otherwise.
630. Molasses testing not above fifty-six degrees by the polariscope: *Provided*, That if an export duty shall hereafter be laid upon molasses by any country from whence the same may be imported, it shall be subject to duty as provided by law at the date of the passage of this act.
631. Moss, sea-weeds, and vegetable substances, crude or unmanufactured, not otherwise specially provided for in this act.
632. Musk, crude, in natural pods.
633. Myrobolan.
634. Newspapers and periodicals; but the term "periodicals" as herein used shall be understood to embrace only unbound or paper-covered publications, containing current literature of the day and issued regularly at stated periods, as weekly, monthly, or quarterly.
635. Nutmegs.
636. Nuts.—Cocoa.
637. Brazil.
638. Cream.
639. Palm.
640. Palm-nut kernels.
641. Nux vomica.
642. Oakum.
643. Oil-cake.
644. Oils.—Almond.
645. Amber, crude and rectified.
646. Ambergris.
647. Anise, or anise-seed.
648. Aniline.
649. Aspic, or spike-lavender.
650. Bergamot.
651. Cajeput.
652. Caraway.
653. Cassia and cinnamon.
654. Cedrat.
655. Chamomile.
656. Citronella, or lemon-grass.
657. Civet.
658. Fennel.
659. Jasmine, or jasimine.
660. Juglandium.
661. Juniper.
662. Lavender.
663. Lemon.
664. Limes.
665. Mace.
666. Neroli, or orange flower.
667. Nut oil, or oil of nuts not otherwise specially provided for in this act.
668. Orange.
669. Olive oil, for manufacturing or mechanical purposes, unfit for eating and not otherwise provided for in this act.
670. Ottar of roses.
671. Palm and cocoanut.
672. Rosemary or anthoss.
673. Sesame or sesamum-seed, or bean.
674. Thyme origanum, red or white.
675. Valerian.
676. Spermaceti, whale, and other fish oils of American fisheries, and all other articles the produce of such fisheries.
677. Olives, green or prepared.
678. Opium, crude or unmanufactured, and not adulterated, containing 9 per cent. and over of morphia.
679. Orange and lemon peel, not preserved, candied, or otherwise prepared.
680. Orchil, or orchil liquid.
681. Ores, of gold and silver.
682. Osmium.
683. Palladium.
684. Paper stock, crude, of every description, including all grasses and pulp of grasses, fibers, rags (other than wool), waste, shavings, clippings, old paper, rope ends, waste rope, waste bagging, old or refuse gunny bags or gunny cloth, and poplar or other woods, fit only to be converted into paper.
685. Paraffine.

686. Parchment and vellum.
687. Pearl, mother of, not sawed, cut, polished, or otherwise manufactured.
688. Peltries and other proper goods and effects of Indians passing or repassing the boundary line of the Territories of the United States: *Provided*, That this exemption shall not apply to goods in bales or other large packages unusual among Indians.
689. Pepper of all kinds, unground.
690. Personal and household effects, not merchandise, of citizens of the United States dying in foreign countries.
691. Pewter and britannia metal, old, and fit only to be remanufactured.
692. Philosophical and scientific apparatus, instruments, and preparations; statuary, casts of marbles, bronze, alabaster, or plaster of Paris; painting, drawings, and etchings, specially imported in good faith for the use of any society or institution incorporated or established for religious, philosophical, educational, scientific, or literary purposes, or for encouragement of the fine arts, and not intended for sale.
693. Phosphates, crude or native.
694. Pimento, unground.
695. Plants, trees, shrubs, and vines, of all kinds, not otherwise specially provided for in this act; and plants, trees, shrubs, roots, seed-cane, and seeds, imported by the Department of Agriculture or the United States Botanic Garden.
696. Plaster of Paris and sulphate of lime, unground.
697. Platina, in ingots, bars, sheets, and wire.
698. Platinum, unmanufactured, and vases, retorts, and other apparatus, vessels, and parts thereof composed of platinum, for chemical uses.
699. Plumbago.
700. Polishing-stones.
701. Potash.—Crude, carbonate of, or "black salts," or fused.
702. Caustic, or hydrate of, not including refined in sticks or rolls.
703. Nitrate of, or saltpeter, crude.
704. Sulphate of, crude or unrefined.
705. Chlorate of.
706. Muriate of.
707. Professional books, implements, instruments, and tools of trade, occupation, or employment, of persons arriving in the United States; but this exemption shall not be construed to include machinery or other articles imported for use in any manufacturing establishment, or for any other person or persons, or for sale.
708. Pulu.
709. Pumice.
710. Quills, prepared or unprepared, but not made up into complete articles.
711. Quinia, sulphate of, and all alkaloids or salts of cinchona-bark.
712. Rags, all not otherwise specially enumerated or provided for in this act.
713. Regalia and gems, statues, statuary, and specimens of sculpture, where specially imported in good faith for the use of any society incorporated or established for philosophical, literary, or religious purposes, or for the encouragement of the fine arts, or for the use or by order of any college, academy, school, seminary of learning or public library in the United States; but the term "regalia" as herein used shall be held to embrace only such insignia of rank or office, or emblems, as may be worn upon the person or borne in the hand during public exercises of the society or institution, and shall not include articles of furniture or fixtures, or of regular wearing apparel, nor personal property of individuals.
714. Rennets, raw or prepared.
715. Saffron and safflower, and extract of, and saffron cake.
716. Sago, crude, and sago flower, not in condition suitable for use as starch.
717. Salacine.
718. Sauer-kraut.
719. Sausage skins.
720. Seeds.—Anise.
721. Canary.
722. Caraway.
723. Cardamom.
724. Coriander.
725. Cotton.
726. Cummin.
727. Fennel.
728. Fenugreek.
729. Hemp.
730. Hoarhound.
731. Mangel-wurzel.
732. Melon.
733. Mustard.
734. Poppy.
735. Pumpkin.
736. Rape.
737. St. John's bread or bean.
738. Sugar-beet.
739. Squash.
740. Turnip.
741. And all flower and grass seeds not otherwise specially provided for in this act.
742. Selep, or saloup.
743. Shells of all kinds, not cut, ground, or otherwise manufactured.
744. Shrimps, and other shell-fish.
745. Silk, raw, or as reeled from the cocoon, but not doubled, twisted, or advanced in manufacture in any way.
746. Silk cocoons and silk-waste.
747. Silk-worms' eggs.
748. Skeletons and other preparations of anatomy.
749. Snails.
750. Soda, nitrate of, or cubic nitrate, and chlorate of.
751. Sodium.
752. Sparterre, suitable for making or ornamenting hats.
753. Specimens of natural history, botany, and mineralogy, when imported for cabinets or as objects of science, and not for sale.
754. Sponges.
755. Spunk.
756. Spurs and stilts used in the manufacture of earthen, porcelain, and stone ware.
757. Stone and sand: Burr-stone in blocks, rough or unmanufactured, and not bound up into millstones; cliff-stone, unmanufactured; pumice-stone, rotten-stone, and sand, crude or unmanufactured.
758. Storax, or styrax.
759. Straw, unmanufactured.
760. Strontia, oxide of, and protoxide of strontian, and strontianite, or mineral carbonate of strontia.
761. Sugar of milk.
762. Sulphur, lac or precipitated, and sulphur or brimstone, not specially enumerated or provided for in this act.
763. Sweepings of silver and gold.
764. Tamarinds.
765. Tapioca, cassava or cassada, provided the same is not fit for use as starch.
766. Tar and pitch of wood.
767. Tea and tea-plants.
768. Teasels.
769. Teeth, natural or unmanufactured.
770. Terra alba.
771. Terra japonica.
772. Tin ore, and tin in bars, blocks, pigs, or grain or granulated.
773. Tonquin, tonqua, or tonka beans.
774. Tripoli.
775. Turmeric.
776. Turpentine, Venice.
777. Turpentine, spirits of.
778. Turtles.
779. Types, old, and fit only to be remanufactured.
780. Uranium, oxide and salts of.
781. Vaccine virus.
782. Valonia.
783. Verdigris, or subacetate of copper.
784. Wafers, unmedicated.
785. Wax, vegetable or mineral.
786. Wearing apparel and other personal effects (not merchandise) of persons arriving in the United States; but this exemption shall not be held to include articles not actually in use and necessary and appropriate for the use of such persons for the purposes of their journey and present comfort and convenience, or which are intended for any other person or persons, or for sale: *Provided, however*, That all such wearing apparel and other personal effects as may have been once imported into the United States and subjected to the payment of duty, and which may have been actually used and taken or exported to foreign countries by the persons returning therewith to the United States, shall, if not advanced in value or improved in condition by any means since their exportation from the United States, be entitled to exemption from duty, upon their identity being established, under such rules and regulations as may be prescribed by the Secretary of the Treasury.
787. Whalebone, unmanufactured.
788. Wood.—Logs.
789. Fire-wood, handle-bolts, heading-bolts, or stave-bolts, and shingle-bolts, hop-poles, railroad ties, ship-timber, and ship-planking.
790. Cedar, lignum-vitæ, lancewood, ebony, box, granadilla, mahogany, rosewood, satinwood, and all other cabinet-woods, unmanufactured, not otherwise specially provided for in this act; bamboo, rattan, reeds, and osier or willow, unmanufactured; bamboo, reeds, and sticks of partridge, hairwood, pimento, orange, myrtle, and other woods, not otherwise specially provided for in this act, in the rough, or not further manufactured than cut into lengths suitable for umbrella, parasol, sun-shade, or whip-sticks, or walking-canes; and India malacca joints, not further manufactured than cut into suitable lengths for the manufactures into which they are intended to be converted.
791. Works of art, paintings, statuary, and other works of art the production of American artists residing temporarily abroad, and paintings, statuary, fountains, and other works of art, imported expressly for presentation to a national institution, or to any State or municipal corporation, or incorporated religious society, college, or other public institution; but such exemption shall be subject to such regulations as the Secretary of the Treasury may prescribe.
792. Works of art, drawings, engravings, photographic pictures, and philosophical and scientific apparatus brought by professional artists, lecturers, or scientists arriving from abroad for use by them temporarily for exhibition and in illustration, promotion, and encouragement of art, science, or industry in the United States, and not for sale, and paintings, statuary, and photographic pictures imported for exhibition by any association duly authorized under the laws of the United States or of any State, for the promotion and encouragement of science, art, or industry, and not intended for sale, shall be admitted free of duty, under such regulations as the Secretary of the Treasury shall prescribe; but bonds shall be given for the payment to the United States of such duties as may be imposed by law upon any and all of such articles as shall not be exported within six months after such importation: *Provided, however*, That the Secretary of the Treasury may, in his discretion, extend such period for a further term of six months in cases where applications therefor shall be made.
793. Works of art, collections in illustration of the progress of the arts, science, or manufactures, photographs, works in terra-cotta, parian, pottery, or porcelain, and artistic copies of antiquities in metal or other material, hereafter imported in good faith for permanent exhibition at a fixed place by any society or institution established for the encouragement of the arts or science, and all like articles imported in good faith by any society or association for the purpose of erecting a public monument, and not intended for sale, nor for any other purpose than herein expressed; but the parties importing such articles shall give bonds, under such rules and regulations as the Secretary of the Treasury may prescribe, for the payment of lawful duties which may accrue should any of the articles aforesaid be so sold, transferred, or used contrary to this provision; and such articles shall be subject, at any time, to examination and inspection by the proper officers of the customs.
794. Yams.
795. Zaffer.

SEC. 2491. All persons are prohibited from importing into the United States from any foreign country any obscene book, pamphlet, paper, writing, advertisement, circular, print, picture, drawing, or other representation, figure, or image on or of paper or other material, or any cast, instrument, or other article of an immoral nature, or any drug or medicine, or any article whatever, for the prevention of conception, or for causing unlawful abortion. No invoice or package whatever, or any part of one, in which any such articles are contained shall be admitted to entry; and all invoices and packages whereof any such articles shall compose a part are liable to be proceeded against, seized, and forfeited by due course of law. All such prohibited articles in the course of importation shall be detained by the officer of customs, and proceedings taken against the same as prescribed in the following section: *Provided*, That the drugs hereinbefore mentioned, when imported in bulk and not put up for any of the purposes hereinbefore specified, are excepted from the operation of this section.

SEC. 2492. Whoever, being an officer, agent, or employé of the Government of the United States, shall knowingly aid or abet any person engaged in any violation of any of the provisions of law prohibiting importing, advertising, dealing in, exhibiting, or sending or receiving by mail obscene or indecent publications or representations, or means for preventing conception or procuring abortion, or other articles of indecent or immoral use or tendency, shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor, and shall for every offense be punishable by a fine of not more than $5,000, or by imprisonment at hard labor for not more than ten years, or both.

SEC. 2493. Any judge of any district or circuit court of the United States, within the proper district, before whom complaint in writing of any violation of the preceding sections is made, to the satisfaction of such judge, and founded on knowledge or belief, and if upon belief, setting forth the grounds of such belief, and supported by oath or affirmation of the complainant, may issue, conformably to the Constitution, a warrant directed to the marshal, or any deputy marshal, in the proper district, directing him to search for, seize, and take possession of any such article or thing hereinbefore mentioned, and to make due and immediate return thereof to the end that the same may be condemned and destroyed by proceedings, which shall be conducted in the same manner as other proceedings in the case of municipal seizure, and with the same right of appeal or writ of error.

SEC. 2494. The importation of neat cattle and the hides of neat cattle from any foreign country into the United States is prohibited: *Provided*, That the operation of this section shall be suspended as to any foreign country or countries, or any parts of such country or countries, whenever the Secretary of the Treasury shall officially determine, and give public notice thereof, that such importation will not tend to the introduction or spread of contagious or infectious diseases among the cattle of the United States; and the Secretary of the Treasury is hereby authorized and empowered, and it shall be his duty, to make all necessary orders and regulations to carry this law into effect, or to suspend the same as therein provided, and to send copies thereof to the proper officers in the United States, and to such officers or agents of the United States in foreign countries as he s all judge necessary.

SEC. 2495. Any person convicted of a willful violation of any of the provisions of the preceding section shall be fined not exceeding $500, or imprisoned not exceeding one year, or both, in the discretion of the court.

SEC. 2496. No watches, watch-cases, watch-movements, or parts of watch-movements, or any other articles of foreign manufacture, which shall copy or simulate the name or trade-mark of any domestic manufacture or manufacturer, shall be admitted to entry at the custom-house of the United States, unless such domestic manufacturer is the importer of the same. And in order to aid the officers of the customs in enforcing this prohibition, any domestic manufacturer who has adopted trade-marks may require his name and residence and a description of his trade-marks to be recorded in books which shall be kept for that purpose in the Department of the Treasury, under such regulations as the Secretary of the Treasury shall prescribe, and may furnish to the Department fac-similes of such trade-marks; and thereupon the Secretary of the Treasury shall cause one or more copies of the same to be transmitted to each collector or other proper officer of the customs.

SEC. 2497. No goods, wares, or merchandise, unless in cases provided for by treaty, shall be imported into the United States from any foreign port or place, except in vessels of the United States, or in such foreign vessels as truly and wholly belong to the citizens or subjects of that country of which the goods are the growth, production, or manufacture; or from which such goods, wares, or merchandise can only be, or most usually are, first shipped for transportation. All goods, wares, or merchandise imported contrary to this section, and the vessel wherein the same shall be imported, together with her cargo, tackle, apparel, and furniture, shall be forfeited to the United States; and such goods, wares, or merchandise, ship, or vessel, and cargo shall be liable to be seized, prosecuted, and condemned, in like manner, and under the same regulations, restrictions, and provisions as have been heretofore established for the recovery, collection, distribution, and remission of forfeitures to the United States by the several revenue laws.

SEC. 2498. The preceding section shall not apply to vessels or goods, wares, or merchandise imported in vessels of a foreign nation which does not maintain a similar regulation against vessels of the United States.

SEC. 2499. Each and every imported article, not enumerated in this act, which is similar, either in material, quality, texture, or the use to which it may be applied, to any article enumerated in this act as chargeable with duty, shall pay the same rate of duty which is levied on the enumerated article which it most resembles in any of the particulars before mentioned; and if any non-enumerated article equally resembles two or more enumerated articles on which different rates of duty are chargeable, there shall be levied on such non-enumerated article the same rate of duty as is chargeable on the article which it resembles paying the highest rate of duty; and on articles not enumerated, manufactured of two or more materials, the duty shall be assessed at the highest rate at which the same would be chargeable if composed wholly of the component material thereof of chief value; and the words "component material of chief value," wherever used in this act, shall be held to mean that component material which shall exceed in value any other single component material of the article; and the value of each component material shall be determined by the ascertained value of such material in its condition as found in the article. If two or more rates of duty shall be applicable to any imported article, it shall pay duty at the highest of such rates.

SEC. 2500. Upon the reimportation of articles once exported of the growth, product, or manufacture of the United States, upon which no internal tax has been assessed or paid, or upon which such tax has been paid and refunded by allowance or drawback, there shall be levied, collected, and paid a duty equal to the tax imposed by the internal-revenue laws upon such articles.

SEC. 2501. A discriminating duty of 10 per cent. ad valorem, in addition to the duties imposed by law, shall be levied, collected, and paid on all goods, wares, or merchandise which shall be imported in vessels not of the United States; but this discriminating duty shall not apply to goods, wares, and merchandise which shall be imported in vessels not of the United States, entitled, by treaty or any act of Congress, to be entered in the ports of the United States on payment of the same duties as shall then be paid on goods, wares, and merchandise imported in vessels of the United States.

SEC. 2504. Whenever any vessel laden with merchandise, in whole or in part subject to duty, has been sunk in any river, harbor, bay, or waters subject to the jurisdiction of the United States, and within its limits, for the period of two years, and is abandoned by the owner thereof, any person who may raise such vessel shall be permitted to bring any merchandise recovered therefrom into the port nearest to the place where such vessel was so raised, free from the payment of any duty thereupon, and without being obliged to enter the same at the custom-house; but under such regulations as the Secretary of the Treasury may prescribe.

SEC. 2505. The produce of the forests of the State of Maine upon the St. John River and its tributaries, owned by American citizens, and sawed or hewed in the province of New Brunswick by American citizens, the same being unmanufactured in whole or in part, which is now admitted into the ports of the United States free of duty, shall continue to be so admitted under such regulations as the Secretary of the Treasury shall from time to time prescribe.

SEC. 2506. The produce of the forests of the State of Maine upon the St. Croix River and its tributaries, owned by American citizens, and sawed in the province of New Brunswick by American citizens, the same being unmanufactured in whole or in part, and having paid the same taxes as other American lumber on that river, shall be admitted into the ports of the United States free of duty, under such regulations as the Secretary of the Treasury shall from time to time prescribe.

SEC. 2507. Machinery for repair may be imported into the United States without payment of duty, under bond, to be given in double the appraised value thereof, to be withdrawn and exported after said machinery shall have been repaired; and the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to prescribe such rules and regulations as may be necessary to protect the revenue against fraud, and secure the identity and character of all such importations when again withdrawn and exported, restricting and limiting the export and withdrawal to the same port of entry where imported, and also limiting all bonds to a period of time of not more than six months from the date of the importation.

SEC. 2508. That the importation of all articles of foreign manufacture, or of boxes or packages containing the same, when stamped, marked, branded, or labeled to represent that such articles were manufactured in the United States, is hereby prohibited, and all such articles shall be forfeited to the United States.

SEC. 2509. That the importation of opium, containing less than 9 per cent. of morphia, and of opium prepared for smoking be, and the same is hereby, prohibited: and all such opium shall, upon importation, be seized and proceeded against for forfeiture and condemnation. All opium containing less than 9 per cent. of morphia, and all opium prepared for smoking, wherever found in the United States, shall be subject to seizure, and shall be condemned and destroyed unless the claimant thereto shall show to the satisfaction of the court that the same was lawfully imported or was prepared from opium lawfully imported: *Provided*, That officers of the United States, by whom opium may be seized under the provisions of this section, and persons giving information leading to such seizure, shall receive such compensation, upon the condemnation of the opium so seized, as the Secretary of the Treasury may direct, to be paid from the appropriation for the prevention and detection of frauds upon the customs revenue. The whole amount of such compensation shall not, however, exceed, in any case, one-half of the appraised value of the opium seized and condemned: *Provided further*, That the Secretary of the Treasury may prescribe suitable regulations for the enforcement of this section.

SEC. 2510. All lumber, timber, hemp, manila, wire rope, and iron and steel rods, bars, spikes, nails, plates, angles, bars, and bolts, and copper, and composition metal which may be necessary for the construction and equipment of vessels built in the United States for foreign account and ownership or for the purpose of being employed in the foreign trade, including the trade between the Atlantic and Pacific ports of the United States, after the passage of this act, may be imported in bond, under such regulations as the Secretary of the Treasury may prescribe; and upon proof that such materials have been used for such purpose, no duties shall be paid thereon. But vessels receiving the benefit of this section shall not be allowed to engage in the coastwise trade of the United States more than two months in any one year, except upon the payment to the United States of the duties on which a rebate is herein allowed: *Provided*, That vessels built in the United States for foreign account and ownership shall not be allowed to engage in the coastwise trade of the United States.

SEC. 2511. All articles of foreign production needed for the repair of American vessels engaged exclusively in foreign trade may be withdrawn from bonded warehouses free of duty, under such regulations as the Secretary of the Treasury may prescribe.

SEC. 2512. That no duty shall be levied or collected on the importation of peltries brought into the Territories of the United States by Indians, nor on the proper goods and effects, of whatever nature, of Indians passing or repassing the boundary line aforesaid, unless the same be goods in bales or other large packages unusual among Indians, which shall not be considered as goods belonging to Indians, nor be entitled to the exemption from duty aforesaid.

SEC. 2513. There shall be levied, collected, and paid on the importation of all raw or unmanufactured articles, not enumerated or provided for in this title, a duty of 10 per cent. ad valorem; and all articles manufactured, in whole or in part, not enumerated or provided for in this title, a duty of 20 per cent. ad valorem.

COLLECTION OF DUTIES ON IMPORTS.

SEC. 13. All merchandise imported into the United States shall, for the purpose of this act, be deemed and held to be the property of the person to whom the merchandise may be consigned; but the holder of any bill of lading consigned to order and properly indorsed shall be deemed the consignee thereof, and in case of the abandonment of any merchandise to the underwriters the latter may be recognized as the consignee.

SEC. 14. That all invoices of imported merchandise shall be made out in the currency of the place or country from whence the importations shall be made, or if purchased, in the currency actually paid therefor, shall contain a correct description of such merchandise, and shall be made in triplicate and signed by the person owning or shipping the same, if the merchandise has been actually purchased, or by the manufacturer or owner thereof if the same has been procured otherwise than by purchase, or by the duly authorized agent of such purchaser, manufacturer, or owner.

SEC. 15. That all such invoices shall, at or before the shipment of the merchandise, be produced to the consul, vice-consul, or commercial agent of the United States of the consular district from which the merchandise is exported to the United States, and shall have indorsed thereon, when so produced, a declaration signed by the purchaser, manufacturer, owner, or agent, setting forth that the invoice is in all respects correct and true, and was made at the place from which the merchandise is to be exported to the United States; that it contains, if the merchandise was obtained by purchase, a true and full statement of the time when, the place where, the person from whom the same was purchased, and the actual cost thereof and of all charges thereon; and that no discounts, bounties, or drawbacks are contained in the invoice but such as have been actually allowed thereon; and when obtained in any other manner than by purchase, the actual market value or wholesale price thereof at the time of exportation to the United States in the principal markets of the country from whence exported; that such actual market value is the price at which the merchandise described in the invoice is freely offered for sale to all purchasers in said markets, and that it is the price which the manufacturer or owner making the declaration would have received, and was willing to receive, for such merchandise sold in the ordinary course of trade, and if subject to specific duty the actual quantity thereof; and that no different invoice of the merchandise mentioned in the invoice so produced, has been or will be furnished to any one. If the merchandise was actually purchased, the declaration shall also contain a statement that the currency in which such invoice is made out is that which was actually paid for the merchandise by the purchaser.

SEC. 16. That, except in case of personal effects accompanying the passenger, no importation of any merchandise exceeding $100 in dutiable value shall be admitted to entry without the production of a duly-certified invoice thereof as required by law, or of an affidavit made by the owner, importer, or consignee, before the collector or his deputy, showing why it is impracticable to produce such invoice; and no entry shall be made in the absence of a certified invoice, upon affidavit as aforesaid, unless such affidavit be accompanied by a statement in the form of an invoice, or otherwise, showing the actual cost of such merchandise, if purchased, or if obtained otherwise than by purchase, the actual market value of wholesale price thereof at the time of exportation to the United States, in the principal markets of the country from which the same has been imported; which statement shall be verified by the oath of the owner, importer, consignee, or agent desiring to make entry of the merchandise, to be administered by the collector or his deputy, and it shall be lawful for the collector or his deputy to examine the deponent under oath touching the sources of his knowledge, information, or belief in the premises, and to require him to produce any letter, paper, or statement of account, in his possession, or under his control, which may assist the officers of customs in ascertaining the actual value of the importation or any part thereof; and in default of such production when so requested, such owner, importer, consignee, or agent shall be thereafter debarred from producing any such letter, paper, or statement, for the purpose of avoiding any additional duty, penalty, or forfeiture incurred under this act, unless he shall show to the satisfaction of the court or the officers of the customs, as the case may be, that it was not in his power to produce the same when so demanded; and no merchandise shall be admitted to entry under the provisions of this section unless the collector shall be satisfied that the failure to produce a duly-certified invoice is due to causes beyond the control of the owner, consignee, or agent thereof.

SEC. 17. That whenever merchandise imported into the United States is entered by invoice, one of the following declarations, according to the nature of the case, shall be filed with the collector of the port, at the time of entry, by the owner, importer, consignee, or agent; which declaration so filed shall be duly signed by the owner, importer, consignee, or agent, before the collector, or be-

fore a notary public or other officer duly authorized by law to administer oaths and take acknowledgments, who may be designated by the Secretary of the Treasury to receive such declarations and to certify to the identity of the persons making them; and every officer so designated shall file with the collector of the port a copy of his official signature and seal: *Provided*, That if any of the invoices or bills of lading of any merchandise imported in any one vessel, which should otherwise be embraced in said entry, have not been received at the date of the entry, the declaration may state the fact, and thereupon such merchandise of which the invoices or bills of lading are not produced shall not be included in such entry, but may be entered subsequently.

Declaration of consignee, importer, or agent.

I, ——— ———, do solemnly and truly declare that the invoice and bill of lading now presented by me to the collector of ——— are the true and only invoice and bill of lading by me received of all the goods, wares, and merchandise imported in the ———, whereof ——— ——— is master, from ———, for account of any person whomsoever for whom I am authorized to enter the same; that the said invoice and bill of lading are in the state in which they were actually received by me, and that I do not know or believe in the existence of any other invoice or bill of lading of the said goods, wares, and merchandise; that the entry now delivered to the collector contains a just and true account of the said goods, wares, and merchandise, according to the said invoice and bill of lading; that nothing has been, on my part, nor to my knowledge on the part of any other person, concealed or suppressed, whereby the United States may be defrauded of any part of the duty lawfully due on the said goods, wares, and merchandise; that the said invoice and the declaration therein are in all respects true, and were made by the person by whom the same purports to have been made; and that if at any time hereafter I discover any error in the said invoice, or in the account now rendered of the said goods, wares, and merchandise, or receive any other invoice of the same, I will immediately make the same known to the collector of this district. And I do further solemnly and truly declare that to the best of my knowledge and belief [insert the name and residence of the owner or owners] is [or are] the owner [or owners] of the goods, wares, and merchandise mentioned in the annexed entry; that the invoice now produced by me exhibits the actual cost [if purchased] or the actual market value or wholesale price [if otherwise obtained] at the time of exportation to the United States in the principal markets of the country from whence imported of the said goods, wares, and merchandise, including the value of all cartons, cases, crates, boxes, sacks, and coverings of any kind, and all other costs, charges, and expenses incident to placing said goods, wares, and merchandise in condition, packed ready for shipment to the United States, and no other or different discount, bounty, or drawback but such as has been actually allowed on the same.

Declaration of owner in cases where merchandise has been actually purchased.

I, ——— ———, do solemnly and truly declare that the entry now delivered by me to the collector of ——— contains a just and true account of all the goods, wares, and merchandise imported by or consigned to me, in the ———, whereof ——— ——— is master, from ———; that the invoice and entry which I now produce contain a just and faithful account of the actual cost of the said goods, wares, and merchandise, including the value of all cartons, cases, crates, boxes, sacks, and coverings, of any kind, and all other costs, charges, and expenses incident to placing said goods, wares, and merchandise in condition, packed ready for shipment to the United States, and no other discount, drawback, or bounty but such as has been actually allowed on the same; that I do not know nor believe in the existence of any invoice or bill of lading other than those now produced by me, and that they are in the state in which I actually received them. And I further solemnly and truly declare that I have not in the said entry or invoice concealed or suppressed anything whereby the United States may be defrauded of any part of the duty lawfully due on the said goods, wares, and merchandise; that the said invoice and the declaration thereon are in all respects true, and were made by the person by whom the same purports to have been made; and that if at any time hereafter I discover any error in the said invoice or in the account now produced of the said goods, wares, and merchandise, or receive any other invoice of the same, I will immediately make the same known to the collector of this district.

Declaration of manufacturer or owner in cases where merchandise has not been actually purchased.

I, ——— ———, do solemnly and truly declare that the entry now delivered by me to the collector of ——— contains a just and true account of all the goods, wares, and merchandise imported by or consigned to me in the ———, whereof ——— ——— is master, from ———; that the said goods, wares, and merchandise were not actually bought by me, or by my agent, in the ordinary mode of bargain and sale, but that nevertheless the invoice which I now produce contains a just and faithful valuation of the same, at their actual market value or wholesale price, at the time of exportation to the United States in the principal markets of the country from whence imported for my account [or for account of myself or partners]; that the said invoice contains also a just and faithful account of all the cost of finishing said goods, wares, and merchandise to their present condition, including the value of all cartons, cases, crates, boxes, sacks, and coverings of any kind, and all other costs and charges incident to placing said goods, wares, and merchandise in condition, packed ready for shipment to the United States, and no other discount, drawback, or bounty but such as has been actually allowed on the said goods, wares, and merchandise; that the said invoice and the declaration thereon are in all respects true, and were made by the person by whom the same purports to have been made; that I do not know nor believe in the existence of any invoice or bill of lading other than those now produced by me, and that they are in the state in which I actually received them. And I do further solemnly and truly declare that I have not in the said entry or invoice concealed or suppressed anything whereby the United States may be defrauded of any part of the duty lawfully due on the said goods, wares, and merchandise; and that if at any time hereafter I discover any error in the said invoice, or in the account now produced of the said goods, wares, and merchandise, or receive any other invoice of the same, I will immediately make the same known to the collector of the district.

SEC. 18. That any person who shall knowingly make any false or untrue statement in the declarations provided for in the preceding section, or shall aid or procure the making of any such false statement as to any matter material thereto, shall, on conviction thereof, be punished by a fine not exceeding $5,000, or by imprisonment at hard labor not more than two years, or both, in the discretion of the court: *Provided*, That nothing in this section shall be construed to relieve imported merchandise from forfeiture for any cause elsewhere provided by law.

SEC. 19. That the owner, consignee, or agent of any imported merchandise which has been actually purchased, may, at the time when he shall make and verify his written entry of such merchandise, but not afterwards, make such addition in the entry to the cost or value given in the invoice, or *pro forma* invoice, or statement in form of an invoice, which he shall produce with his entry, as in his opinion may raise the same to the actual market value or wholesale price of such merchandise at the time of exportation to the United States, in the principal markets of the country from which the same has been imported; but no such addition shall be made upon entry to the invoice value of any imported merchandise obtained otherwise than by actual purchase; and the collector within whose district any merchandise may be imported or entered, whether the same has been actually purchased or procured otherwise than by purchase, shall cause the actual market value or wholesale price of such merchandise to be appraised; and if the appraised value of any article of imported merchandise shall exceed by more than 5 per cent., and not more than 20 per cent., the value declared in the entry, there shall be levied, collected, and paid, in addition to the duties imposed by law on such merchandise, a further sum equal to 2 per cent. of the total appraised value, for each 1 per cent. of the increased valuation as ascertained by the appraiser in excess of 5 per cent. above the entered value; and the additional duties shall only apply to the particular article or articles in each invoice which are undervalued: and if such appraised value shall exceed the value declared in the entry more than 20 per cent., such entry shall be held to be presumptively fraudulent, and the collector of customs shall seize such merchandise and proceed as in cases of forfeiture for violations of the customs laws; and in any legal proceedings which may result from such seizure the fact of such undervaluation shall be presumptive evidence of fraud, and the burden of proof shall be on the claimant to rebut the same, and forfeiture shall be adjudged unless he shall rebut said presumption of fraudulent intent by sufficient evidence: *Provided*, That the forfeitures provided for in this section shall apply to the whole of the merchandise or the value thereof in the case or package containing the particular article or articles in each invoice which are undervalued: *And provided further*, That all additional duties, penalties, or forfeitures, applicable to merchandise entered by a duly certified invoice shall be alike applicable to goods entered by a *pro forma* invoice or statement in form of an invoice. The duty shall not, however, be assessed upon an amount less than the invoice or entered value.

SEC. 20. That when merchandise entered for customs duty has been consigned for sale by or on account of the manufacturer thereof to a person, agent, partner, or consignee in the United States, such person, agent, partner, or consignee shall, at the time of the entry of such merchandise, present to the collector of customs at the port where such entry is made, as a part of such entry, and in addition to the certified invoice or statement in the form of an invoice required by law, a statement signed by such manufacturer declaring the cost of production of such merchandise, such cost to include all the elements of cost as stated in section 10 of this act. When merchandise entered for customs duty has been consigned for sale by or on account of a person other than the manufacturer of such merchandise to a person, agent, partner, or consignee in the United States, such person, agent, partner, or consignee shall, at the time of the entry of such merchandise, present to the collector of customs at the port where such entry is made, as a part of such entry, a statement signed by the consignor thereof, declaring that the merchandise was actually purchased by him or for his account, and showing the time when, the place where, and from whom he purchased the merchandise, and in detail the price he paid for the same: *Provided*, That the statements required by this section shall be made in triplicate, and shall bear the attestation of the consular officer of the United States resident within the consular district wherein the merchandise was manufactured, if consigned by the manufacturer or for his account, or from whence it was imported when consigned by a person other than the manufacturer, one copy thereof to be delivered to the person making the statement, one copy to be transmitted with the triplicate invoice of the merchandise to the collector of the port in the United States to which the merchandise is consigned, and the remaining copy to be filed in the consulate.

SEC. 21. That if any owner, importer, consignee, agent, or other person shall make or attempt to make any entry of imported merchandise by means of any fraudulent or false invoice, affidavit, letter, paper, or by means of any false statement, written or verbal, or by means of any false or fraudulent practice or appliance whatsoever, or shall be guilty of any willful act or omission by means whereof the United States shall be deprived of the lawful duties, or any portion thereof, accruing upon the merchandise, or any portion thereof, embraced or referred to in such invoice, affidavit, letter, paper, or statement, or affected by such act or omission, such merchandise, or the value thereof, to be recovered from the person making the entry, shall be forfeited, which forfeiture shall only apply to the whole of the merchandise or the value thereof in the case or package containing the particular article or articles of merchandise to which such fraud or false paper or statement relates; and such person shall, upon conviction, be fined for each offense a sum not exceeding $5,000, or be imprisoned for a time not exceeding two years, or both, in the discretion of the court.

SEC. 22. That it shall be the duty of the appraisers of the United States, and every of them, and every person who shall act as such appraiser, or the collector and naval officer, as the case may be, by all reasonable ways and means in his or their power, to ascertain, estimate, and appraise (any invoice or affidavit thereto or statement of cost, or of cost of production to the contrary notwithstanding) the actual market value and wholesale price of the merchandise at the time of exportation to the United States in the principal markets of the country whence the same has been imported, and the number of yards, parcels, or quantities, and actual market value or wholesale price of every of them, as the case may require.

SEC. 23. That when the actual market value, as herein defined, of any article of imported merchandise wholly or partially manufactured and subject to ad valorem duty, or to duty based in whole or in part on value, can not be ascertained to the satisfaction of the appraising officer, and to assist in the ascertainment of such value, the appraiser or appraisers shall use all available means to ascertain the cost of production of such merchandise at the time of exportation to the United States, and at the place of manufacture; such cost of production to include cost of materials and of fabrication, all general expenses covering each and every outlay of whatsoever nature incident to such production, together with the expense of preparing and putting up such merchandise ready for shipment, and a profit of not less than 5 per cent. upon the total cost as thus ascertained; and in no such case shall the said actual market value of such merchandise be appraised upon original appraisal or reappraisement at less than the total cost of production as thus ascertained.

SEC. 24. That there shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, nine general appraisers of merchandise, each of whom shall receive a salary of $5,000 a year. Not more than five of such general appraisers shall be appointed from the same political party. They shall not be engaged in any other business, vocation, or employment, and may be removed from office at any time by the President for inefficiency, neglect of duty, or malfeasance in office. They shall be employed at such ports and within such territorial limits as the Secretary of the Treasury may from time to time prescribe, and are hereby authorized to exercise the powers and duties devolved upon them by this act and to exercise, under the general direction of the Secretary of the Treasury, such other supervision over appraisements, classifications, and rates of duty of imported merchandise as may be needful to secure lawful and uniform appraisements, classifications, and rates of duty at the several ports. Three of the general appraisers shall be on duty as a board of general appraisers daily during each day of the year (except Sunday and legal holidays) at least from 10 o'clock in the morning until 4 o'clock in the afternoon, at the port of New York, at which port a place for samples shall be provided, under such rules and regulations as the Secretary of the Treasury may from time to time prescribe, which shall include rules as to the classes of articles to be deposited, the time of their retention, and as to their disposition, which place of samples shall be under the immediate control and direction of the general appraisers.

SEC. 25. That the appraiser shall revise and correct the reports of the assistant appraisers as he may judge proper, and the appraiser, or, at ports where there is no appraiser, the person acting as such, shall report to the collector his decision as to the value of the merchandise appraised. If the collector shall deem

the appraisement of the merchandise by such appraiser too low, he may order a reappraisement, which shall be made by one of the general appraisers, or, if the importer, owner, agent, or consignee of such merchandise shall be dissatisfied with the appraisement thereof, and shall have complied with the requirements of law with respect to the entry and appraisement of merchandise, he may forthwith give notice to the collector, in writing, of such dissatisfaction, on the receipt of which the collector shall at once direct a reappraisement of such merchandise by one of the general appraisers. The decision of the appraiser, or the person acting as such (in cases where no objection is made thereto, as above authorized, either by the collector or by the importer, owner, consignee, or agent), or of the general appraiser in cases of reappraisement, shall be final and conclusive as to the dutiable value of such merchandise against all parties interested therein, unless the importer, owner, consignee, or agent of the merchandise shall be dissatisfied with such decision, and shall forthwith give notice to the collector, in writing, of such dissatisfaction, or unless the collector shall deem the appraisement of the merchandise too low; in either case the collector shall transmit the invoice and all the papers appertaining thereto to the board of general appraisers which shall be on duty at the port of New York, or of three general appraisers who may be designated by the Secretary of the Treasury for such duty at that port or at any other port, which board shall examine and decide the case thus submitted, and their decision, or that of a majority of them, shall be final and conclusive as to the dutiable value of such merchandise against all parties interested therein, and the collector shall ascertain, fix, and liquidate the rate and amount of duties to be paid on such merchandise, and the dutiable costs and charges thereon, according to law.

SEC. 26. The decision of the collector as to the classification of imported merchandise, and as to the rate and amount of duties chargeable thereon, including all dutiable costs and charges, and as to all fees, charges, and exactions of whatever character (excepting duties on the tonnage of vessels), shall be final and conclusive against all persons interested therein unless the owner, importer, consignee, or agent of such merchandise, or the person paying such fees, charges, and exactions other than duties, shall, not before, but within ten days after such ascertainment and liquidation of duties, as well in cases of merchandise entered in bond as for consumption, or within ten days after the payment of such fees, charges, and exactions, if dissatisfied with such decision, give notice in writing to the collector, setting forth therein distinctly and specifically, and in respect to each entry or payment, the reasons for his objections thereto, and if the merchandise is entered for consumption shall pay the full amount of the duties and charges ascertained to be due thereon. Upon such notice and payment the collector shall transmit the entry and all the papers and exhibits connected therewith to the board of general appraisers which shall be on duty at the port of New York, or of three general appraisers who may be designated by the Secretary of the Treasury for such duty at that port or at any other port, which board shall examine and decide the case thus submitted, and their decision, or that of a majority of them, shall be final and conclusive upon all persons interested therein (except in cases where an application shall be filed in the circuit court within the time and in the manner provided for in section 14 of this act), and the entry thereof shall be liquidated accordingly, including all dutiable costs and charges thereon, and all fees, charges, or exactions shall be paid in accordance with their decision.

SEC. 27. If the owner, importer, consignee, or agent of any imported merchandise, or the collector, or the Secretary of the Treasury, shall be dissatisfied with the decision of the board of general appraisers, as provided for in section 13 of this act, as to the construction of the law respecting the classification of such merchandise and the rate of duty imposed thereon under such classification, they, or either of them, may, within thirty days next after such decision and not afterwards, apply to the circuit court of the United States, within the district in which the matter arises, for a review of the questions of law involved in such decision. Such application shall be made by filing in the office of the clerk of said circuit court a concise statement of the errors of law complained of, and a copy of such statement shall be served on the collector, or on the importer, owner, consignee, or agent, as the case may be. Thereupon the court shall order the board of appraisers to transmit to said circuit court a certified statement of their findings of the facts involved in the case and their decision thereon; and the facts so found and certified shall be final and conclusive upon the court; which statement and certificate of the board of appraisers shall constitute the record in the circuit court, and said circuit court shall proceed to hear and determine the question of law involved in such decision, and the decision of such court shall be final, unless such court shall be of opinion that the question involved is of such importance as to require a review of such decision by the Supreme Court of the United States, in which case said circuit court, or the judge making the decision may, within thirty days thereafter, allow an appeal to said Supreme Court; but an appeal shall be allowed on the part of the United States whenever the Attorney-General shall apply for it within thirty days after the rendition of such decision. On such original application, and on any such appeal, security for damages and costs shall be given as in the case of other appeals in cases in which the United States is a party. Said Supreme Court shall have jurisdiction and power to review such decision, and may affirm, modify, or reverse such decision of such circuit court, and remand the case with such orders as may seem to it proper in the premises, which shall be executed accordingly. For the purposes of this section the circuit courts of the United States shall be deemed always open, and said circuit courts, respectively, may establish, and from time to time alter, rules and regulations not inconsistent herewith for the procedure in such cases as they shall deem proper.

SEC. 28. The general appraisers, or any of them, are hereby authorized to administer oaths, and said general appraisers, and boards of general appraisers, and collectors, as the case may be, may call before them, and examine upon oath, any owner, importer, agent, consignee, or other person, touching any matter or thing which they, or either of them, may deem material respecting any entry of imported merchandise in ascertaining the value or classification thereof; and they, or either of them, may require the production of any letters, accounts, or invoices relating to said merchandise, and may require such testimony to be reduced to writing, and when so taken it shall be filed in the office of the collector, and preserved for use or reference until the final decision of the collector or said board of appraisers shall be made respecting the valuation or classification of said merchandise, as the case may be.

SEC. 29. That all decisions of the general appraisers and of the boards of general appraisers, respecting values and rates of duty, shall be preserved and filed, and shall be open to inspection under proper regulations to be prescribed by the Secretary of the Treasury. All decisions of the general appraisers shall be reported forthwith to the Secretary of the Treasury and to the board of general appraisers in New York, and the report to the board shall be accompanied, whenever practicable, by samples of the merchandise in question, and it shall be the duty of the said board, under the direction of the Secretary of the Treasury, to cause an abstract to be made and published of such decisions of the appraisers as they may deem important, and the decisions of each of the general appraisers and boards of general appraisers, which abstract shall contain a general description of the merchandise in question and of the value and rate of duty fixed in each case, with reference, whenever practicable, by number or other designation, to samples deposited in the place of samples at New York, and such abstract shall be issued from time to time, at least once in each week, for the information of customs officers and the public.

SEC. 30. That whenever imported merchandise is subject to an ad valorem rate of duty, or to a duty based upon or regulated in any manner by the value thereof, the duty shall be assessed upon the actual market value or wholesale price of such merchandise, at the time of exportation to the United States, in the principal markets of the country from whence imported, and in the condition in which such merchandise is there bought and sold for exportation to the United States, or consigned to the United States for sale, including the value of all cartons, cases, crates, boxes, sacks, and coverings of any kind, and all other costs, charges, and expenses incident to placing the merchandise in condition packed ready for shipment to the United States, to which shall be added the cost of transportation, shipment, and transshipment, with all the expenses thereof from the place of manufacture or production to the vessel in which shipment is made to the United States; and if there be used for covering or holding imported merchandise, whether dutiable or free, any unusual material, article, or form, designated for use otherwise than in the bona fide transportation of such merchandise to the United States, additional duty shall be levied and collected upon such material or article at the rate to which the same would have been subject if separately imported. That the words "value" or "actual market value" whenever used in this act or in any law relating to the appraisement of imported merchandise shall be construed to mean the actual market value or wholesale price as defined in this section.

SEC. 31. That in all suits or information brought, where any seizure has been made pursuant to any act providing for or regulating the collection of duties on imports or tonnage, if the property is claimed by any person, the burden of proof shall lie upon such claimant: *Provided*, That probable cause is shown for such prosecution, to be judged of by the court.

SEC. 32. That all fees exacted and oaths administered by officers of the customs, except as provided in this act, under or by virtue of existing laws of the United States, upon the entry of imported goods and the passing thereof through the customs, and also upon all entries of domestic goods, wares, and merchandise for exportation, be, and the same are hereby, abolished; and in case of entry of merchandise for exportation, a declaration, in lieu of an oath, shall be filed, in such form and under such regulations as may be prescribed by the Secretary of the Treasury; and the penalties provided in the fifth section of this act for false statements in such declaration shall be applicable to declarations made under this section: *Provided*, That where such fees, under existing laws, constitute, in whole or in part, the compensation of any officer, such officer shall receive, from and after the passage of this act, a fixed sum for each year equal to the amount which he would have been entitled to receive as fees for such services during said year.

SEC. 33. That no allowance for damage to goods, wares, and merchandise imported into the United States shall hereafter be made in the estimation and liquidation of duties thereon; but the importer thereof may, within ten days after entry, abandon to the Government all or any portion of goods, wares, and merchandise included in any invoice, and be relieved from the payment of the duties on the portion so abandoned: *Provided*, That the portion so abandoned shall amount to 10 per cent. or over of the total value or quantity of the invoice.

SEC. 34. That whenever it shall be shown to the satisfaction of the Secretary of the Treasury that, in any case of unascertained or estimated duties, more money has been paid to or deposited with a collector of customs than as has been ascertained by final liquidation thereof the law required to be paid or deposited, the Secretary of the Treasury shall direct the treasurer to refund and pay the same out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated. The necessary moneys therefor are hereby appropriated, and this appropriation shall be deemed a permanent indefinite appropriation; and the Secretary of the Treasury is hereby authorized to correct manifest clerical errors in any entry or liquidation, whether for or against the Government, at any time within one year of the date of such entry, but not afterwards.

SEC. 35. That from and after the taking effect of this act, no collector or other officer of the customs shall be in any way liable to any owner, importer, consignee, or agent of any merchandise, or any other person, for or on account of any rulings or decisions as to the classification of said merchandise or the duties charged thereon, or the collection of any dues, charges, or duties on or on account of said merchandise, or any other matter or thing as to which said owner, importer, consignee, or agent of such merchandise might, under this act, be entitled to appeal from the decision of said collector or other officer, or from any board of appraisers provided for in this act.

SEC. 36. That any person who shall give, or offer to give, or promise to give any money or thing of value, directly or indirectly, to any customs officer, in consideration of or for any act or omission contrary to law in connection with or pertaining to the importation, appraisement, entry, examination, or inspection of goods, wares, or merchandise, including herein any baggage, or of the liquidation of the entry thereof, shall, on conviction thereof, be fined not exceeding $2,000, or be imprisoned at hard labor not more than one year, or both, in the discretion of the court; and evidence of such giving, or offering, or promising to give, satisfactory to the court in which such trial is had, shall be regarded as *prima facie* evidence that such giving or offering or promising was contrary to law, and shall put upon the accused the burden of proving that such act was innocent, and not done with an unlawful intention.

SEC. 37. That any officer or servant of the customs or of the United States who shall, excepting for lawful duties or fees, demand, exact, or receive from any person, directly or indirectly, any money or thing of value, in connection with or pertaining to the importation, appraisement, entry, examination, or inspection of goods, wares, or merchandise, including herein any baggage, or liquidation of the entry thereof, on conviction thereof, shall be fined not exceeding $5,000, or be imprisoned at hard labor not more than two years, or both, in the discretion of the court. And evidence of such demanding, exacting, or receiving, satisfactory to the court in which such trial is had, shall be regarded as *prima facie* evidence that such demanding, exacting, or receiving was contrary to law, and shall put upon the accused the burden of proving that such act was innocent and not with an unlawful intention.

SEC. 38. That any baggage or personal effects arriving in the United States in transit to any foreign country may be delivered by the parties having it in charge to the collector of the proper district, to be by him retained, without the payment or exaction of any import duty, or to be forwarded by such collector to the collector of the port of departure, and to be delivered to such parties on their departure for their foreign destination, under such rules, regulations, and fees as the Secretary of the Treasury may prescribe.

DRAWBACKS ON EXPORTED MERCHANDISE.

SEC. 39. That on all articles exported manufactured of materials upon which duty has been paid, and entitled to drawback under any provision of law, there shall be allowed a drawback equal to the duty paid on such materials without retention of any part thereof, but such drawback shall be paid only to the manufacturer or actual owner of such merchandise, and in cases only where the identity of the articles exported with the imported materials upon which drawback is claimed shall be established under regulations to be prescribed by the Secretary of the Treasury: *Provided however*, That where the amount of drawback is less than $100, the fees of the United States consuls for certifying the foreign-landing certificate shall not exceed 50 cents: *And provided further*, That the duties refunded by way of drawback on imported sugar and molasses, or manufactures thereof, shall be ascertained by the same tests as are provided by law to be applied to sugar and molasses when imported.

SEC. 40. That all imported goods, wares, and merchandise which may be in the public stores or bonded warehouses on the day and year when this act shall go into effect, except as otherwise provided in this act, shall be subjected to no other duty upon the entry thereof for consumption than if the same were

imported respectively after that day; and all goods, wares, and merchandise remaining in bonded warehouses on the day and year this act shall take effect, and upon which the duties shall have been paid, shall be entitled to a refund of the difference between the amount of duties paid and the amount of duties said goods, wares, and merchandise would be subject to if the same were imported respectively after that date.

SEC. 41. That sections 2970 and 2983 of the Revised Statutes of the United States are hereby amended so that the same shall be, respectively, as follows:

"SEC. 2970. Any merchandise deposited in bond in any public or private bonded warehouse may be withdrawn for consumption within three years from the date of original importation, on payment of the duties and charges to which it may be subject by law at the time of such withdrawal: *Provided*, That nothing herein shall affect or impair existing provisions of law in regard to the disposal of perishable or explosive articles."

"2983. In no case shall there be any abatement of the duties or allowance made for any injury, damage, or deterioration by any merchandise while deposited in any public or private bonded warehouse: *Provided*, That the duty assessed on merchandise withdrawn from any such warehouse shall be assessed on the quantity withdrawn therefrom at the time of such withdrawal; but no allowance for leakage or evaporation of wines, liquors, and distilled spirits shall be made: *And provided further*, That nothing in this section as amended shall restrict or in way affect the liability of the proprietors of bonded warehouses on their bonds: *And provided further*, That nothing herein shall restrain or limit the exercise of the authority conferred on the Secretary of the Treasury by section 2984 of the Revised Statutes."

SEC. 42. That nothing in this act shall in any way change or impair the force or effect of any treaty between the United States and any other Government, or any laws passed in pursuance of or for the execution of any such treaty, so long as such treaty shall remain in force in respect of the subjects embraced in this act; but whenever any such treaty, so far as the same respects said subjects, shall expire or be otherwise terminated, the provisions of this act shall be in force in all respects in the same manner and to the same extent as if no such treaty had existed at the time of the passage hereof.

SEC. 43. That sections 2808, 2838, 2839, 2841, 2843, 2845, 2853, 2854, 2856, 2858, 2860, 2900, 2902, 2905, 2907, 2908, 2909, 2929, 2930, 2931, 2932, 2943, 2945, 2952, 3011, 3012, 3012½, 3013, 3060 of the Revised Statutes of the United States; and sections 9, 10, 11, 12, 14, and 16 of an act entitled "An act to amend the customs-revenue laws and to repeal moities," approved June 22, 1874; all of the act entitled "An act restricting the refunding of customs duties and prescribing certain regulations of the Treasury Department," approved March 3, 1875; and sections 7, 8, and 9 of the act entitled "An act to reduce internal-revenue taxation, and for other purposes," approved March 3, 1883, and all other acts and parts of acts inconsistent with the provisions of this act are hereby repealed, but the repeal of existing laws or modifications thereof embraced in this act shall not affect any act done, or any right accruing or accrued, or any suit or proceeding had or commenced in any civil cause, before the said repeal or modifications; but all rights and liabilities under said laws shall continue and may be enforced in the same manner as if said repeal or modifications had not been made, nor shall said repeal or modifications in any manner affect the right to any office, or change the term or tenure thereof. Any offenses committed, and all penalties or forfeitures or liabilities incurred under any statute embraced in or changed, modified, or repealed by this act may be prosecuted and punished in the same manner and with the same effect as if this act had not been passed. All acts of limitation, whether applicable to civil causes and proceedings, or to the prosecution of offenses, or for the recovery of penalties or forfeitures embraced in or modified, changed, or repealed by this act, shall not be affected thereby; and all suits, proceedings, or prosecutions, whether civil or criminal, for causes arising or acts done or committed prior to the passage of this act, may be commenced and prosecuted within the same time and with the same effect as if this act had not been passed.

Mr. HARRIS. Before the Senator from Iowa proceeds, I desire to ask him, and if he shall agree with me in opinion or desire, I then wish to ask the unanimous consent of the Senate to fix a time, and the shorter the time the better it will suit me, upon which general debate upon this bill shall be closed. I shall be glad, if such an agreement can be reached, that we then also agree to consider amendments under Rule VIII, or under the principles of Rule VIII; but I will first put the general proposition: Does it meet the approval of the Senator from Iowa to fix a reasonably short time within which general debate shall be closed upon the proposition?

Mr. ALLISON. What is called general debate in the Senate I think is a very different thing from general debate in any other body. It is impossible for me to say now when gentlemen will cease to desire to speak upon this subject. It is an important subject, as the Senator from Tennessee knows, affecting every interest and every industry and taking in the entire range of our domestic manufactures and products and our importations. So it would seem to me that I ought not to take any responsibility at this time respecting the closing of general debate.

I concur with the Senator from Tennessee in a desire that we shall go on with as much rapidity as possible in the consideration of the bill, and that we shall reach a vote as soon as it is practicable to reach it.

Mr. HARRIS. I quite agree with the Senator from Iowa in the fact that there is no more important question which addresses itself to the legislative department of the Government than the one which the bill proposes, but believing as I do that there is not a Senator upon this floor who has not well-defined and fixed opinions as to the principle that will control his vote in respect to every phase and feature of it, I think it is more important to the country that we come to a vote and have action upon it than to have extended debate upon the general principle.

If the Senator from Iowa agrees, I shall ascertain whether we can, by unanimous consent, fix a reasonable time at which the general debate shall close and we proceed, then, to have the bill read for amendment.

Mr. ALLISON. I do not know how it is possible for us at this time to agree that the debate shall close upon the bill as respects the independence of gentlemen who desire to speak on the subject. Therefore, for myself I would not be willing at this moment to fix any time when a Senator should be deprived of the right of expressing his views upon the bill.

Mr. HARRIS. Of course the Senator from Iowa knows that if it is done at all, it is an agreement that must be made by unanimous consent.

Mr. ALLISON. I understand that.

Mr. HARRIS. Every Senator will commit himself to it if the agreement can be reached at all. I simply desired to know what the wish of the Senator from Iowa was, and he agreeing with me, then I desired to consult the wishes of the Senate and see if we can fix a time at which we shall commence reading the bill paragraph by paragraph for amendment.

Mr. ALLISON. My own idea would be that at some time in the discussion it would be a wise thing to limit the debate on the details of the bill to five or ten minutes on amendments, but I will state, if the Senator will allow me, that it is rather premature to make any suggestion to-day, at any rate, upon that question.

Mr. HARRIS. Does the Senator think that ten days or two weeks would be sufficient for general debate?

Mr. ALLISON. I hope so.

Mr. HARRIS. Then, if the Senator will allow me, I will ask the unanimous consent of the Senate that we agree to close the general debate upon the bill in ten days from to-day, when the reading of the bill for amendment shall proceed.

Mr. ALLISON. I should not like to consent to that at the very beginning. It may be that we shall want eleven days, or we may want twelve.

Mr. PLATT. If I may, as a very humble member of the Senate, say a word, since this consent has been asked, it is quite possible, perhaps probable, that the general debate upon the bill may not consume ten days, but at the same time I think it is a little premature when the bill is first called up for discussion to attempt to fix any time when the debate shall cease. As a very humble member of the Senate I may want to say something myself after those who are more familiar with the subject shall have spoken upon it, and I do not want any agreement which will exclude myself or other humble members of the Senate from expressing their opinion.

Mr. VEST. I should like to ask the Senator from Iowa in regard to a matter which may much facilitate the discussion of the bill. I want to ask him if it is proposed that the clerk of the Committee on Finance or of the subcommittee shall prepare a comparative statement between the Mills bill, as it is called, and the amendment proposed? That has been the custom in the other branch of Congress and also in the Senate. The substitute is so long, so intricate, that in the brief time we have now for debate it is almost impossible to ascertain exactly the difference between the House bill and the substitute. Also, as suggested by the Senator from Texas [Mr. REAGAN], the ad valorem rates should be shown. For one who is not an expert and who has not devoted his life to the tariff question, it is almost impossible in the course of a few days to ascertain what are really the salient points of difference between these measures.

Mr. ALLISON. In response to the suggestion of the Senator from Missouri I will say that the clerk of the Committe on Finance, others aiding him, has already prepared what I think is a very valuable contribution in the direction indicated by the Senator from Missouri. It is a print of the bill with the ad valorem rates of the Mills bill and the present law, the quantity of importations for the year 1887, which is the last available fiscal year, the unit of value, the amount of duty collected, etc. The Senator by sending to the Finance Committee room or the document-room either, I think, can be furnished with a copy of it. It was printed on Saturday.

Mr. VEST. Do I understand the Senator to state that that is a comparative statement between the House bill and the substitute? Does it give the ad valorem rates in each bill?

Mr. ALLISON. It does not give the ad valorem rates of the substitute, because, of course, the substitute was only presented a few days ago, but it gives all other ad valorems.

Mr. VEST. I should be very glad if the Senator from Iowa, who is at the head of the committee, would have such a table prepared, as it would facilitate the matter very much with many of us.

Mr. ALLISON. I will state to the Senator that it is not an easy thing to do that.

Mr. REAGAN. If the Senator will allow me, I will suggest that if the table which he says was prepared yesterday was supplemented simply by stating the rates proposed in the Senate bill and the specific rates reduced to ad valorem, we should then have the information sought by the Senator from Missouri. Without that, if we take the mixed rates, specific and ad valorem, no one but an expert can understand what the real rates are. By giving the information asked for by the Senator from Missouri, we shall have before us the exact facts, so as to know what we are doing. I trust the Senator will allow the table to be supplemented by adding to it the rates under the Senate amendment, reducing them also to ad valorem.

Mr. ALDRICH. If the Senator from Iowa will allow me a moment, I will state that the table now printed and before the Senate, or which will be put in the hands of Senators in the course of the day, contains, wherever it is possible to obtain the information, the unit of value of present importations, and each Senator can make the application of

the rate for himself to that unit of value. It is of course to some extent a matter of estimate; it must be so; and a table prepared by one man perhaps would not meet the views of another man or another Senator as to what was a proper application. We give all the data which are obtainable in regard to the matter by printing the unit of value and the rates which we propose to fix upon importations.

Mr. REAGAN. If we are to take the mixed rates of duty of the Senate substitute, then I suggest that no one but an expert after making the calculations can know the difference of rate between the two bills. Certainly by adding to the table the rates under the Senate bill and reducing them to the ad valorem basis, it would give the whole information, and it would enable us to proceed without the trouble of undertaking to make the calculations and acting as experts, which very few Senators are qualified to do. It would facilitate matters if that course should be taken.

Mr. ALLISON. That matter can be looked into and prepared, if practicable, at an early day.

Mr. REAGAN. I hope it will be done.

Mr. ALLISON. Mr. President, in presenting this bill for consideration at this time it is perhaps unnecessary for me to go into any great detail. Especially is this true after the exhaustive report in explanation of the measure made to the Senate some days ago, and prepared largely, I will say, by the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. ALDRICH], and also after the brief explanation made by the Senator from Ohio [Mr. SHERMAN]. But there are some things outside of the report that I think ought to be made clear in the very beginning of this discussion; and therefore I wish to refer to a few salient points which may come up in the debate.

The Senate bill proposes to reduce the revenue an amount ranging from $65,000,000 to $73,000,000.

I think I ought to state that this is the first opportunity the Senate has had to consider this great question of the reduction of the revenues since the revision of 1883. The first opportunity came to the Committee on Finance on the 25th day of July of this year, after the usual time of the adjournment of a long session of Congress, and at a time when, under the ordinary and customary proceedings of Congress, especially in a Presidential year, the two Houses should have adjourned. It came to this body after the House of Representatives had been in session upon and respecting this question for within a fraction of eight months. Within a period of a little over sixty days the Senate Committee on Finance prepared the pending substitute, and now present it to you for your consideration.

If the Senate had had an opportunity, it would have considered such a bill as this and the question of the surplus during the last Congress; but the House of Representatives, where these bills must originate under the Constitution, failed during that Congress to send us a bill looking to a reduction of the revenue.

It has been said that the Senate has delayed the consideration of this bill in committee. I speak for myself as well as for my colleagues on the committee when I say we have not had the time we should have had to carefully consider the bill in all its details. The House of Representatives took eight months to prepare a bill, not having the effect to invigorate and strengthen the industries of our country, but I will not say for the purpose, but having the effect, and in an irregular way, to greatly disturb those industries. It is an easy thing to tear down, but it is not so easy to build up. So the Senate Committee on Finance had one object in view, and the Committee on Ways and Means of the House and the House of Representatives, if we are to judge from the effect of their bill sent to us, intended another.

The first question that met the Committee on Finance at the threshold was how much revenue could be taken off safely with reference to all the obligations of the Government. We agreed that from $60,000,000 to $70,000,000 reduction would be safe. I think myself, and I only speak for myself now, that that is the highest possible sum we ought to go in the reduction of the revenue; and therefore whatever amendments may be proposed to this bill hereafter, I trust will not look to a greater reduction of the revenue than is proposed by the substitute.

I had occasion to say on the 28th of August in the discussion on the sundry civil bill, before all the great appropriation bills of the year had finally passed, that the revenues for this year would only exceed the appropriations about $19,000,000. I am able to say that that estimate then made with four appropriation bills undisposed of, has been verified now that they have all practically passed both Houses, with a variation of but $26,000; so that for the current year upon the estimate made by the Secretary of the Treasury, in his annual report of the revenues of this current fiscal year, and the appropriations made by the bills already passed for this current fiscal year, there will be a surplus of but $19,000,000 in round numbers. But the estimate of the Secretary of the Treasury, it must be borne in mind, was made last December. He estimated then that the revenues for this year from customs would be $228,000,000. As he estimated, the revenue from customs last year, the year ending June 30, 1888, would be $228,000,000. The actual revenues from customs during the fiscal year 1888 was $219,000,000—I am only speaking in round numbers, of course, in these statements—instead of $228,000,000 as estimated by him.

I have before me a statement for the first three months of this fiscal year of the revenues and from customs, and they fall behind the revenues from customs of last year for the first quarter, in round numbers, $2,000,000. If this should continue for the entire four quarters of the year, there will be a reduction of revenue from customs to the extent of $8,000,000; and instead of receiving $219,000,000, as we received last year, we shall only receive $211,000,000, making the receipts from customs this year $17,000,000 less than the estimate made by the Secretary of the Treasury in his annual report; and if we take into consideration all the revenues of the Government for the three months composing the first quarter of this year they have fallen off $5,000,000 as compared with the revenues for the same period last year, which, if continued through the year, would make the revenues for the year $20,000,000 less than the estimates of the Secretary and leave no surplus.

I make these statements for the purpose of showing that the enormous surplus which now remains in the Treasury is not likely to be accelerated or increased by anything that is to occur during the present fiscal year, if we take the appropriations as the basis of expenditure and the revenues as disclosed by the receipts of the first three months of this fiscal year. By the provisions of the pending bill there will be no surplus from these revenues unless we put out of consideration entirely the sinking fund of this year. Therefore it is that our Senate substitute contemplates—and we may as well understand it in the beginning of this debate—that for the current fiscal year, this being an exceptional one, as we have made appropriations this year which ought to have been made last year to the extent of $30,000,000 at least. We are not likely to have a surplus for the sinking fund beyond the amount necessary to retire the 4½ per cent. bonds due on the 1st day of October, 1891, including the accumulated surplus now in the Treasury, of $96,000,000, as shown by the Treasury statement on the 1st of October.

Having said this much as respects our current revenues, I wish, before I pass from this subject, to say a word as to the amount of money now in the Treasury, because that should be considered separate and apart from any question of the revenues that are to be derived from this bill or the current revenues from year to year.

We are not making a law here that is intended to in any manner affect the accumulated surplus of the Government. We are making provision for the permanent support of the Government, including every obligation that we are under. According to the report of the Secretary of the Treasury, on the 1st day of October, there were $96,000,000 of surplus in the Treasury—no, not in the Treasury; there were $57,000,000 of this money deposited in national banks throughout the country, as shown by the statement of the 1st day of October. So there are really but $39,000,000 of this $96,000,000 in the Treasury.

In this debate I do not wish to refer to the management of the Treasury as respects this accumulated surplus; but for the life of me, I can not understand why it is that this $96,000,000 is not used to retire the 4½ per cent. bonds that are presently to be paid off by the Government. There is no man here or in the country who does not know that every dollar of that surplus which now lies in the Treasury will be used for the purpose of paying off these 4½ per cent. bonds, and that it will lie in the Treasury or in the hands of the banks who hold it until the 1st day of October, 1891, unless in the mean time the Secretary of the Treasury shall purchase and cancel these bonds as he has ample authority to do. There has not been a time in the history of this surplus when the Government could not have purchased these bonds so as to have made more than 2 per cent. per annum interest upon the money invested.

By what process of financiering is it that this Administration, instead of purchasing the 4½ per cent. bonds due presently with the money that must be used for the purpose of redeeming them in 1891, allows certain national banks to take $57,000,000 without interest, the banks loaning it in turn to their customers at whatever the current rate of interest may be? This Government to-day is, therefore, losing 2 per cent. per annum at least on every dollar of the $96,000,000 that are in the Treasury and in the banks, as shown by the report of the Secretary of the Treasury, because there has not been a time, I repeat, since not only the 4½ percents of the Government but the 4 per cent. bonds could not have been bought by the Government so as to realize a higher rate of interest than 2 per cent. Can the Administration justify the management of the Treasury in its policy of refraining from the purchase of the bonds which are presently payable, and loans the money to national banks without interest, with an understanding or expectation that these deposits shall be held there for an indefinite length of time? Is there any possible defense that can be made of this disposition of the public money? Can any one say that this $96,000,000 could not be presently employed by the saving of 2 per cent. per annum for three years or 6 per cent. on the amount.

Now, Mr. President, having said thus much respecting the situation of the Treasury at the present time, I wish to speak as briefly as I can in a general way respecting the features of the measure before us.

In the first place the substitute differs from the House bill in respect to the fact that it proposes to deal with all the schedules in the tariff. The House bill did not deal with the tobacco schedule, with the silk schedule, with the wines and liquors schedule, and dealt lightly with the sugar schedule. We have incorporated in this substitute every

schedule in the existing tariff law, including those I have named and including those also provided for in the House bill. This measure has been made up by the Committee on Finance upon an entirely different principle from that found in the House bill. It has been made up on the principle of protecting American labor and American industry. That is its aim and purpose. If that has not been accomplished in the details of the schedules which we propose the Committee on Finance will be glad to have any Senator point out this defect and propose amendments which will accomplish that purpose. We have sought to care for every industry in our country where we have the same facilities and opportunities of providing for the wants of our people that are enjoyed by other nations engaged in similar industries.

That is the principle of this scheme.

It may be and it is true that in almost every schedule we have increased here and there existing rates of duty. It was the purpose of the framers of this measure to examine with as much care as was possible in the limited time we had the various industries of our country, and if we found that a foreign producer had an advantage over a citizen of the United States, under the circumstances I have just indicated, we sought to put our own producer and manufacturer upon terms of equality with those who are producing the same things abroad. Therefore this measure is open to the criticism that we have advanced here and there rates of duty, but we have also in the aggregate largely reduced rates of duty. I will speak of these details later on. That is, the effect of the substitute is to reduce the revenue from customs on many of the schedules, and in the aggregate reduces the revenue from customs more than $30,000,000 on the basis of any computation that can be made.

But, before entering into such details I wish to say one or two things that ought to be said in response to the minority report, which I find printed with the majority report, or rather with one of the minority reports, because singularly enough the minority composed of five Senators found it necessary to make three reports upon this substitute.

Why it was that the three Senators who united in one report were not willing to adopt the report prepared with so much care apparently, and with so much diligence by the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BECK], why they were not willing to put their names to his report, I do not know; but they seem to have used especial care that not one syllable uttered by the Senator from Kentucky should receive the *imprimatur* of their indorsement, therefore they left him in his solitude to make a report which would suit him upon this bill. The Senator from Tennessee [Mr. HARRIS] and the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. VANCE] and the Senator from Indiana [Mr. VOORHEES], it seems, were able to agree in their views upon this substitute, and therefore they make a separate and independent report, not very long, it is true, but containing a great deal of valuable misinformation, if such a thing is possible.

The Senator from New Jersey [Mr. MCPHERSON] it seems also, like the Senator from Kentucky, stands in a situation of absolute isolation. He does not agree with the Senator from North Carolina and the Senator from Tennessee, nor with the Senator from Indiana. He stands alone also, not even with the Senator from Kentucky, because he submits also a separate and independent report, and as this is more brief than the others I will take the liberty of reading it to the Senate in full:

> I concur in the above report, indorsing the House bill in respect to articles placed upon the free-list, but desire some modifications in the dutiable-list.
> J. R. MCPHERSON.

So my friend from New Jersey finds that the only thing he can do with these minority reports is to indorse them so far as they place certain articles on the free-list, not an inch beyond, but so far as the dutiable articles are concerned in the House bill he wants to make amendments.

So, Mr. President, we are in the attitude here of finding a divided constituency as respects this great bill that comes to us from the House. Only three of the minority are able to agree to formulate a report which is satisfactory to a majority of the minority of the committee.

I am not surprised that the Senator from New Jersey, whom I do not see in his seat, should be satisfied with the free-list of the House bill. By some process five leading industries in New Jersey were put upon the dutiable-list in the House that were upon the free-list when the bill was originally reported to the House of Representatives. So it seems that the interests of New Jersey have been cared for in the House to a satisfactory degree so far as the free-list is concerned. I may have occasion later on to dwell somewhat upon the changes made in the bill in the House of Representatives, but it is enough for me to explain in the absence of the Senator from New Jersey that he finds the free-list satisfactory now, the provision as to New Jersey interests having been changed during the progress of the debate in the House of Representatives. But that is aside from the point to which I desired to call attention at this moment.

The minority—because of course the views of these three gentlemen constituting a majority of the minority of the Committee on Finance must be regarded as the views of the minority—say in the beginning of their report:

> In the preparation of this substitute no member of the minority of the committee was consulted or informed as to its provisions until it was reported to the full committee, on the 25th day of September, 1888.

That is true in a sense, but it is also true that this minority did not seek that information, and I deem the explanation I am about to make necessary and essential in view of the implication in that report. They notified the majority of the Committee on Finance the day this bill appeared in the Finance Committee that the minority of the committee intended to stand upon the Mills bill without the dotting of an "i" or the crossing of a "t," and that so far as any attitude of theirs was concerned they would agree upon no bill—I state the substance of their contention, which was that they would stand substantially by the House bill. It was, therefore, perfectly apparent in the very beginning that whatever bill was prepared by the committee and submitted to this body for consideration must be prepared by the Republican members of the Committee on Finance, and we proceeded with that understanding from the beginning of the preparation of the bill until the date given in this report, the 25th of September, when the subcommittee of the Committee on Finance having it under consideration reported it to the full Committee on Finance.

Mr. HARRIS. Will the Senator from Iowa allow me to ask him to state what member of the minority gave the assurance to which he refers?

Mr. ALLISON. I will answer the Senator by saying that the senior member of the minority stated that to every member of the majority over and over again, and I am very much mistaken if that statement of his was not concurred in by the Senator from Tennessee; at least I never heard anything from him to the reverse of the statement made by the one who had a right to speak for the minority.

Mr. HARRIS. I, of course, do not question the statement made by the Senator from Iowa, but I desire to say that I had no knowledge of any such declaration. Surely the Senator will not say that I ever informed the majority of the committee that I was going to stand unalterably upon the House bill. I have given utterance to such principles as would control my action.

Mr. ALLISON. That statement may have been made too broadly by me, but the substance was, "We intend to stand by the House bill, and you may make such a bill as you choose to make;" and I might go further as respects what was said in various ways relating to this bill, from which we all understood that the minority not only did not wish to take part in the preparation of a substitute, but that they did not even wish to see it until it was a finished production for their inspection. That was as I understood it. As the Senator from Tennessee perfectly well knows, we never withheld the testimony. The opportunity was given for every member to have copies of the testimony taken by the subcommittee as we progressed, and they were present, of course, most of the time, and had the opportunity of being present all the time.

Mr. FRYE. Will the Senator allow me to ask a question? Were the minority of the Committee on Finance at any time excluded from any hearings before the committee?

Mr. ALLISON. Never. Not only were they not excluded, but they always had an opportunity of being present, as the Senators will bear me out in saying.

Mr. VANCE. Will the Senator allow me to ask him if the minority were ever invited to those hearings?

Mr. ALLISON. Why, Mr. President, "invited?" There never was that formal invitation which is sent for one to come to an evening entertainment; but the Senator from Tennessee well knows that many times I have searched for him in the committee-rooms of this Chamber to notify him of hearings.

Mr. HARRIS. Will the Senator allow me? There ought not to be any misunderstanding about the matter of hearing.

Mr. ALLISON. Certainly not.

Mr. HARRIS. In May a subcommittee was appointed, of which the Senator from Iowa was chairman, for the purpose of hearing such persons as desired to be heard upon the revenue question. The Senator from Kentucky and the Senator from Indiana and myself were members of that subcommittee. So far as I know, the Democratic members of the subcomittee were notified of hearings, had the right, as they had the opportunity, to be present, and almost invariably, if not invariably, some one of them was present at the examination of all the persons who were examined by the subcommittee.

Mr. ALLISON. I am obliged to the Senator from Tennessee for making that statement. I am also able to state that the Senator from Tennessee was one of the most faithful and constant in his attendance at the sittings of the subcommittee, and gave diligent attention to every question connected with the hearings—I am glad to say that for him—as was also the Senator from Kentucky; and I am not seeking to exclude others by mentioning these two gentlemen. Of course the Senator from Indiana [Mr. VOORHEES], who was also a member of the subcommittee, was present from time to time, but often had engagements elsewhere which prevented him from appearing as frequently, perhaps, as he desired, but the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BECK] and the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. HARRIS] were in constant attendance until the Senator from Kentucky unfortunately was obliged to leave the city on account of illness.

Mr. President, there is another thing which I ought to call attention to in this minority report so as to clear away the field. This minority report takes occasion not only to express its own views in the matter I have described, but to express the views of the House of Representatives by incorporating bodily and integrally the report of the House Committee on Ways and Means in their report, and in doing so they have made blunders, which I suppose were unintentional. This House report was made in April, if I remember aright.

Mr. HARRIS. The 2d of April.

Mr. ALLISON. Submitted on the 2d day of April, 1888. In that report is a statement of the results of the House bill as reported. They state how much the revenue would be reduced from customs and how much from internal revenue. I do not go into the question of the accuracy of their calculations at this moment, but they show—and this is now, according to the rules of the Senate, made a part of its archives—that they made a reduction by the House bill of $78,000,000, $24,000,000 on internal revenue and $54,000,000 by reduction of duties on imports, including the free-list; whereas this House bill was so changed in the course of its passage through the House of Representatives that instead of the reductions on the dutiable-list amounting to over $53,000,000 they amount only to a little over $49,000,000. New Jersey industries were taken care of. Some other industries that I might describe and mention were taken care of and removed from the free-list, thereby not only reducing the dutiable and free-lists to $49,000,000, but reducing the free-list to $19,000,000. The internal revenue part of the bill was made up on an estimate made by the Committee on Ways and Means in March. That estimate has not been verified by the report of the Commissioner of Internal Revenue made since the close of the fiscal year.

The internal revenue reduction as proposed in the bill is more than $2,000,000 less than that stated in what is found to be the minority report with this bill. Thus, instead of the House bill reducing the total revenues by $78,000,000 as is alleged by this minority report, the House bill reduces them by but $71,000,000 on its own calculations, making a difference of over $6,000,000.

That is a general statement as respects the reduction. The House bill on its face then, as it stands here, only reduces the revenues practically $71,000,000 in round numbers.

Now, Mr. President, I wish to say a few words as to the measure we have reported. Perhaps I ought to say in the beginning, that upon one computation made by experts the reduction of the revenue made by it will be $73,000,000. That computation is made up on the idea that where we have increased the duty there will be a corresponding or at least a partial reduction in the importations, and thus the revenue will be reduced in that way. That is the basis upon which this table is made up. But if the computation were made upon the basis of the House bill it would be different. It can not be made upon the basis of the House bill, for in no case have we reduced the duty, in my judgment, to such a point as to lead to an increase of importations, whilst the manifest purpose, or at least the manifest effect, of the House bill is to increase importations not only of the articles that are put upon the free-list but also of the articles where the duties are reduced. That being the manifest effect of the bill, of course it is a question merely of estimate whether or not the increased importation will not amount to a sufficient sum to prevent any reduction of revenue under the House bill. I believe in many instances that will be the absolute result. I have no doubt that where large reductions have been made upon certain imported articles the importations will increase so much that the revenue will not be reduced at all from those particular articles, and the general effect of the House bill will be, not to reduce the revenue at all, or if at all, to a very limited amount, so far as customs revenue is concerned.

But we believe that the increased duties which we propose will reduce importations in most cases of increase, but if we are mistaken in that, if the importations should be what they were in 1887, our bill will still reduce the revenues $61,000,000, so that there is no question but that the effect of the Senate substitute will be to reduce the revenue from $61,000,000 to $73,000,000, and in my judgment it is likely to be midway or substantially midway between those two points. That is the purpose and intent of the Senate amendment. But we have not only reduced the revenue from imports; we have also reduced the internal revenue as well; and I wish to make an observation or two upon the internal-revenue taxation in view of the minority report.

We have put provisions in this substitute very similar to the House bill on tobacco; and why the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. VANCE] could bring his mind to the point of criticising the tobacco provisions of this substitute I can not quite comprehend. The minority say that "practically the substitute offers to the people free whisky and free tobacco." I can not understand why the Senator from North Carolina should censure the majority of the Finance Committee for proposing a diminution of the internal revenue upon tobacco. I do not understand why it is that we should be criticised in one breath for reducing the tobacco tax, and the Mills bills, so called, extolled into the upper heavens for doing the same thing. In other words, they condemn us for dealing with the internal revenue upon tobacco, and then they indorse the Mills bill, which does practically the same thing.

Why did we put free tobacco in this bill? I will say frankly for myself that I have not been very vigorous and urgent as respects the reduction or repeal of the internal-revenue tax upon tobacco, but I have supposed that there was practically a universal sentiment in favor of taking off the tax on tobacco in both Houses of Congress. This certainly is true as shown by the votes in the two Houses. It has been reduced and reduced from year to year from 32 cents a pound until the last reduction was to 8 cents a pound. It is said to be an onerous imposition upon many of the agricultural States of the Union that produce tobacco, and I supposed that there was a general sentiment in favor of that reduction, and I yielded to it, and the Committee on Finance yielded to it; that is, wherever they were not originally in favor of taking off that tax.

The only difference between the House bill and the Senate bill in that respect is that we have made a reduction upon manufactured cigars of $1.50 a thousand, and we have also taken off the tax upon retail dealers in tobacco, which is retained in the House bill at $1 for each dealer. We did not believe that it was wise to have an army of revenue officers going in every cross-road and hamlet and village in our country collecting a dollar tax from every man who may sell a cigar. Therefore we wiped out that tax in our provision, which is retained in the Mills bill, so called, at $1 for each dealer.

Another provision of this substitute is a provision exempting from tax alcohol used in the arts. The minority say, speaking of this subject:

> But in view of the impossibility of preventing frauds upon the revenue that should be derived from distilled spirits used for purposes other than the arts, the loss of revenue may be safely estimated at many times $7,000,000.

Is there any Senator who would say that alcohol, if it can be safely allowed to be so used without disturbing the tax upon spirits used as beverages, should not be made free of tax? Why is it that all the men who are obliged to use alcohol as a solvent in the thousand varied chemical productions should not have that privilege, thereby cheapening their products, if it can be done safely? Who will say that all those who make varnishes or are engaged in similar mechanical industries, should not have the benefit of this solvent, alcohol, which is the best known for all these purposes, if it can be furnished free of tax safely without impairing the revenue?

Therefore, as a starting point, there is not any one that I know of who will say that the industries of our country should be burdened with a tax upon alcohol of 90 cents a gallon, unless it is absolutely necessary that that burden should come for the purpose of collecting the revenue which we derive now and which we are likely to derive for some time to come from distilled spirits used as a beverage. I take it, then, that the only possible objection to this is that it will disturb the revenue. Now, will it? I say in the beginning that if any Senator here, any of the lawyers of this body or those accustomed to draught or construe or criticise statutes, will declare that we have not put into this substitute provisions sufficiently stringent to prevent frauds upon the revenue as respects the use of alcohol in the arts, the Committee on Finance will accept any amendments he may propose to secure the safety of the revenue.

We intended to make, and have, I believe, made provision here that will absolutely make it impossible to defraud the revenue as respects alcohol used in the arts. I know that the Senator from Ohio [Mr. SHERMAN], in his brief debate the other day, expressed some doubt about these provisions. I am afraid the Senator from Ohio had not given these provisions that careful consideration which he generally gives to the subject he discusses, or else he would have modified that expression. There has been, I know, a prevailing opinion for several years that the ingenuity of chemistry would be so great under temptation as to provide some method whereby spirits infused and impregnated with wood alcohol could have that alcohol withdrawn and the spirits then used as a beverage. I have examined this question with care, and there is no part of the bill to which I have given more personal attention than to this question, and I want to say here and now that I have no hesitation in expressing the opinion that we can, under the provisions of this substitute, prevent fraud just as certainly as we can prevent fraud in the original distillation of spirits.

It is stated over and over again by chemists who have examined this subject that the only method whereby methylated spirits or wood alcohol can be entirely removed from alcohol proper is by distillation, and not by any crude method of distillation, but by the finer process of redistillation. Therefore it is that if we have machinery and power under existing law to prevent fraudulent distillation of alcohol, the same stringent and restrictive provisions which are here embodied will prevent the redistillation of methylated alcohol into alcohol suitable for beverages.

But we are not without absolute information upon this subject. Great Britain has had this principle in her statute system since 1854, and it is a part of her system to-day, and she has a tax upon spirits more than double, twice and a half, the tax upon spirits in this country. She raises $70,000,000 per annum now by her taxation upon distilled spirits, a greater amount in the aggregate than we raise, and yet methylated alcohol is permitted to be used in Great Britain free of tax.

Germany having double the tax upon distilled spirits that we have, also has a system of bonding and methylization which is perfect in its working.

Here, then, are two countries taxing distilled spirits much higher than we tax them, and yet having machinery in their laws whereby spirits can be withdrawn for industrial purposes without injury to the revenue. Therefore, it will not do to make a mere *ad captandum* statement that this can not be done. It has been done; it is being done under laws no more stringent than we propose here; and therefore there is no question of fraud involved in these provisions as respects alcohol used in the arts. I say this from absolute conviction that it can be done and will be done. My friend from Kentucky in his minority report virtually admits that, because he says that the effect of it will be to give the whisky ring an opportunity of securing an advance upon untaxed alcohol.

But this is only one method. As the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. ALDRICH] very well reminds me—although I intended to speak of it before passing from the subject—we have in this measure a provision whereby chemists and other manufacturers may withdraw spirits in bond without the payment of the tax, and they may use these spirits in the production of such chemicals as the Secretary of the Treasury may from time to time authorize them to produce, without the payment of the tax, and they may do this in bonded warehouses. We have provided a system of bonding for domestic productions. It has been done in this way since 1866 by chemists for export, and I can seen no reason why it can not as well be done for domestic consumption.

It may be noted, as I pass, that at every internal revenue revision we have liberalized the law as respects the authority of chemists to manufacture articles for export. So, taking these provisions together, I regard them as wise provisions, and surely if they can be executed they are necessary provisions, for our producers come in competition at every turn with the great chemists of Germany, who have free alcohol, and with the chemists of Great Britain, the producers of a thousand articles in which alcohol is an essential element in these great countries, who are contesting severely with us for the industrial markets of the world, and particularly for the markets of our own country. So, proclaiming as both sides of this Chamber proclaim practically, that we do not intend to reduce the internal-revenue tax upon distilled spirits at this time, and with the indications at least that this tax is likely to remain for some time to come, are we to put gyves upon our wrists as respects our own great industries and allow Germany and Great Britain to have this enormous advantage of us in all these particulars, and are we to be intimidated in this effort to grant relief by the mere assertion, without a particle of proof to sustain it, that possibly there may be frauds committed under provisions we propose?

Mr. President, this is in curious contrast with the provisions of the bill which the minority of the committee indorse; and I want to say a word respecting that, although it is discussed in the report of the majority. The minority of the committee propose in reality to disturb, if not destroy, our internal-revenue system as respects the collection of the tax upon distilled spirits. What do they do? They open up to free distillation practically all distilleries having a capacity of less than 25 bushels of grain per diem. I will not discuss that question; it is discussed in the report in detail, and I invite criticism of the statements in that report as respects this free distillation proposed in this bill. Everybody knows that with the great temptation of 400 per cent. upon this article of distilled spirits, there are inducements to fraud, and this House bill proposes to open wide every avenue and every door leading in that direction.

But there is another thing that is curious in view of the criticism of the minority as respects the tobacco tax, and as respects the tax upon alcohol used in the arts, that this Mills bill, which they indorse, removes all taxes from retail dealers in spiritous liquors and retail dealers in malt liquors. I would like to have some Senator on the other side of the Chamber disclose why it is that they propose to withdraw from the reveune on whisky $5,000,000, or about one-fourteenth part of all the revenue, by allowing retail dealers to go scot free throughout the country. A tax yielding over four and a half million dollars is swept down by that provision, and yet the minority seem to think that we have opened wide this door and interfered with the collection of the tax on spirits by removing the internal tax from alcohol used in the arts.

So much, Mr. President, for the first two provisions found in the committee's bill. Now I come to the tariff schedules. The first schedule is the chemical schedule. I will say in respect to this schedule, which is a long one, that the committee gave it such attention and care as they were able.

Upon many articles we have reduced the rates below the provisions of the House bill, because wherever alcohol is used as a solvent or in the manufacture of chemical productions we have reduced the duty.

I may say that in the chemical schedule I do not know or remember now a single increase; there may be here and there an increase in that schedule, but certainly none of any prominence.

Then we come to the earthenware and glass schedule. There is practically no increase in the earthenware and glass schedule, but there is a diminution upon some articles, and perhaps I ought to say here—because I mean so far as I discuss these questions to discuss them as frankly as I can—we have provided for the inclusion of the dutiable value of packages and covers; so that under that provision there will necessarily be an increase of duty, as compared with the provisions of existing law. To cover that we have reduced the earthenware and glass schedule wherever there is an ad valorem duty to the extent of 5 per cent.; but with that exception, I think it can not be safely said that there is a reduction in the earthenware schedule.

Now we come to metals, and that seems to be a schedule that has troubled our friends in their minority report. Of course that is practically the most important schedule in the bill. It covers the entire range of our iron and steel and other metallic productions. We have increased the duty in some cases. We have made in this schedule duties specific that were formerly ad valorem, which will operate undoubtedly in some instances as an increase, but not in very many.

This metal schedule is based upon the idea that we should encourage the manufactures of iron and steel in our own country. If there is any one thing that this nation ought to do more than another, it is to build up every industry that is involved in the metals of our country. For every defensive purpose, as well as for every industrial purpose, this should be so. We have 150,000 miles of railway, more railway than there is in all Europe, and I do not know but in all the world beside. Are we to be dependent upon a hostile government possibly for the materials which are so essential to us in both war and peace? Our friends on the other side knew something of the difficulties in that particular twenty-five years ago. If the iron of Birmingham had been developed a quarter of a century ago, instead of under the beneficent laws which are now on our statute book, the tale might have been a very different one so far as the prolongation of the civil struggle in which we were engaged is concerned.

Therefore, aside from any question of our industries, it seems to me it is our duty to see to it that we so encourage the production of the metals in this country as to make us absolutely independent of all the nations of the world. In the minority report I find this metal schedule particularly criticized. It says:

> In no single instance is the policy upon which the substitute was framed more clearly demonstrated than in that of railway iron.

They give some illustrations and I want to accept the illustrations given by them.

> The cost to produce rails at a leading mill in the United States in 1887 was less than $27 per ton, of which less than $4.25 per ton was paid in wages.

I read now from the minority report:

> The present rate of duty on steel rails is $17, and by the substitute it is reduced to $15.68 per ton. The question arises whether this will reduce the wages of the operatives $1.32, or whether $11.43 bounty above the whole cost paid for labor will satisfy the manufacturers.
>
> The labor cost in a ton of steel rails being $4.25, on the pretense that this is so much higher than the former wages, the burden of $15.68 is thus laid upon every ton of steel rails imported into the United States, and thus governing the prices here in order to equalize the difference in domestic and foreign wages.

Is that a frank statement? If it is, is it an intelligent statement? Why, Mr. President, by a curious association of circumstances the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. ALDRICH] and the Senators of the minority seem to have had the same illustrations in their minds. I would have supposed, if I did not know it to be otherwise, that they had met socially or in some other way and agreed upon what illustrations they should put in their reports respectively. The Senator from Rhode Island has absolutely annihilated this statement as respects the cost of producing steel rails. The testimony is so eminent that I desire to call the attention of the Senate to it expressly, although I have no doubt they have read it over and over again. I read now from page 31 of the majority report, in which appears a statement of Mr. Abram S. Hewitt. I need not state who Mr. Hewitt is. He was a distinguished member of the House of Representatives for many years. He is known to be a man of the highest intelligence as respects these very questions and of the highest integrity. He is now the Democratic candidate for mayor of the city of New York.

Mr. ALDRICH. One of the candidates.

Mr. ALLISON. I mean one of them. This is his statement as quoted by the Senator from Rhode Island in the majority report.

Mr. Hewitt said:

> The percentage of labor involved in the production of any given article depends upon where you begin to estimate the percentage. If you begin with a steel-rail mill, which uses pig-iron, the labor will be from 25 to 30 per cent. The actual wages paid by a wire-mill will amount to about 20 per cent. of the cost. If you include labor in the blast-furnace that would make it 60 per cent. But if you go on back to the ore bed, and put in everything which was paid out from the ore bed, the percentage of labor would have been about 90 per cent. I say this because the gentleman (Mr. Thomas G. Shearman, of Brooklyn, N. Y.) proposes to overthrow facts within my knowledge, and for which I pay. I say the amount which I pay out for labor, when I include every particle of raw material beginning at the ground—and I am a miner both of ore and coal—I have never, with all my anxiety to get it down, got it below 90 per cent. on the value of the finished product.
>
> Mr. MILLS. What is the finished product?
>
> Mr. HEWITT. Any finished product. I make bar-iron.
>
> Mr. MILLS. Is pig-iron a finished product?
>
> Mr. HEWITT. The labor in pig-iron will be 90 per cent. of the cost. It actually takes 90 per cent. of the cost of the article for labor, when you include everything from the beginning to the end.

Mr. Hewitt shows in this statement that 90 per cent. of the cost of manufacturing a steel rail is labor. We have in the committee-room abundant evidence of the same fact. I will not stop to illustrate from the testimony before the committee, but I will only add to Mr. Hewitt's complete and accurate statement a statement made by the Cleveland Rolling Mill Company, of Cleveland, Ohio, furnished by the honorable Senator from Ohio, who now sits opposite to me [Mr. PAYNE], at the request of the committee, in order that we might have accurate and intelligent information as to the actual labor cost of producing a ton of steel rails. The committee asked him to procure this information for us, and I have it here before me, and it will be embodied in our testimony taken from the books of the Cleveland Rolling Mill Company, and vouched for as to its accuracy by the Senator from Ohio.

STEEL RAILS.—STATEMENT OF CLEVELAND ROLLING-MILL COMPANY, OF CLEVELAND, OHIO.

[Presented by Senator H. B. PAYNE, of Ohio.]

Statement showing the cost of producing one ton of steel rails from Lake Superior iron ores, taken from the pay-rolls and expense account.

Paid for labor in mining one ton of ore	$2.32
Paid for labor in transportation of one ton of ore	1.15
Paid for labor in producing one ton of pig-iron from ore	8.85
Paid for labor in producing one ton of steel rails from pig-iron	9.51
Total amount for labor in the production of one ton of steel rails from Lake Superior ore	$21.83

The minority in its report states to us that it costs $4.25. This statement proceeds—

Paid for materials and transportation on same (less the cost of labor), such as ore, spiegel, coke, coal, oil, gas, ganister, clay, brick, etc.	$7.67

And as the Senator from Nevada [Mr. JONES] very properly says, that is mostly labor, and it is.

Total cost of 1 ton of steel rails manufactured from Lake Superior ores, $29.50.

And yet the minority of the committee instruct the people of the United States that the labor cost of a ton of steel rails is only $4.25.

Now let me take another illustration——

Mr. HAWLEY. I beg the Senator to allow me. Perhaps they mean producing from pig-iron laid in the pig in their own grounds in Ohio.

Mr. ALLISON. They do not say so. You mean the minority report?

Mr. HAWLEY. Yes. If they do, I understand you to say the cost was $9.

Mr. ALLISON. I see the point of the Senator's interruption, and I thank him for it, and I will read again:

Paid for labor in producing 1 ton of steel rails from pig-iron, $9.51—

as against $4.25, according to the minority report. It is a valuable thing for the Senate to know that it only costs $4.25 to produce a ton of steel rails in our country, which sells now for $31.50. That is valuable information to impart to those whose duty it is and whose business it is to supply steel rails, because if the difference between $4.25, the cost of labor, and the price at which steel rails sell for now in the market, is what would thus appear, I want to invite my associates on the Finance Committee to join me in building a steel-rail mill, and we can sell our steel rails at a good deal less than $31.50 a ton.

Now, then, another illustration:

The rods—

Listen to this criticism of our bill by the minority of the committee—

The rods out of which the farmers' wire fence is made are not apparently changed in rate, but by various changes in classification actual and important additional burdens are imposed. A reduction in dutiable value from 3½ to 3 cents per pound weight accomplishes this. An additional size, No. 6, added without an apparent change of rate does adroitly increase the rate paid on wire rods of this size from 45 per cent. to about 54 per cent., and is an increased tax on this one size of wire rods of nearly $300,000, upon the basis of the importations of 1887,

therefore increasing the cost of wire fence to the farmers of the country. So says impliedly this minority report. In connection with this statement there are a few facts which I think should be placed on record. In the first place, this report states that we have reduced the unit of value or rather the dutiable value of rods from 3½ to 3 cents per pound upon this class of wire rods. That is to say, we have provided that this class of rods valued at 3 cents a pound, instead of 3½ cents per pound, shall come in at the lower rate of duty, which, under existing law, is six-tenths of a cent per pound.

When the law of 1883 was enacted we provided that all rods not less than No. 5, wire gauge, should pay six-tenths of a cent per pound when valued at 3½ cents a pound or less. At that time no wire rod was rolled thinner than No. 5, wire gauge. Then we provided that all wire thinner than No. 5 should pay another and a higher rate. That is, it was the intention of the law that all thinner than No. 5, wire gauge, should pay duty as wire; but it was held by the Treasury Department that all rolled iron or steel should be classed as rods, and drawn iron or steel should be classed as wire. The foreign manufacturers then rolled their rods thinner than No. 5 down to No. 6, and imported them under the blanket clause at 45 per cent. ad valorem, a plain and palpable evasion of the intent of the law.

I think there is no better illustration than this, and I will say to my friends on the other side that I want to point a moral here as respects ad valorem duties. Taking the importations of 1887, the duties on steel rods not lighter than No. 5 wire gauge, the unit of dutiable value was 1.6 cents a pound. No. 6 is a finer rod, and came in at 45 per cent. ad valorem, under this Treasury decision, and 201,000,000 pounds of No. 6 came in valued at 1.1 cents per pound.

There is not a man but knows that wire No. 6, being a thinner rod, costs more than a No. 5 wire rod, and yet under this system of ad valorem duties, which has been so often denounced by so many Secretaries of the Treasury, these men bring in these rods at a valuation of 1.1 cents per pound, or at a nominal value on the other side of $24.64 a ton. Does any man believe that they can manufacture wire rods of No. 6 wire gauge at the rate of $24.64 per ton? It is a clear and palpable undervaluation; and all the committee did in this regard was to put this one wire gauge in at the specific duty of six-tenths of a cent per pound, the rate provided for by existing law. It may be that the duties will be somewhat increased, but if they were now valued as they ought to be valued and as the true valuation is, there will be no increase of duty, but really a decrease of the ad valorem rate on a true valuation, as No. 5 wire rods now come in at 36 per cent. ad valorem, or a duty of six-tenths of a cent per pound.

In this connection, Mr. President, I want to call attention to some information that was before the Committee on Finance as respects these wire rods. It was shown before the Committee on Finance that up to the specific duty of 1883 no wire rods were manufactured in this country; but by the development of this wire-rod industry and the use of wire for fences there has been an enormous increase in the use of wire rods. Last year there were imported 149,000 tons, and the year before importations largely in excess of that, but last year we manufactured in the United States 188,000 tons of wire rods, and we shall probably in two years from this time manufacture every wire rod consumed in this country; and the price of wire rods has been greatly reduced from year to year.

When we commenced the manufacture of wire rods in this country two years ago the men who manufactured them in Germany sought to break the market, and they reduced the price to $35 a ton free in New York, duty paid, but when they found they could not induce our people to buy their rods and that our people manufactured their own, they made a close combination in Germany, a trust, whereby they put the price of wire rods up to $40.50 per ton, duty paid in New York, and they have remained there and have staid practically there for the last nine months. I will not read the testimony, but merely state the facts. It will be seen, therefore, that wire rods are being produced now in this country cheaper than they were ever produced before anywhere.

But our friends of the minority seem to think that fence-wire is a wire-rod. Fence-wire is a different thing. These wire-rods are the raw material for fence-wire. These rods are drawn out to No. 11 to 12 wire gauge, and thus become fence-wire. We have reduced the duty on fence-wire in our subsitute a quarter of a cent a pound. The Mills bill does not touch it. So the criticism as applied to this particular thing shows itself to be absolutely an error of fact. Taking our bill as it stands and comparing it with the bill that these gentlemen say they are willing to support, we have done more for the purpose of reducing the duty on fence-wire than has the House bill.

Wire for fencing is now so cheap that a man with $90 can fence a 160-acre field. I know of no boon to our people so great as that boon which has furnished them fence-wire at 2¾ cents a pound, and which affords an opportunity to fence a farm for $90.50, as shown by the present price of fence-wire in this country, at the place of manufacture, or 56 cents per acre. I see the Senator from Missouri shakes his head. That is the wholesale price of fence-wire to-day at every mill where wire for fencing is made. Mr. Oliver, of Pittsburgh, states the present cost of wire fencing under existing conditions which are not changed by the substitute.

The consumer certainly has no right to complain that his wire is costing too much under existing conditions. Barbed wire, which five years ago (with rods coming in at 30 per cent. duty) was worth 8 cents per pound, is to-day selling as low as 2¾ cents per pound at the factory. Allowing half of 1 cent per pound for middle-men's profits and freights (a very liberal estimate) the price to the consumer would be 3¼ cents per pound. At this price it would cost just $90.72, or a little over 56 cents an acre, to fence a farm of 160 acres with barbed wire four strands high. Wire nails are sold at $2.30 per keg at the factory, which is less than the cost of rods in 1882. These two articles form the great outlet for the wire-rods that are manufactured and imported into this country—barbed-wire fence and wire nails. No better evidence is required of the fact that protection cheapens the protected article than the constant reduction in the price of wire and wire-rods since 1883 in the face of an advance of 50 per cent. in the rate of duty.

Prior to 1883 the duty on wire-rods was 30 per cent. ad valorem.

Mr. President, I have spent perhaps longer time on the subject of wire than I ought to have done. I do not know but that I should say something more as respects the metal schedule. I will simply add that we have reduced copper one-half, and there is no better refutation of what is said by many people, that the duty is added to the price, than what is disclosed in respect to the question of copper. The duty is a high duty now. We have reduced it one-half. Why? Because we have for the last two or three years exported largely of copper, so that the duty does not affect the price of copper one way or the other in this country. The testimony was clear before the Committee on

Finance that copper is cheaper in this country now than it is in Europe; and a further statement was made before us that a French trust has absolute control of the copper of the world, and they buy all the copper of the world as they have bought and are buying the copper from all the copper mines in the United States; they therefore control the price not only in this country but in Europe, and the duty has no effect upon the price, as the price is now less here or no more than in London, where it is free of duty.

Therefore I say for present purposes or at this time it is not necessary that we should retain the duty on copper for the protection of our own producers, and yet conditions may change. At the present time it is the enormous production of copper and its foreign control that controls the price of copper and not the duty.

The next schedule is wood and wooden-ware. I suppose I need not explain to the Senate that we have made no practical change in the wood schedule. We have corrected one or two incongruities in that schedule, or rather one or two difficulties that arise in the administration of that schedule under the present law. I have been in the past myself rather disposed to think that we ought to reduce the duty upon sawed lumber, but I think it is clear from what has been disclosed recently that any reduction of the duties upon sawed lumber would inure not to our people, but inure to the benefit of the Dominion of Canada; and I am not ready at this moment to pick out and select things which shall especially benefit the Dominion of Canada. We have many unsettled questions with that Government, and lumber should not now be excepted from any arrangements we may in the future make with them. Upon this point I beg to present what has been stated recently by Consul Hotchkiss upon this subject, which is found in the majority report:

I have been thus explicit in describing the systems of the two countries, for, to my mind, they are the key by which the situation and effect may be safely prejudged in case free lumber becomes a reality.

There is no dispute that the American manufacturer controls the making of prices. In doing this he is not influenced by the Canadian supply in any degree. If the duty of $2 is removed it will not affect the American price, because it has never been a factor, and will still be unfelt. No lower price will prevail in the United States than heretofore, and no different net results will be experienced by the manufacturer.

The Canadian, on the contrary, will lay his lumber down in the American market at $2 less per thousand, and will obtain for it the same as the American does, so that the net result to the Canadian manufacturer will be a clear gain of the $2 which the American Government has remitted. This additional net result to the Canadian manufacturer will, however, be of very brief duration.

Having shown how the governments in Canada continue their control of the timber land and their disposition to tax them to the utmost, I am confident that not a May pay-day will pass before a public notice will issue in effect that a further increase in annual and timber dues has been made an order in council, in sums sufficient to absorb the $2 per thousand into the provincial treasuries.

We know, in confirmation of this statement, that when we removed the duty of $1 a thousand on logs Canada straightway put an export duty of $2 a thousand on the same article.

I also wish to incorporate in the RECORD, in order that it may be convenient, a statement made by the Department of Agriculture respecting the effect of the tariff duty upon lumber:

At the present stage of development, however, it seems, so far as the saving of standing supplies is concerned, there need be no fear nor hope from foreign competition, for "the quantity of standing pine in the United States and Canada is reduced to a condition of absolute control; it is held in strong hands on both sides and will not be lightly frittered away." The stumpage price, which has lately advanced as never before, will necessitate the upholding of present values for manufactured lumber, and an advance of prices is as certain as a decrease of supplies.

The discussions of the tariff question in the "lumberman's" papers is naturally tinged by diverse personal interests, according as the manufacturer owns stumpage or relies upon supplied material. There are a number of American lumbermen who have invested millions of dollars and hold large timber-limits in Canada, and their interest would lead them to desire the removal of the incumbrance of $2, which the Canadian Government places on the unmanufactured, and the home Government on the manufactured article. The establishments on this side of the line do not wish to lose the margin of $2, although, as a lumber dealer expressed himself, "they can well afford it, for they control supplies, production, and price."

It is argued that whatever may be the temporary effects of a local or personal character that might result from the abolition of the tariff, such effects would not immediately be felt; they would not be great, and only short-lived. The range in which Canadian lumber, which has never been kept out by the duty, can compete with our own will be extended by so much as the amount of the present duty, if removed, would pay for extended transportation; meanwhile the Canadian stumpage will increase in value, and the distance from which Canadian supplies must be brought will increase so as to offset any temporary advantage.

An unbiased weighing of the arguments advanced on both sides leads to the conclusion that the removal of the tariff on lumber would have no appreciable effect upon the price to the consumer, nor be detrimental to the lumberman's or saw-mill business, nor in the least affect the laboring man; but at the same time no appreciable benefit towards preservation of forests and forest supplies need be expected at this date from such removal. Possibly positive local advantages may be gained, if by such competition local manufactures were encouraged and the shipping of raw material made less profitable.

With these statements, by officials now in office and familiar with the subject, and the additional statement that, in my judgment and belief, after as full an examination as I could make of the subject, the taking off of the duty on a particular article of lumber involved in the House bill would simply be so much of a bonus to the Dominion of Canada rather than a benefit to our own people, I leave the matter, only adding that the framers of the House bill do not touch but one or two classes in the lumber schedule. They do not reduce the duties upon the advanced manufactured lumber; they leave those open, and therefore it is that the effect of the House provision will be simply to put into the treasury of the Dominion of Canada $2 a thousand which it is proposed to take off lumber. That is all I have to say on the lumber question at this time.

Then we come to sugar, which is the next schedule. I want to run over these schedules briefly and state what are the salient points of them.

The House bill reduces the sugar duty 18 per cent.; our substitute reduces it 50 per cent., and with that reduction the ad valorem duty on sugar is higher than the duty upon any other article of a similar nature in the schedules, if we except perhaps a few classes of wool. The sugar duty remains at 41 per cent. and a little more ad valorem under the substitute. It was not an easy thing for the committee to deal with this sugar question as respects the different grades of sugar. I think we have reached a fair solution as between the consumers and refiners of sugar. There was a disposition to make such a readjustment of the duty as would carry the polariscope test to No. 16, Dutch standard, but the majority of the committee thought it unwise, without further information at least, to make that radical change in the law, and therefore we have left the polariscope test in the substitute as it is now, at No. 13, Dutch standard, and as is proposed in the House bill.

Sugar is as essential to every family in the United States as is bread. It enters as much into the consumption of every household, wherever that household may be, as does flour; and if there is any necessary of life that should have a low rate of duty it is sugar, as this duty is paid by the consumer, because we do not now, and can not under the most favorable circumstances for many years to come, produce one-half of what we consume, and I believe—I speak for myself—that reasonable encouragement is given in the substitute to test our power of producing sugar either from sorghum or beets, and also reasonable protection to those now engaged in this production from cane.

The consumption of sugar in our country is enormous. In 1850 we produced as much sugar as we imported. It was not until the decade between 1850 and 1860, I believe, that we reached a point where we imported more sugar than we produced. There was a large production of sugar between these years, and we produced about 384,000,000 pounds on an average, and we imported very little more than we produced. Each year after 1865 there was a gradual increase in the consumption of sugar not only in the aggregate but per capita. We have trebled the consumption of sugar in twenty years, and now consume in the United States more than 3,150,000,000 pounds of foreign sugar, whereas we only consumed twenty years ago 1,110,000,000 pounds; so that in twenty years the people of the United States have nearly trebled their consumption of sugar.

Is there any law of political economy which should require every family in the United States to pay the present high duty of 2 cents a pound upon sugar consumed in that family and in addition the cost paid to refiners of sugar? There is not a family in the United States but what pays more for sugar than it does for bread because of this enormous duty, and yet this House bill comes here to us reducing the duty upon sugar only 18 per cent., making it a nominal reduction, and why? It has been the boast of the Democratic party that they wanted to reduce the duties upon the necessaries of life. What necessary of life is greater than that of sugar? And yet, although it bears the highest rate of duty of any article upon the dutiable-list, liquors and wines not excepted——

Mr. DAWES. Rice.

Mr. ALLISON. Rice should be excepted. It pays the highest ad valorem rate of duty of any article upon the dutiable list, distilled spirits and wines not excepted, and yet this House bill reduces sugar only 18 per cent. Is it to be claimed here that we propose to reduce the duties upon the necessaries of life, and yet keep up this enormous duty upon this essential necessary?

Unless we can utilize beets and sorghum in the production of sugar in the future it is not probable that we shall ever produce one-tenth of the sugar that we consume in this country, and we are consuming year by year a greater number of pounds per capita. So if this measure shall become a law, and thereby reduce the cost of sugar to the consumers of the United States from 1 to 1¼ cents a pound or $42,000,000 per annum to our people, the effect of this reduction will be undoubtedly to increase the consumption of sugar in our country from year to year. And hence I should say that, as respects this sugar duty, it is probable the revenue will be increased at the rate of $1,000,000 or $2,000,000 a year beyond one-half the amount we have received, and to that extent there will be an addition to the revenue.

Our sugar-producing territory, except of sorghum, is limited, and cane-sugar is produced under unfavorable conditions as compared with the great amount of the production of sugar throughout the world from cane. The Senator from Kentucky takes especial pains to criticise our action on the sugar question in his report, whereby he not only criticises this reduction severely, but he goes back to the legislation of 1883 and states that in the conference committee the duty on sugar between Nos. 13 and 16, Dutch standard, was raised from 2½ cents to 2¾ cents a pound, and he says in his report that the Senate, by a yea-and-nay vote, had fixed the relation between what is known as raw sugars and sugars between 13 and 16 at 40 cents per hundred pounds or four-tenths of a cent per pound. He states, then, that after a further examination

we yielded finally to a difference of half a cent a pound between unrefined and sugars between 13 and 16 Dutch standard, and then he says the Republicans in the conference committee increased that difference to three-fourths of a cent per pound.

I do not see how it is possible for him to indorse this House bill after making that statement, because this House bill makes the distinction between sugars below 13 Dutch standard and sugars between 13 and 16 Dutch standard of fifty-seven one-hundredths per cent., or nearly the amount provided for in the existing law of which he complains.

The dividing line by this House bill, which we are considering here, provides as respects sugar that all sugars above No. 13 Dutch standard shall pay fifty-seven one-hundredths of a cent beyond the average of the sugar that comes in under the polariscopic test. This substitute, as proposed by your Senate committee, proposes a difference of three-eighths of a cent per pound or a difference of one-fifth of a cent a pound in favor of the substitute and the consumer of sugar and against the refiner as compared with the House bill, and yet the Senator from Kentucky criticises this substitute which reduces twenty one-hundredths of a cent below the bill which he supports between 13 and 16 Dutch standard, and says he is in favor of the House bill. This House bill makes a greater difference in favor of the refiner than the highest point he was willing to concede in 1883.

The difference between the substitute which we propose and the House bill as respects sugar is a difference of $6,000,000 in the aggregate per annum to the consumer. By the House bill the tax upon the people of the United States is $6,000,000 per annum more than the Senate substitute, as the duty is paid by the people who consume the sugar, and, in my judgment, it is practically the only case in all these dutiable-lists where the consumer pays the duty; and, as the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. HOAR] very justly and very properly observes, it bears heavily upon the poor and upon those who have large families. Six million dollars to whom? Where will it go? It is between 13 and 16. Why is it that the refining interest insists all the time upon that relation of 13 and 16? It is that the centrifugal sugars can not come in between 13 and 16, and thus go into consumption without the intervention of the refiner. Therefore it is that they want to make the line of demarkation strongest between 13 and 16, in order that all sugars that come in may be raw sugars, and thus pass through the processes of refining in our country; and I repeat that the Senate substitute makes a difference of one-fifth of a cent, or $6,000,000 per annum in favor of the consumers of sugar.

What is the effect of that? According to the census of 1880, there was twenty-seven and a half millions of capital invested in sugar refining in the United States. I have not been able to procure the accurate statistics between then and now, but I assume that there is certainly not more than $50,000,000 of capital engaged in that industry now. So this concession made to sugar refiners in the House bill as compared with the Senate bill is 12 per cent. upon all the capital of all the sugar refineries in the United States; and yet the Senators who have made the minority report upon this bill, including the separate and distinct report of the Senator from Kentucky, indorse these House provisions as respects the question of sugar, and then they denounce all trusts. They legislate by the provisions of this House bill $6,000,000 into the pockets of the sugar trust, 12 per cent. per annum upon their capital, and take it out of the pockets of the people of the United States and denounce the Republican party and this substitute for administering to and fostering trusts! Consistency is a jewel that is not found in this minority report any more than it is in the report of the Senator from Kentucky.

The next schedule is tobacco and cigars. We propose in this bill to somewhat modify the duties upon tobacco and cigars. I am not clear that the provisions as introduced are exactly what they ought to be. I say that for the benefit of all those who may be interested in this manufacture we have done the best we could with the information at hand; but, I repeat, in the great hurry of getting this bill with all its schedules properly before the Senate, we have had to report some provisions without the careful examination which should have been made.

We have changed the duty upon imported cigars from two and one-half dollars a thousand and 25 per cent. ad valorem to a specific duty of three and one-half dollars. The effect of that may be, I think, to increase the duty upon some kinds of imported cigars; but as they are a luxury I do not think that increase will be very much felt.

We have also made a change in the law as respects wrappers. We have taxed tobacco suitable for wrappers 75 cents a pound, unstemmed, and if stemmed, $1. In order to compensate for that increase on the wrappers we have reduced the duty on Cuban tobacco for fillers, which is the only tobacco practically imported, from 35 to 40 respectively to 25 and 20 cents. I do not know that this adjustment is just what it should be, and the committee desires the information that always comes from an open discussion of the details of a bill in the Senate and such further information as we can acquire from the trade before the details are finally adjusted.

The next schedule is provisions. We have made some changes in the provision schedule. So far as we could we have provided specific duties in lieu of the ad valorem duties.

There are some things that the committee have in contemplation that we have not yet done as respects the provisions schedule. The committee are considering the question of providing some rate of duty upon eggs imported into our country for the benefit of our own producers and farmers and for the protection of this great industry, which, as Edward Atkinson said, is equal to the iron industry; but we have not yet perfected that provision.

The flax, hemp, and jute schedule has been changed somewhat. It has been changed, first, by the removal of all duty upon the raw material. It has been changed, next, by making specific rates instead of ad valorem rates in many cases. We have reduced certain products of the manufacture of these grasses and fibers and we have increased some others. Notably we have reduced one-half the duty on binding-twine. I will mention that in the interest of farmers and for the benefit of those who joined in the minority report, so that there may be no mistake about it. The reduction is from 2½ to 3 cents a pound to 1½ cents a pound. We have reduced also the duty on cotton-bagging one-half. The duty on cotton-bagging is now 1½ to 2 cents a pound. All under 7 cents a pound is 1½, and all above is 2 cents. We have reduced that to three-fourths of a cent a pound, as our sympathies ran out somewhat with the extraordinary arrangement made by those who use cotton-bagging for consumption during the present year.

The next schedule is silk and silk goods. I will say, for the benefit of those who have not examined with care these schedules, that we have adopted specific duties in lieu of ad valorem duties as applied to this schedule because of the great undervaluations in it. Indeed, a great portion of the difficulty in the New York custom-house arises from the importation of silks, and we have adopted specific rates instead of ad valorem rates. We have done that upon the request of the Secretary of the Treasury, so that we can not, of course, be charged with anything extraordinary in that respect. Secretary Manning—I have his request before me—prepared a silk schedule, which we have adopted in the main, providing specific duties upon silk goods in lieu of ad valorem duties, and I believe the effect will be to increase somewhat the rate of duty upon silks as compared with the duty now collected, or which ought to be collected. It was the intention of the committee and the intention of the Secretary of the Treasury, as we understood it, to make these specific duties correspond exactly with the ad valorem duties, when honestly collected, now on the statute-book.

We have made no great changes in the three other schedules, sundries, books, and the free-list.

Thus, Mr. President, I have gone over the details of this bill, not with the expectation or intention of discussing the merits or demerits of protection or free trade. I did not intend and do not propose to do that in this debate at this moment. I intend to refrain from discussing the abstract question of free trade and protection. I only mean to say that from my examination of these bills—the House bill and the substitute—the one is a clear and distinct measure of protection to American industry and American producers, and the other is a step, and I may say a long step, in the direction of what is commonly known as free trade.

I am reminded by the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. ALDRICH] that I have not touched upon wool and woolens. I have not, nor have I upon cotton. These are two of the great schedules in this bill. The woolen schedule is changed very much and the cotton schedule is considerably changed; but in the cotton schedule there has been only an increase of duty upon two or three items of rates upon the finer grades and an equal number of items of the lower grades have been reduced.

We have increased duties in the woolen schedule somewhat, but only in the higher classes of woolen goods. We have not touched the lower classes of woolen goods, except to correct what has been understood in the Treasury Department and by both Houses of Congress to be an injustice in respect to worsted goods. We have made that correction and classified worsted goods with woolen goods in every case, and in that sense, perhaps, the lower classes of worsted goods will be required to pay a somewhat increased duty. But with that exception every increase in the woolen schedule comes from an increase in the higher and finer grades of woolen manufactures, and they were made necessary because we increased the duty by 1 cent a pound upon the finer grades of wool.

I ought to say one word as respects the duty on wool, because, in my judgment, it is probable there will be a small increase of revenue arising from that.

Last year—I have not the exact figures before me, but will state them in general—there were imported last year of carpet wools about 63,000,000 pounds of the lower grades, which are now taxed at 2½ cents a pound, which we do not change. There were imported 21,000,000 pounds of the finer grades of carpet wools at a dutiable value of about 18 cents a pound. Upon that higher grade the bill as reported proposes to increase the duty 1 cent a pound upon clothing wool, of which there were imported over 20,000,000 pounds last year and re-exported, I believe, about 6,000,000 pounds; so that the total importation of clothing wool last year probably would not be more than 15,000,000 pounds that would pay duty; we add 1 cent, so that on these two classes there will be an increase of revenue. In the woolen schedule, taken as a whole, upon the basis that there will be as large importations under the new rates as under existing rates, there will be an increase; but I ven-

ture the statement that with this worsted provision corrected woolen manufactures will not be so largely imported in the future as they have been in the past. It is because of the injustice that has been done to the worsted manufactures that we have had such large importations.

Mr. President, I only desire to say in conclusion upon this bill, that it is my purpose, as I am glad to see it is the purpose of the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. HARRIS], and as I understand it to be the purpose of this side of the Chamber, to proceed as rapidly as we may with the discussion of the bill. At some future time I may have occasion to make some further observations respecting it, but I only desired this morning to state the general provisions and plan of the measure in order that it might be understood by Senators who have not had an opportunity of examining it carefully.

Mr. VANCE. Mr. President, during the excitement of civil war there was a class of our fellow-citizens whose thoughts were directed to the main chance. Whilst others fought and sacrificed to maintain the integrity of the Union this class improved the opportunity to secure a system of Federal taxation which made them participants in all of its results. During all the turmoil and confusion which followed in the wake of war they steadily improved the shining hours to enlarge their share in this taxation, whilst the attention of men more impulsive or patriotic was directed toward other things. In this way they finally succeeded in establishing a partnership with the Government in the great and lucrative business of taxing the people.

Unlike most modern business firms the amount of its capital was not fixed, being all that they could get; nor was its terms limited, being permitted to embrace every possible article known to human want. The terms of the partners *inter sese* were that the Government should enact the law subjecting the products in use by the people to a certain rate of taxation which come into our ports from foreign countries, and the other partners were to levy their taxes upon all domestic products of like character under the "protection" of the Government tax. By this means the Government mulcted everything that came from abroad and the other partners everything made at home, so that nothing escaped.

Inasmuch as the home products exceeded the foreign by at least six to one, these partners of the Government received in taxes about five dollars where the Government received but one. And it is noticeable that the zeal of the partners has from time to time stimulated the Government to increase the taxes upon all articles which contributed most to swell their gains, with little or no regard to the gains of the public Treasury. To such an extent was this carried that they and their friends came in time to forget altogether that there was a Government to be supported, and to regard the taxing power as having been created expressly for the purpose of contributing to their wealth. Their literature spoke of nothing else, remembered nothing else, strove for nothing else.

"But the best-laid schemes of mice and men" at length go astray.

As the country emerged slowly and laboriously from the extravagance and corrupt expenditure of a state of war, and economy and public virtue once more came back under the auspices of a Democratic administration; and as, in spite of all, the wealth of the people continued to grow with returning peace it finally appeared that the one-sixth dollar of this taxation became too much, and the Government found itself in possession of more money than it could properly and wisely use. The President of the United States announced this fact to the country, showing the injury which it did by locking up so great a sum of the people's money, thus withholding it from the necessities of trade and commerce, and portraying vividly the dangers which it threatened, not only to all financial interests, but to the public morals as well. So irresistible was the logic of the situation that the Republican party, the authors and advocates of this unholy and iniquitous system of taxation of the many for the benefit of the few, reluctantly admitted the necessity for reducing the taxes which produced this surplus.

Both parties then being agreed as to the necessity of reduction, the question arose how and upon what things that reduction should be made. Common sense and common honesty suggested that it should be made upon those things where the inequalities were greatest and where the relief to the people would be greatest, to wit, upon the necessaries of life in greatest use by the most people. To understand the situation it is necessary to consider, first, the chief sources of our federal taxation, and the proportion of revenue yielded by each. This revenue is derived as follows:

Custom duties (estimated for 1888)	$228,000,000
Internal taxes (estimated for 1888)	120,000,000
Miscellaneous sources	35,000,000
Total	383,000,000

Now let us analyze the first two. The internal taxes yield pure revenue to the Government minus about 3 per cent., the cost of collection. Of the customs taxes the greatest single item is that of sugar and molasses. The duty derived from these in the last fiscal year was in round numbers $58,000,000. As nine out of every ten pounds consumed in the United States comes from abroad, the duty received therefrom was nine-tenths pure revenue. That is to say that the Government received $9, whilst its partners in the taxing business received only $1. So it may be said of tin-plate, yielding $5,706,000, and of the few unimportant items which yet remain upon the dutiable-list, as Zante currants, manila, jute, and other textile substances, which are the exclusive growth or production of foreign countries. The duty on them is pure revenue.

On the contrary, the duty on the remaining portion of the customs schedules are for the greater part protection, the average being about $5 tax for the manufacturers and $1 revenue for the Government. Indeed, on many leading articles of common necessity the duty is pure protection, and all goes to the manufacturer and none or next to none to the Government. Now, in reducing the taxes which yield revenue to the Government, a decent regard for either the Government or the people who consume the articles and pay the tax would require that, to say the very least, one part of the reduction should come from those things which yield pure or nearly pure revenue, and the other part from those things which yield pure or nearly pure protection. Equity would everywhere prescribe that the contribution levied upon a firm should be upon each of the partners in proportion to his interest or the amount of his stock, as the case may be. No court of conscience upon earth would decree otherwise.

Therefore in accordance with this just and equitable principle the House of Representatives framed its bill, No. 9051, passed it, and sent it to us for our concurrence. It provides for a total reduction of $78,000,000, $24,500,000 of which comes from internal-revenue taxation, which is pure revenue, and $5,700,000 from the customs duty upon tin-plates, which is also pure revenue. When to this is added the remission of duty upon various unimportant articles wholly grown or produced abroad it will be seen that as near one-half as may be of the proposed reductions were made upon those things which exclusively yield revenue, and the other half upon the things which principally yield protection. In short, the Mills bill gave up half of the proposed reduction to come from the Government and called upon the beneficiaries of tariff taxation to give up the other half, whereas in justice it could have called upon these beneficiaries to surrender in proportion to their interest in the taxation, which, as I have before said, was about $5 to one.

To this fair and generous proposition how did this favored class respond? With the exception of three every Republican voted against its passage. When it arrived in the Senate and was acted upon in the Finance Committee it was rejected by the entire Republican vote and the substitute adopted in its place. Now, how does that substitute divide that reduction between the Government and the people on the one side and the favored classes on the other? In the first place, it takes from—

Internal taxes on tobacco, which is pure revenue	$24,371,000
By reduction on alcohol used in the arts	7,000,000
By additions to the free-list of articles which yield pure revenue	6,428,000
By reduction of sugar duties, nine-tenths pure revenue	27,759,000
Total (Excluding fractions.)	65,559,000

They claim a total reduction of $73,668,000, and to make up the remainder they claim that they have reduced duties on manufactured goods proper to the extent of $8,109,000. So that if their statement of the effects of their bill be correct it shows that they propose to reduce revenue by very generously giving up $9 of the Government revenues and $1 of their own. But even this is not true. Selfishness necessarily takes refuge in fraud. The favored classes, at whose suggestion this substitute was framed, were enabled by their technical knowledge of their own business to impose, no doubt, upon the members of the Finance Committee, and to largely increase the duties in several schedules. By the best information which the Democratic members of the Finance Committee could obtain in the short time allowed them to examine the substitute this increase will amount to fully $10,000,000. In my own opinion its practical effect would far exceed this. So that it all amounts to this, that for the privilege of reducing its own revenues, those in which no favored manufacturer whomsoever is interested, the Government would be compelled by this bill to pay these pampered paupers a bonus of more than $2,000,000.

The method by which this increase is effected is not new. It was resorted to in the so-called revision of 1883. That, too, was heralded with the declaration that the country demanded reduction and that the bill proposed by the commission would effect a reduction of at least 25 per cent. Yet when that bill had passed the ordeal of this Chamber and through the dark mysterious manipulations of the conference committee, where no voice was heard but that of the friends of high duties, it was found that the alleged reduction of 25 per cent. had by this same process been converted into an increase of 12½ per cent., making the duties which were 42 per cent., 47 per cent. On this occasion that plan, which has been again tried, consists, first, in changing ad valorem to specific duties; to both specific and ad valorem duties; to specific duties based upon values and ad valorem duties added. And where this could not be conveniently done, or done with sufficient mystification to conceal it, changes of classification have been made.

It is almost impossible for any but an expert importer to ascertain precisely what these changes mean, but the intention is plain enough to the humblest understanding. Is not this the acme of pampered insolence; the very incarnation of human selfishness? I do not wonder at their thus using the power which they have acquired over the legislation of

their country; it is quite natural that they should go quite to the end of their tether, if there be any end to it, in their unhallowed pursuit of wealth; but I do wonder that any intelligent Christian man, outside of the favored circle, can be induced to support by his vote and influence this shameless iniquity.

These changes of classification and of rates of duty are justified, and always have been, under the pretense of simplification and of preventing fraud against the Government by importers. This is the old cry of "Stop thief," and must cause a broad smile on the faces of manufacturers when they mention it to each other. How a plain ad valorem duty could possibly be simplified by the addition of a specific duty thereto is one of the mysteries of the trade. And how it could be further simplified by basing a specific duty on a valuation of the article and adding both to the ad valorem is a still greater mystery; but when you add a half dozen different classifications of the same article, distinguishable only by an imperceptible shade of difference in material, fineness, or coarseness, and affix a different value, a different specific, and a different ad valorem rate of duty to each classification, the simplification to be found therein becomes the greatest mystery of all.

The same argument applies with even greater force to questions of fraudulent valuation.

Take the woolen schedule—paragraph 354—"cloth shawls," etc., valued at not exceeding 40 cents per pound, 35 cents per pound, and 35 per cent. ad valorem; valued at above 40 cents per pound and not exceeding 60 cents, 35 cents per pound, and 40 per cent. ad valorem; valued above 60 cents per pound, 40 cents per pound, and 40 per cent. ad valorem. Here there are three different estimations of value in the first place—three different specific duties and three different ad valorem duties on the same article. Surely this is simplification with a vengeance. The next section, 355, "flannel, blankets, and hats," is still worse, comprising four different estimates of value, four specific rates of duty, and four ad valorem rates of duty. The next paragraph, No. 356, "women's and children's dress goods," etc., is, if possible, still more complicated. So it is through the whole of the woolen and the cotton schedules. Proof of this is found in sections 316, 318, 319, 321, 323, and 324. In the metal schedule these tricks abound, and wherever it was practicable to do so specific duties have been added to or substituted for ad valorem, and classifications changed. In their view ad valorem duties, plain and simple as they are, are objectionable, because they will reduce the tax as the price is reduced, whereas specific duties tax the cheapest articles as much as the dearest, and maintain the duties at one figure, although the price goes down until, as often happens, the tax becomes more than the price of the goods.

The Senator from Ohio [Mr. SHERMAN] claims that the whole schedule is divided into 795 paragraphs, each one relating to a single article.

There are fifteen different schedules, each of which is separate and distinct. Besides that it divides the whole into 795 paragraphs, each paragraph relating to a single article, thus dissipating the idea, which is so common in this country, that the tariff affects three thousand or four thousand articles, because 795 paragraphs describe every article, not only on the dutiable, but on the free list as well.

Let us see if this is true. See section 358, woolen schedule, where are enumerated seven different articles; section 359 enumerated five different articles of three different materials in two different states of manufacture; section 360, where are enumerated fifteen different articles made of three different materials; section 370, where are enumerated six kind of articles made of two different kinds of material. Paragraphs 375, 376, and 377 of the silk schedule, 395, 412, 416, 417, 415, each embracing many articles. In addition to which, necessarily, each schedule has a comprehensive and residuary clause erected to the unknown, "not specially enumerated and provided for."

The report very frankly tells us how careful the majority was to consult all the parties interested in the money to be received from this taxation, and how very tender they had been in dealing with any item wherein their profits might be touched. They say "the time which has elapsed since the House bill reached the Senate has been diligently employed by your committee in a careful investigation of the diverse and important questions involved in a general tariff revision, and in hearing such representatives of the vast number of interests affected by changes in the tariff schedules as could be heard in the limited time at their disposal. Other interested parties are desirous of being heard, and it is the intention of the committee, with the approval of the Senate, to give such time to further hearings as shall be possible during the period the bill may be under discussion, with a view of eliciting the fullest information in order that the provisions of the substitute and of such amendments as shall be suggested may be acted upon with the greatest degree of intelligence."

And with this view they reserve the privilege of suggesting further amendments. By this we are to understand that while the Senate of the United States sits in this Chamber in discharge of its high functions to legislate for the interest of the whole people, the congress of the "interested parties" who are to benefit by public taxation is sitting in the lobby to supervise our work and see that it conforms to their wishes. They are to be consulted whenever any Senator shall suggest an amendment. Surely the power of these protected classes could not be more humbly acknowledged than is done by this statement. With all the care which has been taken of their interests, with all the subserviency which American Senators have thus manifested to these "Barons of the exchequer" it is to be supposed, if not hoped, that their diligence in the guardianship of their own interests, even down to the consideration of the very last amendment which may be proposed, will meet with its reward.

People reading the report of the majority would naturally feel curious to know if that subcommittee "heard" anybody beside the interested manufacturers. Was there any consumer there? Was any complaint made by those who simply pay the taxes, and were there any suggestions made for their relief or to prevent their "injury" and their "disturbance?" Indeed in the difficult task of framing a bill "to secure the proper relation between the rates imposed upon the numerous articles produced in our related and interdependent industries, the most difficult problem of tariff adjustment," did it ever occur to those able financiers to try their hands upon a problem much more simple and important, the revenue duties which should best promote the interest of 60,000,000 people and equalize the burdens of the support of their Government on principles of justice and equality?

It seems to me they should have tried the simple problem first and secured the greatest good for the greatest number before they tested their great genius in solving the problem of how to divide an untold mass of plunder so as to give satisfaction to all the robbers and fry any quantitity of fat out of their spoils. I wonder, too, did the indecency of the spectacle ever occur to them, of permitting these "interested parties" to dictate the laws which were to tax their countrymen? A reputable citizen would not be permitted to sit upon a jury for the trial of a cause in which he had the least interest, directly or indirectly, or any of his kindred, by consanguinity or affinity. A decent judge would not sit in the trial of a cause in which he had once been retained or consulted nor in a suit for or against a corporation in which he had a single share of stock.

Yet in this great cause, wherein they petition the Government to levy taxes upon the people which are to go into their own pockets, they are permitted to control the method and the amount! They are summoned here for that purpose, they are retained in the lobbies until the last moment for that purpose, and the committee gravely tell us that should any amendment be suggested they reserve the right to consult the plaintiffs. *Curia advisari vult.*

I commend their care, but opine their fears are groundless. Judging by this report there would seem to be no danger whatever that the majority of the Finance Committee should at any time forget the welfare of the manufacturers and act as though they had a Government to support and sixty millions of countrymen to legislate for.

Their free-list is a fair indication of their regard for those neglected sixty millions. Acorns, baryta, bees-wax, braids, bristles, chickory, culm, coal-tar, curling-stone handles, Zante currants, Chinese matting, human hair, mineral waters, opium for smoking, rags, rape-seed, sponges, and sand show their respect for the comfort of the million. Books printed in foreign tongues, which our little children can not read, are also free. This, with free opium, is intended doubtless as a bonus to that peculiar American labor for which protection is invoked. With the exception of jute and jute-butts and textile grasses and cheap adulterated molasses there is little upon it worth anything to anybody except the manufacturers. Compare it with the blessings conferred on the poor by the free-list of the House bill—free wool, lumber, salt, cottonties, and tin-plates.

The proposed abolition of all taxes on spirits used in the arts is expressly announced to be for the benefit of the manufacturers. The report says "that this tax is attended with no corresponding benefit except the resulting revenue which is not unnecessary." The report says (on page 10127) that "tariff schedules have been thoroughly revised, rearranged, and greatly simplified. Reductions have been made wherever they have seemed desirable, and we have increased rates wherever it seemed necessary to preserve the workingmen engaged in any American industry requiring protection from ruinous or unequal competition.

You will observe that the usual phraseology is here changed. Up to this report it has usually been called the "American labor in our factories." Now it is "the workingmen engaged in any American industry"—that is to say, any Canadian, Hungarian, Italian, Chinaman, or what not who has taken the place of an American citizen and works for less wages must be protected from ruinous or unequal competition; that is to say, his employer must have more money.

The duty on tin-plate as at present existing is declared to be "anomalous and inadequate." There being no tin-plate produced in America which could be protected, "the inadequacy" of the present tax would be hard to determine; but the anomaly is easily understood. It is certainly rather anomalous, in the opinion of the committee, that this article of prime necessity should be permitted to the people with only a tax paid to the Government instead of the rightful owners, and the committee think that by offering a sufficient reward these distributees of public taxation might be induced to materialize and claim their share. At all events, they think that the pre-natal garments should be prepared and in readiness for the baby which may possibly be born, even though the children who are already in existence go naked and hungry.

In stating the object and intentions of the committee in framing the substitute it was admitted virtually that everything was considered except the interests of the public revenues. They say:

> The substitute is based upon the idea that tariff revision implies an equitable readjustment of duties in the interest and for the benefit of the people of the United States, and in the distribution of rates its framers have not hesitated to erect or to maintain defensive barriers which would carry confidence and comfort into American homes.

Into some of them it will carry this "confidence and comfort," no doubt. The committee did not venture to say all American homes. Into the home of Mr. Carnegie, Mr. Havemeyer, Mr. Ammidown, and every great manufacturer and every member of a trust it will no doubt be warmly received. These homes are found in the palaces.

But in the homes of the cabin and the cottage, in the farmsteads amid the blooming orchards, in the humble habitation of the widow and the orphan the continued tax on their salt, their childrens' books and slate pencils, their tin-cups and water-pails, the increased tax upon their woolen and cotton clothing, their table cutlery, plates, cups and saucers, their blankets and wool hats will carry neither confidence nor comfort. It will rather make the thoughtful among them wonder why in the name of a merciful Creator a free Christian government will thus lade them with this weight of taxation and scrimp their narrow means still more for the benefit of those who are already rich.

The fact that in order to maintain their unnatural profits the manufacturers should urge arguments and make protestations in the very face of human nature and of instinctive moral laws is not so strange as that anybody should be found to believe them. They constantly tell us that their desire for high tariffs is dictated solely by the wish to continue or increase the amount of wages paid to their workmen, and that as for themselves and their own interests it would do them no good, for high duties produce domestic competition and invariably cheapen their products to a point lower than they would be if open to the competition of the world. This is the constant theme of every protection orator, every subsidized paper, and of all the manufacturers themselves, or the great bulk of them, who from time to time for twenty years past have swarmed before committees of Congress eager to swear to these facts in proof of their disinterestedness. Yet all men know that when a man makes anything for sale he naturally and instinctively seeks to obtain the very highest price for it and to obtain the very cheapest material and lowest rate of wages in the manufacture of it.

For between the minimum of cost and the maximum of price lies all the profit there is in the transaction. The nearer these approach the less there is of profit. Therefore when manufacturers or their advocates tell us that they wish such laws passed as will increase the cost of manufacture and lessen the price of their products they simply pervert the truth, and so outrageously that if one did not see it and hear it every day it could scarcely be believed that men in their senses would venture it. In fact, we know that whilst they enhance the price of their products by procuring high duties to be levied on those of their foreign competitors they purchase their labor in the unrestricted labor markets of the world.

It is claimed that the average of American wages are 50 per cent. higher than English wages and 100 per cent. higher than those of the continent of Europe generally. That being so, the average labor cost of all American manufactured products, being about 20 per cent. of the entire cost, covers the difference between American wages and European.

The average rate of tariff duties on all imported products being 47 per cent. of the entire value of the product, there remains 27 per cent. on all goods imported into this country to be added to the cost of all similar goods manufactured in this country over and above the equalization of foreign and domestic labor. To this must be added that large but undefined sum arising from the superior machinery of American manufacturers and the superior skill, strength, and intelligence of the American worker as is evidenced by the output of his products. Now, where does this excess beyond 20 per cent. go? There is but one receptacle for it—the pockets of the manufacturers. If any proof of this were wanting it will be found in the reports of the census of 1880, compiled under high protection auspices, which show conclusively that the profits of manufacturing are greater than those of any other American industry and far exceed many times over that sum which would equalize labor between America and Europe.

So far does this excess go that the people of the United States could well afford to pay themselves through the public Treasury the wages of every workingman in every protected factory in the country and strike off the excess in the tariff on foreign goods which is put there in the workingman's name. Let me illustrate: The cost of making a ton of steel rails in the United States was last year $27, of which $4.25 was paid in wages. This sum covered the difference between American and English labor. The duty on that ton of rails was $17, leaving $12.75 for the manufacturer's profit. Now, suppose that the people of the United States through their treasury should pay that $4.25 themselves and by law abolish the duty on steel rails, that would enable them to buy a ton of English rails laid down in New York for $20.50. Now, as the manufacturer only claims the duty for the sake of his workingman, and as the workman has already been paid for making the ton of rails he could afford to sell the people a ton for the same price, or at most, just enough more duty to exclude his foreign competitor. The rails would then cost the people $24.75, whereas they now cost $31.50.

Again, let me illustrate with pig-iron. The price of American pig for the last several months has averaged about $16.69; the labor cost in that ton was $2.46, which compensates the American maker for his higher labor. The price of a ton of Scotch pig within the same period has averaged about $11.25 laid down in New York, making a difference between the foreign and domestic pig $5.44 with the difference in labor already equalized. Then comes the duty of $6.72 on the Scotch pig which brings it up to $17.97.

This shows that the American maker gets the whole amount of duty on his iron minus $1.28, or $5.44. Now, suppose, as with the steel rails, that we pay the workman his $2.46 from the Treasury for making the ton of pig-iron and repeal the duty, the people would make $5.44 on every ton that they consumed. And if they tell us the truth, that they ask for a tariff on pig-iron solely or mainly to enable them to pay these higher wages to their workmen, of course our manufacturers could compete successfully with the British. But I fancy that they prefer to hold on to that $5.44, which they say they collect as trustees for their workmen. In short, after the manufacturer is compensated for the high wages he is obliged to pay the tariff then becomes simply a question as to how much the public will agree to give him for his own profit. The question of American labor and its protection is then absolutely disposed of. Beyond that the tax is simple and unmitigated plunder.

The fallacies which cluster about this question of labor are numerous. They are so absurd that I doubt if there be an intelligent and impartial thinker in the world who believes them. It is an entire error in the first place to assume that tariffs were ever intended in former times, when our fathers instituted customs duties, to increase wages. High wages were here first, as they always are in new and sparsely settled countries, and when manufactures were beginning with us they asked for tariffs to enable them to compete with foreign manufactures because wages were so much higher in this country than in the Old World, not to make them so. Recognizing the reasonableness of this request, moderate duties were placed by the legislators of that day upon nearly all European products for the purpose of raising revenue and to afford incidental protection to our young manufactures.

There were those then and for many years afterwards who regarded this as a dangerous precedent, and who predicted that the infants would never be satisfied with the small aid afforded them in their struggling days, but would acquire from time to time the wealth and power which would enable them to increase taxation in their benefit to an extent ruinous to consumers and the general public. Henry Clay, who was the illustrious friend of these infant manufactures, met these charges by a positive denial. In his letter to S. F. Bronson, of Georgia, in September, 1843, he said:

> The sum and substance of what I conceive to be the true policy of the United States in respect to a tariff may be briefly stated. In conformity with the principle announced in the compromise act, I think that whatever revenue is necessary to an economical and honest administration of the General Government ought to be derived from duties imposed on foreign imports. And I believe that in establishing a tariff of those duties such a discrimination ought to be made as will incidentally afford reasonable protection to our national interests. I think there is no danger of a high tariff being ever established; that of 1828 was eminently deserving that denomination. I was not in Congress when it passed, and did not vote for it; but with its history and with the circumstances which gave it birth I am well acquainted. They were highly discreditable to American legislation, and I hope, for its honor, will never be repeated.
>
> My opinion that there is no danger hereafter of a high tariff is founded on the gratifying fact that our manufactures have now taken a deep root. In their infancy they needed a greater measure of protection; but as they grow and advance they acquire strength and stability, and consequently will require less protection. Even now some branches of them are able to maintain in distant markets successful competition with rival foreign manufactures.

Yet the tariff of 1828, which he says was "highly discreditable to American legislation," was only 39 per cent., whilst our tariff is 47 per cent.

There can be no doubt, if he spoke his honest sentiments, but that if he were alive to-day he would bitterly oppose this substitute of the Finance Committee, and denounce it with all the force of his impetuous eloquence. But he was mistaken when he supposed that our manufactures having taken deep root would be satisfied, and there was no longer danger of high tariffs becoming the rule in this country. Still his honored name is to this day invoked in behalf of every tariff steal which is laid upon the American people.

To attribute our prosperity as a people and the maintenance of the wages of labor to the fact that we have imposed heavy taxes upon ourselves, is a statement utterly destitute of truth or logic. Not only common sense, but the history of the world refutes it. It is a fact well known that in Europe, whose civilization being similar to our own is a country to which we always look for comparison and precedent, the rate of wages is found to be in the inverse ratio to the amount of tariff taxes. Russia, which is the most highly protected country of Europe, pays the very lowest wages in her industries.

Through Austria, Italy, Germany, Belgium, and France you will find a gradually reducing tariff to be accompanied by a gradually increasing wage rate, until England is reached. There you find no protective tariff at all and you find the highest rate of wages in Europe,

equaling in some of their industries the wages paid our own people. It is therefore sheer nonsense or worse on the part of those who know better, to assert it to be an economic law that high tariffs produce high wages. If it were so of course the operation of the law would be the same everywhere under approximately the same circumstances.

If it be said that the different institutions and material situation of the nations of Europe would make a difference, then let us turn to our own country where the same laws and institutions, and practically the same physical conditions attend each State in the Union. We shall find on examination, as has been shown again and again in this Chamber and elsewhere, that wages vary in every State, in various parts of the same State, and often in the same county or city.

But perhaps the most absurd, not to say idiotic, of all assertions is that free trade (which is now understood to be any duty below 47 per cent.) is correct in theory but false in fact. By this is meant that though the theory of a proposition is absolutely correct, all the processes by which it is worked out and demonstrated to be a theory show that the theory is false. But so long as the manufacturers of our country can force people by law to buy all things which they use from them, at prices fixed by them in the absence of competition, whilst they themselves buy their labor and their food in markets cheapened by the competition of the whole world, they may be expected to continue to make and adhere to these assertions in the face of truth and experience.

The committee in their report dissent altogether from the estimates of the labor cost of a product adopted by the great bulk of political economists all the world over. That is, to take the wages paid to the laborer who converted the product from what was raw material for that process of manufacture, and ascertain what proportion those wages bear to the entire cost of the product. They contend that the labor cost proper of a finished product in its last form ready for consumption should be estimated by the wages paid all the way through the entire processes, from the time when the raw material was taken in the state that nature originally furnished it, and should be compensated by tariff duties embracing the whole.

In one sense this is true, but the committee in making their argument for the purpose of showing that the real labor cost of a finished article is about 90 per cent. of its total value, instead of 20, fail to remember or omit to mention the fact that every sale of the article includes the price of all labor previously expended upon it, and that the final sale of the finished article includes all the labor in all the previous forms of the material of which the article is composed. If the labor of digging a ton of ore from the earth was paid protective wages sufficient to equalize the difference between American and English labor in ore digging, when that ore was sold to the man who smelts it those wages were included in the price and paid for.

When the ton of pig-iron was finished, if the workman who smelted it was paid protective wages sufficient to maintain the natural difference between his wages and those of the English smelter, the sale of that ton of pig-iron to the man who rolls it into bars includes those wages, and they can not require to be compensated by another tariff. When the man who rolls it into bars sells to another artificer to be converted into still another form the high protective wages which he paid to his workmen are again included in the price; and so on to the last form in which it is consumed. And therefore, if the manufacturer of the ultimate form of the iron gets a protection which equalizes the difference between the wages he pays and those which are paid to the English workman who makes the same article, it is all that in reason or logic he could ask. But according to the theory of the committee, it would seem that he ought to be compensated by a duty which would cover the cost of every stroke of human labor which had been expended upon the product in all its history, not remembering that this had all been paid for and that every sale of the article, at every stage of its manufacture, had extinguished the question of labor.

Perhaps, however, there is no greater error connected with this subject or one more persistently urged than that concerning the advantages of the home market. It is very true that if a man could sell readily at home for remunerative prices all that he could produce, it would be a happy and a prosperous state of things. Especially would this be so if it could be done naturally and without a violation of the established laws of economy; in other words, if the home market invites him by offering the best prices. But when he desires to go somewhere else to sell his products and to buy his supplies he does so because that other place invites him by offering him the best market. His interest prompts him to accept it.

Then when the law steps in and forbids him to follow the dictates of his interest and tells him that he shall both buy and sell in the home market, that law is in violation of all good economy and of the highest and dearest rights of the people. And when it is found that all these praises of the home market emanate from the home producer whose wares are for sale, and that the law which forbids a man from seeking the best market is instigated likewise by the home producer, then both the praises and the law become the proper objects of suspicion to every honest mind. The farmers of this country are the victims of this selfish and illogical policy, more perhaps than any other class of the community. If protective tariffs operated to raise the price of his products as it does those of the manufacturer, then the restraint upon his rights would not be any worse than upon other people.

But unfortunately for him, whilst the price of all his supplies is increased by tariffs, the price of all his productions is lowered by the free-trade markets of the world. For him the great maxim of political economy that men should be permitted to sell in the highest market and buy in the cheapest is precisely reversed, and he is compelled to sell in the cheapest market and buy in the dearest. This is not true alone of his surplus products but of all; for the price which he obtains in the home market is fixed by the price of his surplus which he sells abroad. The manufacturer takes advantage of this; forces the farmer to pay him protected prices for his cloth, blankets, and all implements of husbandry, and then buys the farmer's flour, meat, and cotton at free-trade prices. A Southern farmer makes cotton for sale. The price which he obtains for it is that for which it would sell in Liverpool, minus freight, insurance, and commissions.

That Liverpool price is cheapened by the competition of the cotton grown in every quarter of the globe. Being compelled then to take that price, common fairness should permit him to buy his supplies in a market cheapened likewise by the prices of the world. In Liverpool or London he could thus buy the bagging and the iron ties to envelope his new crop, but protection says no—you can not do that unless you pay 50 per cent. duty on your bagging and 35 per cent. on your ties—the House bill proposes to make these ties free and reduce the bagging to 15 per cent. But this protection substitute does worse than even the present law, for whilst it does reduce the duty on bagging to 25 per cent. it increases the duty on the cotton-ties to 75 or 100 per cent. And the history of the Southern farmer's cotton is the history of the Western farmer's wheat.

The reasonable amount of prosperity which the country has enjoyed since the war has not been participated in by the agricultural classes, and little wonder when we consider how they are fleeced on all sides for the benefit of the others. The records of mortgages, of declining prices, amply testify to this. Nowhere has the decay of agriculture been more marked and lamentable than in several of the New England States where manufactures most abound. The statistics of these States completely refute the idea that manufactures furnish a home market which enriches the farmer. An intelligent and painstaking gentleman of this city has carefully collaborated the figures which illustrate this subject, and show beyond all question that whilst the cities and towns of New England have grown and become wealthy by the protective policy it has been at the expense and decay of the country at large. Here are his figures and conclusions:

"The protective policy has built up a number of considerable towns in Massachusetts, Connecticut, and Rhode Island; and these towns have doubtless given encouragement to gardening in their immediate vicinities. But it is manifest that the incidental good has not reached beyond their immediate neighborhoods. It has been shown that the system, while enriching the capitalists and building the towns in these favored States, has at the same time depopulated and impoverished their northern neighbors. And not only are Maine, New Hampshire, and Vermont injured by the artificial stimulant given by protection to manufacturing in the three more southern New England States, but it appears from the census returns that it serves to rob the country in the favored States themselves of population, and thus to ruin agriculture, which fosters the best citizenship, for the purpose of enriching the towns.

"The tendency of population in all our Northern country to rush to the cities is one of the social evils of the times, which legislation should do nothing to encourage if it can do nothing to check. This tendency in New England is particularly noticeable. Massachusetts, the richest and most populous of those States, is undergoing this process of popular congestion—this rushing of the social blood to the head—at a galloping rate. The population of that State in 1870 was 1,457,351, and in 1880 it had risen to 1,783,085. The increase was, therefore, 326,734. A table of the census report of 1880 shows the population of cities and towns in the United States of 4,000 inhabitants and upwards. From this table it appears that in 1870 the towns and cities of Massachusetts, of this description, contained 1,004,000, or not far from three-fourths of the population of the State, and that in 1880 the towns and cities of the State had gained 356,000, or 29,000 more than the State at large. In other words, that the population of the country had diminished to that extent, besides having been stripped of its natural increase.

"The population of Connecticut in 1870 was 537,454, and in 1880 it was 622,700. The increase was, therefore, 85,246. During the same years the population of the towns and cities of Connecticut rose from 289,801 to 370,057. The increase of the city population was therefore 80,255, or only 5,000 less than the gain of the whole State. In other words, the cities absorbed all the natural increase of the country population, except the 5,000, together with what they drew from Maine, New Hampshire, and Vermont, and other sources.

"Rhode Island in 1870 contained 217,353 inhabitants, and in 1880 the population was 276,531. The increase was, therefore, 59,178. The city and town population of Rhode Island increased between those years from 159,900 to 236,200, or 76,300. The cities therefore gained

27,000 inhabitants more than the whole State, or, in other words, the fields and farms lost population to that extent. Instead of fostering agriculture and increasing the number of independent yeomanry, the effect of the protective system is to convert independent yeomanry into dependent factory operatives, liable to be 'locked out' at any moment from the factories and ejected from the tenements occupied by them.

"The depleting effect of protection upon the factory-hand,' breeding States,' is capable of further illustration. Thus the population of Maine in 1870 was 626,915, and in 1880 it was 648,936. The increase was therefore 22,021. The city and town population of Maine in 1870 was 150,630, and in 1880 it was 171,528. The increase was therefore 18,898. These figures show that the aggregate gain of the State was a trifle greater than that of the cities, but the proportionate gain was thirty-fold in favor of the cities. Indeed, if we deduct the increase of city population from that of the State at large the balance in favor of the country will be only 3,123.

"The natural increase of the country alone would be something like 100,000. The population of New Hampshire in 1870 was 318,300, and in 1880 it was 346,991. The increase therefore was 28,691. During the same period the towns and cities of New Hampshire increased from 83,456 to 104,105. The gain therefore was 20,649. This was 8,000 less than the aggregate increase of the State. But it must be remembered that the 8,000 represents the gain of the country, and that proportionate gain is vastly in favor of the cities.

"Vermont in 1870 had a population of 330,551, and in 1880 it was 332,286, showing a gain of 1,735 inhabitants. The towns and cities of Vermont increased in that period from 50,504 to 53,141. The gains of the towns was therefore 2,637, or 900 more than the State, and shows that the agricultural interests had been robbed by the protective policy of that number of citizens over and above the natural increase. The natural increase of population in America is at the rate of 25 per cent. in ten years, and the healthy vigorous population of Vermont at this rate would turn out 80,000 new-born Green Mountaineers in that time."

It thus appears that while protection does protect, and make nabobs of the capitalists engaged in manufacturing, it is destructive of agriculture, and that of all the people in America who support the protective policy, the last to give it aid should be the masses—that is to say, ninety-nine in a hundred of the people in New England—and especially the agricultural population.

These statistical statements, taken from the dry reports of the census, and the inferences necessarily deducible from them are amptly illustrated in a lively, descriptive magazine article of recent date. It is to be found in the April number of the Americam Magazine, and is entitled "The decay of rural New England." The article is both entertaining and instructive as well, although the light which it throws upon the effects of tariff legislation was doubtless never seen or thought of by the writer.

He begins as follows:

The cultivation of the soil, we have been taught to believe, is the true foundation of national prosperity. If this theory is correct, the fact is, to say the least, startling that the population of the hill towns of New England is steadily declining, and its farming lands are gradually becoming unkempt wildernesses. Vast areas in Connecticut and Massachusetts, formerly covered with fruitful meadows and grain fields, are now "unprofitably gay" with tenacious sumac and odorous fern. The once-cultivated land is occupied by brush and brake, and the woodman plies his ax where seventy-five years ago were heard the ring of the scythe and the rustle of the sickle.

The writer describes many scenes of desolation where a few generations ago were fruitful fields and happy homes.

For instance, there is a rural town in Connecticut, not 60 miles from New York by rail, and barely 12 from the busy sites of industry that dot the coast line of the Sound. From the windows of an old farm-house there on a June morning one may look down on a square mile of bush and forest, the rye and clover fields of a former generation. * * * The most casual observer must be impressed by the number of empty houses along the way. Count them. One on the corner where the road leaves the highway, another beneath the big elm on the hill, a third under the hill, a fourth on the next slope, four houses in five minutes' walk, and only one is inhabited. Opposite the occupied house is a deserted cellar with crumbling walls, and in the rear are rows of scrawny current bushes and beds of tansy and peppermint, defining what once was a garden plat. Octogenarians tell that in their day a little brown homestead was here, under whose roof Farmer Morgan and his wife reared a brood of ten children on the produce of the farm that stretched back yonder into what is now a waste. Walking further we count three similar ruins in adjoining fields, and across the brook a fourth, four vanished homes in a distance of a quarter of a mile.

There is much more of this melancholy description, but it must be passed over.

Assuming that it is not money, but lands, houses, and all kinds of personal property which constitute wealth, it is plain enough that whilst people are producing for their own supply that they are increasing in wealth. But when their powers of production become equal to their own supply, and a large surplus over and beyond that, then one of three things must happen: First, the production must stop at the home demand, in which case there is an enforced idleness to that extent which results in a loss of wealth; second, if the production continue, it can not result in an increase of wealth, because the excess or surplus of supply will reduce the value of all that is sold and no advance in wealth can be made; or, third, that surplus must be sold abroad to foreign nations. The protective policy forbids this selling abroad.

Its leaders openly proclaim that they intend to reserve the home market for their own people if they have to build a Chinese wall around the United States to exclude all foreign products. They have very nearly done so. The tariff reformers say that we must so modify our laws as to enable our producers to sell their surplus products in the markets of the world, and this can only be done by cheapening as much as possible all the material of production and by lowering the duties upon foreign products to a point that will reasonably permit foreigners to sell them in our markets. For one thing is certain, absolutely certain, we can not sell to them unless they can sell to us. Foreign trade is simply exchange. The idea that we can rigidly shut out the manufactured products of all the world and expect all the world to buy our surplus products is utterly absurd. Being out of our jurisdiction our laws can not force them to do it. Heretofore our vast area of public lands have brought to us annually a great concourse of immigrants constantly swelling our population and thereby enlarging the market for our productions. This to a great extent accounts for our past prosperity, but it is nearly at an end. Our public lands are rapidly passing into private hands—nearly all of the most desirable of them have been occupied. Naturally this vast swarm of immigrants will diminish, whilst the powers of production, constantly increasing, will make the surplus, day by day, far greater than the home demand. It is largely ahead of it now.

The South raises 7,000,000 bales of cotton per annum, 5,000,000 of which is surplus. What would she do with it in the home market? The surplus wheat of the West is rarely less than 150,000,000 bushels. Must it rot in the home market alongside of her vast surplus of meat and corn?

Then what will be done with it? Practically the manufacturers are answering the question every day. Whenever they find themselves with more on their hands than they can sell in the home market they shut down their works and turn their laborers into the streets. They stop production. To enable them to do this effectively all those engaged in the manufacture of the same article enter into combinations which they call "trusts," by which each one agrees under penalties to obey the orders of the "trust," to sell only at certain prescribed prices, to produce only so much or to stop production altogether, as may be decreed.

Meantime the consumer, finding prices at home put up on him, is not permitted to buy abroad by the tariff, must pay whatever prices are demanded of him for his supplies, and must sell his own productions in glutted markets at home. Thus is the American farmer situated by the beauties of this home-market theory which he is invited to support. Before him stands that high Chinese wall which excludes him from the outer world; behind him stand the trusts armed with corporate powers to inflict penalties upon any treacherous member who shall offer to sell him anything below the regulation price! The fact that any of them still hold the title deeds to their farms, still have decent clothing for their families and sufficient implements for their business, designate them as being special favorites of the gods, who have stamped them with the unmistakable marks of immortality.

In the matter of reduction of tax upon distilled spirits the tender mercies of the majority have only been awakened, as usual, for the benefit of the manufacturers. Alcohol used in the arts, as it is euphoniously expressed, is to be relieved of all tax. These "arts" are principally practiced by quacks, medical pretenders, and compounders of cosmetics, hair dyes, tinctures, and what are known to the world, especially undertakers, as patent medicines. The door for the entrance of fraud which is here opened is as much wider than that which they claim is opened by ad valorem duties on imports as is the Gulf of St. Lawrence than the Gut of Canso.

But it makes all the difference in the world who benefits by the fraud and who loses. Ad valorem frauds were supposed to benefit the importer to the loss of the home manufacturer, but when these were changed to compound duties and multiform classifications, by which the fraud was shifted and inured to the profit of the home manufacturer, the situation is pronounced satisfactory. So in this case the possibility of fraud is admitted, but inasmuch as it inures to the benefit of those "interested parties" who are waiting now to judge of our amendments, it was thought wise to remove the tax and risk the consequences. As to the provisions of the House bill which were intended to mitigate in some degree the harsh features of our internal-revenue laws, which are so much complained of by the small operators in distillation in many parts of our country, the stern regard of the majority for the rights of the Treasury has proven incorruptible.

Section 36 of the House bill provided that the Secretary of the Treasury might permit every farmer to distill his apples, peaches, and grapes free from all the regulations and exactions of the law except simply the payment of the tax. The substitute says no, let him comply with all the manifold and expensive red-tape of the law or let his fruit rot upon the ground, which it mostly does to his loss and that of the Government. The same section provides that the Secretary of the Treasury and the Commissioner of Internal Revenue may in their discretion permit all small distillers of grain, consuming less than 25 bushels per day, to operate free from all restrictions except the payment of the tax which shall be assessed on the capacity of their distilleries.

The substitute refuses to allow this, on the ground that it opens the

door to fraud. Between the lines, it is not intended for the benefit of manufactures. Section 37 of the House bill provides that fruit brandy may be placed in warehouses, and the tax paid thereon when taken out for removal just the same as other spirits. Why not? But the substitute says no—the farmer who distills his fruit shall pay the tax as the brandy comes from the worm. The professional distillers alone shall have the privileges of a Government warehouse. Section 38 of House bill provides that when the distillery apparatus of a small distiller is seized for any violation of law it shall not be destroyed, but shall be sold as provided by existing law. The substitute says No! The property shall be destroyed whenever seized, though there may have been no legal adjudication of the guilt of its owner.

Section 39 of House bill provides that whenever it shall be made to appear to the satisfaction of the judge having jurisdiction that the health or life of any person confined in prison for any offense against these laws is endangered by such close confinement, the judge may release him upon bail or make any order necessary for his comfort and well-being. The substitute says No, let him suffer or die.

In sections 29, 30, and 31 of House bill, it is humanely provided, respectively, that the minimum of punishments provided by statute for offenses shall be repealed, leaving it to the discretion of the judge who acquaints himself with all the circumstances to say what punishment shall be inflicted; and that no warrants of arrest shall be issued upon affidavit of charges upon mere information and belief except by the regular officers of the law, and further provide that no fees shall be paid except where the defendant is convicted or the prosecution shall have been approved by the district attorney of the United States. And further, that all warrants of arrest for offenses against the United States laws shall be returnable before some judicial officer residing in the county of arrest, or if there be none such in that county, then in the county nearest the place of arrest. And lastly it is provided by section 33 (House bill) that the Commissioner of Internal Revenue and the Secretary of the Treasury may compromise cases and reduce or remit any fines, penalties, forfeitures, or assessments under internal-revenue laws. All of which moderate and reasonable provisions in behalf of the small distillers and farmers of the country, the majority indignantly reject. They are too small and humble to secure the attention of those intellects who have been so long struggling to—

Secure the proper relation between the rates imposed upon the numerous articles produced in our related and interdependent industries.

But as they had no time to give to the poor and the humble in the solving of this great problem in customs duties, of course they had none to bestow upon the farmer who distills 100 bushels of apples, or to consult the interest of any of the small fry who are affected by internal-revenue laws. It is a pity; but let us hope there is still justice abroad in the land which will some day be felt.

The attempt to characterize the House bill as sectional in its character because more articles of Northern production are affected by its reductions than of Southern production, is, to say the least, ridiculous. A table is furnished by the committee to show this. Of course nine-tenths of the manufactured products of the United States being made in the northern portion, the duties on which are complained of, necessarily the reductions affected the North more than the South. How could it be otherwise? If it were possible to reduce tariff duties with any show of justice or propriety *sectionally*, it could still be shown that the House bill does not reduce upon articles of Northern production disproportionately. The very reverse would be the fact, and is the fact. Largely over one-half of the proposed reduction by the substitute is made upon sugar, which is a purely Southern product; and rice, also grown in the South, and tobacco, which is mainly a Southern product. And it will not be pretended for a moment that of the productions which are subjects of Federal taxation the South makes anything like near one-half.

I have an abiding hope and belief that our countrymen will not be deceived by any of these proceedings with reference to reducing taxes. For the last ten years the Democratic party has made an honest and persistent effort to reduce them to the necessities of the Government, at every step of which they have been thwarted by the Republican party. They have never at any time had the power to reduce these taxes, for they have not had the possession at any one time of both branches of the legislature and the Executive.

The committee acknowledge in their report the imperious necessity of this reduction, but blame first the President of the United States for the existence of the surplus. They say he could have spent it in paying premiums of $30 on the hundred to their friends the bondholders. It is very true he could, and so he could have squandered it as countless millions have been squandered under the administration of his predecessors, but he did not. They say in the second place that the responsibility rests upon the party in control of the House of Representatives, and that this is the first bill which the House has sent them for reducing revenue in five years.

Nobody will be deceived by this. It is as well known to the country as it is to those Senators who make this assertion, that almost the entire body of the Republican minority in the House have resisted every bill which the Democrats have tried to pass within that period, and that they were able by the help of a handful of Democrats to defeat every bill for reducing taxes, and they know further that these few Democrats who aided them to defeat tariff reduction were applauded to the skies by them and made brevet patriots and moral heroes. They know further, and so does the country, that for ten years past no Republican in the House of Representatives, certainly no considerable number of them, has so much as proposed a bill to reduce tariff taxes.

Many of them have indeed, there as well as here, admitted the necessity of reduction; there is no complaint of the liberality of their admissions in this respect, but during the time which I have been a member of this body I can safely say that no Republican in either House, so far as my recollection goes, has made a bona fide movement to reduce any taxes in the maintenance of which the manufacturers of this country were interested. I challenge a contradiction of this. The result of every step or movement toward a change in the schedules has been an increase, and if anything was lowered it was by accident or oversight.

Now, the moderate propositions of the House bill—which could become a law in twenty-four hours if this Senate would agree to it—are met by a counter proposition which, it is admitted, can not become a law at this session of Congress, which is intended for delay, and which, if adopted, would leave most of the taxes which are complained of in full force and increase many of them. The House bill, on the contrary, is framed not only to relieve the Treasury, but to relieve the people, whilst this substitute is framed so as to relieve the Treasury and increase the burdens of the people. That is the difference between the two.

Mr. ALDRICH. I do not intend to try to answer any portion of the argument of the Senator from North Carolina, but I wish merely to call his attention to a misstatement in regard to the provisions of the substitute reported by the Finance Committee, which he was inadvertently led into, I imagine, by a misprint in the list of articles placed on the free-list. He stated that we had placed opium for smoking upon the free-list. If he will examine the measure as printed, he will find that we have not only not placed it upon the free-list but we have absolutely prohibited its importation. We have not placed it upon the free-list.

Mr. VANCE. Was that in the draught as it was first submitted to the committee?

Mr. ALDRICH. Never has it been in the bill in any other form except as an absolute prohibition of its importation.

Mr. VANCE. It is possible I may have been mistaken.

Mr. ALDRICH. I just want to call attention to that one error of fact at the present moment.

Mr. VANCE. I do not believe it is an error. I shall look into it, and if I find I have made an error I shall correct it. I believe it is so placed on the free-list by omission.

Mr. HISCOCK obtained the floor.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. T. O. TOWLES, its Chief Clerk, announced that the House had passed the following bills; in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

A bill (H. R. 7788) to establish a new land district in the State of Mississippi; and

A bill (H. R. 11042) for the relief of Motier Howe.

The message also announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 2110) granting the right of way for the construction of a railroad through the Hot Springs reservation, State of Arkansas.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED.

The message also announced that the Speaker of the House had signed the following enrolled bills; and they were thereupon signed by the President *pro tempore:*

A bill (S. 869) for the relief of the sufferers by the wrecks of the United States steamer Tallapoosa;

A bill (S. 1856) to establish a life-saving station on the Atlantic coast between Indian River Inlet, Delaware, and Ocean City, Md.;

A bill (S. 3234) to abolish circuit court powers of certain district courts of the United States, and for other purposes;

A bill (S. 3390) to create the Lincoln land district in the Territory of New Mexico;

A bill (S. 3573) granting the right of way to the Pensacola and Memphis Railroad Company over and through the public lands of the United States in the States of Florida, Alabama, Mississippi, and Tennessee, and granting the right of way to said railroad company over and through the United States naval and military reservations near Pensacola, in the State of Florida; and

A bill (H. R. 7516) to increase the pension of Sylvester Stearns.

MRS. MARY M. ORD.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore* laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representative to the bill (S. 2663) granting an increase of pension to Mrs. Mary M. Ord.

The amendment of the House of Representatives was in line 5, before the word "dollars," to strike out "one hundred" and insert "seventy-five."

Mr. DAVIS. I move that the Senate concur in the amendment of the House of Representatives.

The amendment was concurred in.

JOSEPH FENNO, DECEASED.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore* laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 1190) for the relief of Joseph Fenno, deceased.

The amendment of the House of Representatives was, in line 9, to strike out "Busby" and insert "Fenno."

Mr. JONES, of Arkansas. I move that the Senate concur in the amendment of the House of Representatives.

The amendment was concurred in.

RAILROAD THROUGH HOT SPRINGS RESERVATION.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore* laid before the Senate the amendments of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 2110) granting the right of way for the construction of a railroad through the Hot Springs reservation, State of Arkansas.

The amendments of the House of Representatives were on page 2, line 26, before the word "years," to strike out "two" and insert "three;" and in page 2, line 27, after the word "act," to add:

Provided, That this condition as to construction within three years shall be construed as a condition precedent to the grant herein made, and in case of failure to so complete said road as provided, such failure shall of itself work a forfeiture of all rights hereunder.

Mr. BERRY. I move that the Senate concur in the amendments of the House of Representatives.

The amendments were concurred in.

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED.

The following bills, received from the House of Representatives, were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Pensions:

A bill (H. R. 2236) granting a pension to Eli J. Yamgheim;

A bill (H. R. 2702) granting a pension to Mary Ann Shook;

A bill (H. R. 2707) granting a pension to Baker Saine;

A bill (H. R. 3608) to grant an increase of pension to William E. Prince;

A bill (H. R. 4648) granting a pension to Jemima Sterling;

A bill (H. R. 4887) granting a pension to Charles E. Scott;

A bill (H. R. 5751) for the relief of Margaret M. Hatch;

A bill (H. R. 7887) granting an increase of pension to Jonathan C. Harrison;

A bill (H. R. 8521) for the relief of William A. Mathes;

A bill (H. R. 8549) granting a pension to Louisa Rogers;

A bill (H. R. 10199) for the relief of William E. Springstein; and

A bill (H. R. 10515) to increase the pension of William Gallagher.

The following bills were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Claims:

A bill (H. R. 1156) for the relief of Miles F. West;

A bill (H. R. 2896) for the relief of the heirs of John R. Treutlen;

A bill (H. R. 3765) for the relief of James Devine;

A bill (H. R. 5480) for the relief of John Iredell Meares;

A bill (H. R. 7151) for the relief of A. N. Kimball and sureties on his official bond as receiver of public moneys;

A bill (H. R. 9211) for the relief of Jesse Durnell;

A bill (H. R. 9297) for the relief of James Sims; and

A bill (H. R. 10099) for the relief of Melchisedec Robinson.

The following bills were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs:

A bill (H. R. 338) to clear the military record of J. George Ruckstuhl;

A bill (H. R. 2025) to place William J. Lowell on the rolls of the Arkansas Volunteers;

A bill (H. R. 3721) authorizing the President to appoint William English an officer in the regular Army of the United States; and

A bill (H. R. 11165) for the relief of John Gray.

The following bills were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs:

A bill (H. R. 4489) for the relief of J. M. Hogan; and

A bill (H. R. 5043) for the relief of the Stockbridge and Munsee tribe of Indians, in the State of Wisconsin.

The following bills were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Public Lands:

A bill (H. R. 7788) to establish a new land district in the State of Mississippi; and

A bill (H. R. 11042) for the relief of Motier Howe.

The bill (H. R. 10606) to constitute Lincoln, Nebr., a port of delivery, and to extend the provisions of the act of June 10, 1880, entitled "An act to amend the statutes in relation to immediate transportation of dutiable goods, and for other purposes," to the said port of Lincoln, was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

The bill (H. R. 246) for the relief of J. W. Patterson, was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads.

J. W. PARISH & CO.

The bill (H. R. 9718) for the relief of J. W. Parish & Co. was read twice by its title.

Mr. MITCHELL. There is a similar Senate bill which was reported from the Committee on Claims. Unless there is objection, I suggest that the House bill lie on the table.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. It will be so ordered, if there be no objection. The bill will lie on the table.

EXECUTIVE SESSION.

Mr. HISCOCK. Mr. President——

Mr. PLATT. I wish to inquire whether the Senator from New York desires to go on this evening?

Mr. HISCOCK. I should prefer to go on in the morning.

Mr. COKE. The Senator from New York having the floor, I ask him to yield to me for a motion to go into executive session.

Mr. HISCOCK. I yield for that purpose.

Mr. COKE. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business. After 12 minutes spent in executive session the doors were reopened, and (at 4 o'clock and 47 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until to-morrow, Tuesday, October 9, 1888, at 12 o'clock m.

CONFIRMATIONS.

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate October 8, 1888.

TERRITORIAL JUDGES.

Louis W. Crofoot, of Dakota Territory, to be associate justice of the supreme court of the Territory of Dakota for the seventh judicial district.

Charles F. Templeton, of Dakota Territory, to be associate justice of the supreme court of the Territory of Dakota for the eighth judicial district.

COMMISSIONER OF INDIAN AFFAIRS.

John H. Oberly to be Commissioner of Indian Affairs.

COLLECTOR OF CUSTOMS.

Edward D. Linn, of Texas, to be collector of customs for the district of Saluria, in the State of Texas.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

MONDAY, *October* 8, 1888.

The House met at 12 o'clock m. Prayer by Rev. J. H. CUTHBERT, D. D.

The Journal of Friday's proceedings was read and approved.

FORT WALLACE RESERVATION.

The SPEAKER laid before the House the bill (S. 3597) to provide for the disposal of the Fort Wallace military reservation in Kansas.

Mr. TURNER, of Kansas. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill. If the House will hear me but a moment I do not think there will be any objection to its passage. A bill passed the House after consideration some time ago, passed the Senate also, and was indorsed at that time by the Secretary of the Interior, and went to the President. The President, however, found that the survey of a certain 40 acres that is provided for in this bill conflicted with the surveys that had been made, and therefore vetoed the bill. In consultation with the Secretary of the Interior he informed me that they were willing, in fact in favor of the passage of the bill, but wanted the second section amended, so as to allow the Secretary of the Interior to cause a resurvey of that 40 acres in order to overcome the difficulty that presented itself in the original bill. For that reason I ask for the present consideration of the bill. It has already passed the Senate without objection.

The bill was read at length.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill? The Chair hears none.

The bill was ordered to a third reading, and it was accordingly read the third time, and passed.

Mr. TURNER, of Kansas, moved to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed; and also moved that the motion to reconsider be laid on the table.

The latter motion was agreed to.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. LAFFOON, indefinitely, on account of important business.

To Mr. MCCLAMMY, on account of important business.

To Mr. SMITH, of Wisconsin, on account of important business.

To Mr. BAYNE, for Monday and Tuesday, October 8 and 9.

To Mr. MORGAN, on account of important business.

To Mr. NEWTON, an indefinite extension of his leave.

To Mr. CLARK, indefinitely, on account of important business.

WAREHOUSING FRUIT BRANDY.

Mr. MCMILLIN. I ask unanimous consent to discharge the Committee on Ways and Means from the further consideration of the bill (S. 70) to provide for warehousing fruit brandy, and in doing so I will

make a statement concerning the subject. It is a bill, the substance of which is included in the bill that was passed by the House, and I believe that that portion of it is recommended by the Senate, granting authority for the bonding of spirits distilled from fruits, and it is approved by the Treasury Department. My reason for calling it up now is because if it is not passed now it will be of no benefit to those engaged in that industry this year, because there is no hope that general legislation on that subject can be passed in time to afford relief this year. I will state also that I submitted the proposition to the gentleman from Pennsylvania, Judge KELLEY, and the gentleman from Indiana, General BROWNE, who were the only members of the committee on the other side of the House in the city. I also have the authority of the Democratic members, and I think there is no objection to it from any source. It is but a matter of justice.

Mr. MCKENNA. I did not hear the gentleman's explanation.

Mr. MASON. I would like to ask what is the purport of the bill?

Mr. MCMILLIN. The bill is to extend the act entitled "An act relating to the production of fruit brandy and to punish frauds connected with the same."

Mr. MASON. I simply state that I will not raise any technical objection, but simply wish to reserve the right to vote and speak against the measure.

The bill was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the provisions of an act entitled "An act relating to the production of fruit brandy, and to punish frauds in connection with the same," approved March 8, 1877, be extended and made applicable to brandy distilled from apples or peaches, or from any other fruit the brandy distilled from which is not now required or hereafter shall not be required to be deposited in a distillery warehouse: *Provided*, That each of the warehouses established under said act, or which may hereafter be established, shall be in charge either of a storekeeper or of a storekeeper and gauger, at the discretion of the Commissioner of Internal Revenue.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the Committee on Ways and Means being discharged from the further consideration of the bill, and to its consideration at this time? The Chair hears none.

Mr. HITT. I ask to have the bill reported again.

The bill was again reported.

Mr. MASON. It is a Senate bill.

Mr. MCMILLIN. It is a Senate bill and passed the Senate unanimously, I am informed.

The bill was ordered to a third reading; and it was accordingly read the third time, and passed.

Mr. MCMILLIN moved to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed; and also moved that the motion to reconsider be laid on the table.

Mr. MCMILLIN. I ask to have printed in the RECORD the Senate report, which sets out more fully the reasons for the passage of the bill than I did in my statement.

There was no objection.

The report (by Mr. VANCE) is as follows:

The Committee on Finance, to whom was referred the bill (S. 70) to provide for warehousing fruit brandy, have had the same under consideration, and report:

The law relating to the warehousing of grape brandies was passed in order to grant privileges to producers whose necessities were identical at that time with those of the producers of brandies now derived from other fruits. The object of this law originally was to enable distillers of grape spirits to keep in bond, without paying tax, for three years, their products until they should be sufficiently matured for the market. Prior to the passage of this law the distillers of grape spirits were required to pay the internal-revenue tax on the same at the time of distillation. This requirement of law imposed such onerous duties upon producers that many were prevented from utilizing wines which were useful only for distillation, or which constituted surplusage in the market on account of the heavy burden imposed upon them. Only a few who commanded sufficient capital were able to pay this tax at that time, as they were compelled to hold such goods sometimes for a considerable period in order to mature them for consumption.

At that time vine-growers, especially in California, were much disheartened, and in some cases were uprooting their vines and in many cases also were throwing away or destroying their wine products which could not be otherwise utilized. The practical value of the law which was passed to enable them to place their brandies in special bonded warehouses was speedily demonstrated; the interests of vine-growers immediately revived; instead of uprooting vines more were planted; many distilleries were established, and the market now is well supplied with choice and well-matured products. Distillation of brandies from fruit enables the producer to utilize material which may fail to find profitable markets otherwise. It enables the vine-grower to obtain profit from inferior goods which are not equal in quality to standard articles, and also to derive some benefit from such waste substances as are left over after expressing grape-juice from skins, seeds, and other residuum of the wine-press.

Practically the same necessities now prevail in all fruit-growing districts. Large quantities of many kinds of fruit, more especially apples and peaches, are being utilized through distillation, but owing to the fact that no bonding privileges are extended to this class of products there is not only great hardship experienced from the levying of the internal-revenue tax upon the same, but also great incentive to fraud. It has been observed also that where the tax on spirits intended for consumption is levied and collected at the time the goods are first produced, the excessive cost of the same, owing to the imposition of the tax, causes holders to force them upon the market long before they are matured and fit for use as beverages. It is therefore greatly to the interest, not only of the producer and the Government, but also of the consumer, that this bill extending these bonding privileges to the producers of fruit brandies should be enacted into law. As a means to prevent fraud it would certainly result in an increase of public revenue, and is therefore, properly speaking, a revenue measure.

This measure passed the Senate in the last Congress (Forty-ninth), and your committee again recommend its passage.

COL. JAMES C. DUANE.

Mr. HERMANN. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill (S. 45) for the relief of James C. Duane.

The bill was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the sum of $648, lawful money, be, and is hereby, appropriated, out of any moneys in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to reimburse Col. James C. Duane, brevet brigadier-general, United States Army, for losses incurred in his office as engineer of the third light-house district through the forgeries committed by a clerk in his office, Henry J. Buete (who has fled the country), in raising his official checks to amounts greater than those for which they were drawn and signed, between the 1st day of January and the 23d day of June, 1879, without any negligence or fault on the part of said Col. James C. Duane.

There was no objection.

Mr. HERMANN. Mr. Speaker, this is a most worthy claim. It has been long delayed, but at last, I hope, justice will be done to one of the most conscientious, gallant, and laborious officers of the Army. The amount involved is only $648, and I call up this claim now, as I have frequently endeavored to do many times before, although the general is not a constituent of mine; and to do this I lay aside claims of my own constituents in order that this bill may be considered. As the report so fully shows, General Duane was detailed as engineer for the third light-house district on Staten Island, New York, in 1879, and during that service a clerk in his employ, with most systematic and remarkable cunning, forged and raised certain checks and vouchers for small amounts for laborers and material men's accounts for light-houses, and through which increased sums were fraudulently inserted, and General Duane was held responsible and actually paid the fraudulent sums in the settlement of his accounts. The Light-House Board recommended to the Treasury Department its repayment, and the Secretary of the Treasury recommended its payment to Congress, or rather submits the first recommendation to us, and I can assure gentlemen that, after a most careful and thorough examination, no blame attaches to the general; but every consideration of justice and equity warrants a return payment to him, and I trust the bill will pass.

The bill was ordered to a third reading; and it was accordingly read the third time, and passed.

Mr. HERMANN moved to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed; and also moved that the motion to reconsider be laid on the table.

The latter motion was agreed to.

LINCOLN, NEBR., A PORT OF DELIVERY.

Mr. RICE. I ask unanimous consent to take from the House Calendar and put on its passage now the bill (H. R. 10606) to constitute Lincoln, Nebr., a port of delivery, and to extend the provisions of the act of June 10, 1880, entitled "An act to amend the statutes in relation to immediate transportation of dutiable goods, and for other purposes," to the said port of Lincoln.

The bill was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That Lincoln, in the State of Nebraska, be, and is hereby, constituted a port of delivery in the customs collection district of New Orleans, and that the privileges of the seventh section of the act approved June 10, 1880, entitled "An act to amend the statutes in relation to immediate transportation of dutiable goods, and for other purposes," be, and the same are hereby, extended to said port. And that there shall be appointed at said port a surveyor with compensation at $250 per annum and the usual fees.

There being no objection, the House proceeded to the consideration of the bill, which was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time; and being engrossed, it was accordingly read the third time, and passed.

Mr. RICE moved to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed; and also moved that the motion to reconsider be laid on the table.

The latter motion was agreed to.

ADAM L. EPLEY.

Mr. EZRA B. TAYLOR. I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Claims be discharged from the further consideration of the bill (S. 1137) for the relief of Adam L. Epley, and that the bill be now considered.

The bill was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay to Adam L. Epley, the son and only heir of John D. Epley, deceased, late a private in Company F, One hundred and fifty-third Regiment Ohio Volunteers, the arrears of pension due or allowable at the time of his death, and heretofore authorized to be paid the said John D. Epley, now deceased, under pension certificate No. 296437.

There being no objection, the Committee on Claims was discharged from the further consideration of the bill, and the House proceeded to its consideration.

The bill was ordered to a third reading; and it was accordingly read the third time, and passed.

Mr. EZRA B. TAYLOR moved to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed; and also moved that the motion to reconsider be laid on the table.

The latter motion was agreed to.

HENRY LECOMTE.

Mr. TILLMAN. On behalf of the Committee on Military Affairs, I ask unanimous consent that the committee be discharged from the further consideration of joint resolution S. R. 112, and that the resolution be now taken up for immediate consideration.

The resolution was read, as follows:

Joint resolution (S. R. 112) authorizing the Secretary of War to receive for instruction at the Military Academy at West Point Henry Lecomte, of Switzerland.

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America

in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of War be, and he hereby is, authorized to permit Henry Lecomte, of Switzerland, to receive instruction at the Military Academy at West Point: *Provided*, That no expense shall be caused to the United States thereby: *And provided further*, That in the case of the said Lecomte the provisions of sections 1320 and 1321 of the Revised Statutes shall be suspended.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of this joint resolution?

Mr. ROGERS. Reserving the right to object, I would like to hear some explanation of the matter.

Mr. TILLMAN. This is simply a matter of international courtesy which has been often practiced by our Government toward foreign countries, and by them toward us. The object of the resolution is simply to allow the son of a distinguished Swiss officer, who served with honor in our Federal Army during the civil war, and who is now a colonel in the Swiss army, to educate his son at the West Point Academy at his own expense.

Mr. ROGERS. That explanation is all that I care for.

Mr. FULLER. One word. What does the gentleman mean when he says, "at his own expense?" Will this young man pay for his own rations, clothing, and everything of that sort?

Mr. TILLMAN. Yes, sir. I hold in my hand a letter from the Secretary of State, transmitting a letter from the representative of the Swiss Government to this country asking this courtesy. Several times American youths have graduated at the great military academy of France, at St. Cyr; and only a short time ago an American cadet graduated with the highest honors at the English military academy at Woolwich. The granting of international courtesy in this way is, as I have remarked, a very common thing; but in order to satisfy gentlemen I will ask that the letter of the Secretary of State and that of the Swiss minister be read.

Mr. FULLER. All I wish to say is this: If there is to be any expense to the Government connected with this matter, I desire to object; for we have scores of American youths who would be very glad to receive education at the Military Academy.

Mr. TILLMAN. There will be no expense except the little that may arise from the fact of one more student receiving tuition and quarters, which amounts to practically nothing.

Mr. HITT. I will ask the gentleman whether there are not at West Point to-day several students from foreign countries whose admission has been authorized in this manner?

Mr. TILLMAN. Certainly; and I am astonished that any member should intimate an objection. These evidences of international courtesy are extended, I believe, by all civilized nations to each other; and there certainly should be no hesitation when it is proposed that the United States grant such a courtesy to the sister Republic of Switzerland, which has no military academy of its own.

There being no objection, the Committee on Military Affairs was discharged from the further consideration of the joint resolution, and the House proceeded to its consideration.

The joint resolution was ordered to a third reading, and it was accordingly read the third time, and passed.

Mr. TILLMAN moved to reconsider the vote by which the joint resolution was passed; and also moved that the motion to reconsider be laid on the table.

The latter motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. TILLMAN] will please obtain from the committee-room and furnish to the Clerks the original engrossed copy of the Senate bill.

Mr. TILLMAN. Certainly I will do so, Mr. Speaker, and would have sent it to your desk instead of the printed copy, but I had just entered the Hall when I heard a motion for the regular order called, and I resolved to push the consideration of even a printed copy of the resolution to-day, because I have been waiting patiently and begging for a week to bring this matter up and I determined to beg no longer, but to object to everything and call a quorum till I succeeded in passing it, as I have long since become convinced that while the best method of getting anything out of a woman is to beg, the best way to obtain a favor or even justice from a man is to fight. [Laughter.]

J. W. PATTERSON.

Mr. PETERS. I ask unanimous consent to discharge the Committee of the Whole House from the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 246) for the relief of J. W. Patterson, and put it upon its passage.

The bill was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the proper accounting officers of the Treasury be, and they are hereby, authorized and required to pay to J. W. Patterson, late postmaster at Humboldt, Kans., the sum of $2,634.23, of which said Patterson was robbed on or about September 20, 1870, and which he has accounted for to the Government; said robbery having occurred without neglect or other fault on the part of said Patterson.

The committee recommend the adoption of the following amendment:

Strike out "$2,634.23" and insert "$617.73."

There being no objection the bill was considered, the amendment adopted, and the bill as amended ordered to be engrossed and read a third time; and being engrossed, it was accordingly read the third time, and passed.

Mr. PETERS moved to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed; and also moved that the motion to reconsider be laid on the table.

The latter motion was agreed to.

NICKOLAS LEUSCHEN AND OTHERS.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE, of Kentucky I demand the regular order.

Mr. SCOTT. I hope the gentleman will yield to me for a moment to ask consent to pass a bill.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE, of Kentucky. I will hear the gentleman's request.

Mr. HAUGEN. I demand the regular order.

Mr. SCOTT. This bill is in the interest of a poor sailor; it carries no appropriation. The man served four years during the war——

Mr. HAUGEN. I withdraw the objection.

Mr. SCOTT. Then, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to concur in the Senate amendments to the bill (H. R. 4601) to amend the naval record of Nickolas Leuschen, Peter Leuschen, and Loth Possum.

I will state that this bill passed the House of Representatives in this session by unanimous consent. It went to the Senate and was there verbally amended, which did not affect the bill. It passed the Senate with the amendment, and is now on the Speaker's table. I merely ask to concur in the Senate amendment.

There being no objection, the Senate amendment was considered and concurred in.

ANTHONY L. WOODSON.

Mr. STONE, of Kentucky, submitted the following report:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 8962) for the relief of Anthony L. Woodson, of Woodsonville, Ky., having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendment to said bill and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: Strike out the amount "$3,666.29" and insert "$4,130.40." Strike out all after the word "use," in line 9, the following words: "And the further sum of $2,300, being the value of engineer stores taken in the same way for the construction of forts, stockades, etc., at or near Mumfordsville, Ky.," to which the Senate agree.

W. J. STONE,
J. M. BROWER,
T. R. STOCKDALE,
Managers on the part of the House.

JOHN C. SPOONER,
JAMES K. JONES,
JOHN H. MITCHELL,
Managers on the part of the Senate.

The following statement by the House conferees accompanied the conference report:

The bill as it passed the House appropriated $3,666.29 for quartermaster's stores and $2,300 for material used in building fortifications. The Senate struck out the $2,300, thus declining to pay for the engineer stores. The committee of conference find that in addition to the amount allowed for quartermaster stores, fencing was used for fires by the troops to the amount of $434.20 in value, thus making $4,130.40 agreed on by the committee.

The report was agreed to.

Mr. STONE, of Kentucky, moved to reconsider the vote by which the report was agreed to; and also moved that the motion to reconsider be laid on the table.

The latter motion was agreed to.

WILLIAM H. CAYCE.

Mr. WHEELER. I submit the following privileged report from the Committee on Public Lands. I am instructed to report back this resolution, and recommend its adoption.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Interior is hereby requested to transmit to this Congress all the papers and records in the case of St. Louis, Iron Mountain and Southern Railroad *vs.* William H. Cayce, in contest concerning 120 acres of land in Miller County, Arkansas, to the end that the action taken by the Forty-fifth Congress June, 1878, be called up and be reviewed by this Congress, wherein said land was declared to be public land of the United States and subject to pre-emption entry, and that pending said review by Congress the Secretary of the Interior be requested to take no further action in the case of said lands.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Alabama sends up the printed resolution. He will please furnish the clerks with the original engrossed resolution during the day.

Mr. WHEELER. I will do so.

The resolution was adopted.

Mr. WHEELER moved to reconsider the vote by which the resolution was adopted; and also moved that the motion to reconsider be laid on the table.

The latter motion was agreed to.

BRIG. GEN. ABSALOM BAIRD.

Mr. HITT. I ask unanimous consent to discharge the Committee of the Whole House from the further consideration of the joint resolution (S. R. 59) authorizing Brig. Gen. Absalom Baird, United States Army, to accept from the President of the French Republic a diploma conferring the decoration of Commander of the National Order of the Legion of Honor.

The SPEAKER. The joint resolution will be read, subject to objection.

The joint resolution is as follows:

Resolved, etc., That Brig. Gen. Absalom Baird, of the United States Army, is hereby authorized to accept from the President of the French Republic a diploma conferring upon him the decoration of Commander of the National Order of the Legion of Honor.

The report (by Mr. HITT) is as follows:

The Committee on Foreign Affairs, to whom was referred the joint resolution (S. R. 59) authorizing General Baird to accept from the President of the French Republic a diploma conferring the decoration of Commander of the Legion of Honor, beg leave to submit the following report, and recommend its adoption:

Last year the French Government invited the President of the United States to send two officers of our Army to France to witness certain maneuvers, on a grand scale, of the French army, to take place in the following September.

Similar invitations have been extended annually by France to this Government as to those in Europe; and it has been the custom of the great European powers to always send officers of distinguished reputation and abil ty, and also high rank, whose name and position naturally designated them as fit representatives of powerful countries.

With us the custom has been different, and our Government has restricted its selections to officers, without much regard to their rank, who happened to be on leave of absence in France at the time appointed for the grand maneuvers.

Our Government has therefore been represented by officers much inferior in age and rank to those representing other countries, which has sometimes caused embarrassment to the French Government in its desire to pay us the compliments that our position among nations warrants and the friendly disposition of the French Republic made it most willing to offer.

To remove this source of embarrassment, General Sheridan recommended the selection of officers of high rank, and the President appointed for this duty of representing our Army at the grand maneuvers in France, Brig. Gen. A. Baird, Inspector-General, and Maj. Henry C. Hasbrouck, Fourth Artillery, commandant Military Academy.

The gratification of the French Government at the action of our own, in designating a general officer of the rank and reputation of General Baird, was shown in many ways; by the marked and formal courtesy with which he was received and treated, and the facilities afforded him during the maneuvers, which were witnessed by about sixty representatives of different governments, eight of whom were general officers.

To a number of these representative officers, including General Baird, of high rank and distinguished personal history, the French Government gave the diploma of a Commander of the Legion of Honor, as an expression of the friendly feeling of the French Government for our Republic, and its action in sending a general officer of such reputation and experience, and as a recognition of the achievements and character of General Baird.

This diploma is usually given by the French Government to encourage high endeavor in every honorable pursuit, but chiefly military. It is given to the man who writes a great book, or discovers a great invention, but especially to one who is distinguished as a soldier.

Your committee see no reason why this expression of friendship for the United States and its representative by the French Government should be refused by this Republic alone among all those governments to whose representatives similar diplomas were accorded, and therefore recommend that the resolution granting permission to General Baird to accept the diploma be adopted.

HEADQUARTERS ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES,
Washington, D. C., June 9, 1887.

SIR: In response to the polite and gratifying invitation of the French Government, conveyed by their minister in this country through the Secretary of State, for our Government to send two Army officers to witness certain maneuvers on a grand scale of the French Army, which are to take place in September next, I have the honor to recommend to the President that Brig. Gen. A. Baird, Inspector-General, and Maj. Henry C. Hasbrouck, Fourth Artillery, commandant of cadets at the Military Academy, be selected to represent our Army and sent to France for this purpose.

General Baird was not long ago appointed as Inspector-General of the Army in consequence of his eminent merit and the distinguished services he has rendered, both in the field during the war and in the more routine matters pertaining to his profession, and his worth as a man and efficiency as a soldier mark him as a fit representative of our Army.

Major Hasbrouck has also a fine record in the field, and for the past five years has rendered valued service as commandant of cadets at the Military Academy, and by virtue of that position and his professional abilities has been the officer to whom all questions upon tactics have been submitted and whose decisions have been adopted as the ruling for the Army. It is ultimately my intention to appoint him as president of a board to revise the tactics for our service, and the experience which he can, if detailed, now gain abroad in witnessing the maneuvers of very much larger bodies of men than can be brought together in this country would be of inestimable value in this connection.

The French Government has annually extended these invitations to this nation and to those of Europe. From the foreign countries it has always been the custom to send officers of distinguished reputation and ability and also of high rank, whose name and position naturally designated them as fit representatives of powerful contries.

With us the custom has been different, and, influenced by what has all the appearance of the melancholy attending great poverty, we have restricted our selections to some of those officers, without very much regard to their rank, who happened to be on leave of absence in France at the appointed time. This has resulted in causing our Government to be represented by officers much inferior in age and rank to those going from other countries, and the French Government, in its desire to pay to us the compliments that our position among nations warrants, has been much embarrassed in the entertainment of our chosen representatives. It is within our power to remove this source of embarrassment, and I think that courtesy to the French nation requires such action on our part, and we can reach this end by selecting officers of the rank I have recommended.

Our Army, it is true, numbers but 25,000 men, but it is the army of a nation of 60,000,000 people, and as good an army for its numbers as that of any other country on the globe, and its officers are especially distinguished for their ability and integrity.

The limited strength of our military force forms one of the most potent reasons for furthering every measure which will promote its efficiency, and in a time of peace I know no better method of reaching this object than is now offered us in the invitation of the French Government, provided we designate men whose rank, position, training, and powers of observation will enable them to obtain opportunities for the examination of the improved methods abroad and the ability to absorb and explain what they see.

With this object in view no better officers could be chosen than those I have recommended, and I strongly urge that their detail may be ordered.

Very respectfully, your obedient servant,

P. H. SHERIDAN,
Lieutenant-General, Commanding.

Hon. WILLIAM C. ENDICOTT,
Secretary of War.

WAR DEPARTMENT, ADJUTANT-GENERAL'S OFFICE,
Washington, June 27, 1887.

SIR: I have the honor to transmit herewith an order designating you, under an invitation extended by the Government of France, as one of the officers of the United States Army to witness the maneuvers of the French army in September next.

The object in designating officers for this duty is not only to recognize an international compliment, but also to obtain information that will be useful to our own Army.

The Secretary of War desires you to give particular attention to such matters as are not usually given in text-books, and that, as soon as practicable after your return, you prepare and transmit to this office a report of your observations, embodying whatever may, in your judgment, be of value or interest to the military service of the United States.

Very respectfully, your obedient servant,

R. C. DRUM, *Adjutant-General.*

Brig. Gen. ABSALOM BAIRD,
Inspector-General United States Army, Washington, D. C.

There being no objection, the joint resolution was ordered to a third reading; and it was accordingly read the third time, and passed.

Mr. HITT moved to reconsider the vote by which the joint resolution was passed; and also moved that the motion to reconsider be laid on the table.

The latter motion was agreed to.

CANCELLATION OF CERTAIN INDIAN PATENTS.

Mr. PEEL, by unanimous consent, from the Committee on Indian Affairs, reported back favorably the bill (S. 3433) authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to accept the surrender of and cancel land patents to Indians in certain cases.

Mr. PEEL. I ask unanimous consent that this report may be now considered, instead of being referred to the Calendar. It is a bill the Secretary feels much interest in.

The SPEAKER. The bill will be read, subject to the right of objection.

The bill was read at length.

There being no objection, the bill was considered, ordered to a third reading; and it was accordingly read the third time, and passed.

Mr. PEEL moved to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed; and also moved that the motion to reconsider be laid on the table.

The latter motion was agreed to.

ORDER OF BUSINESS.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE, of Kentucky. I demand the regular order.

The SPEAKER. This being Monday, the regular order is the call of States and Territories for the introduction of bills and joint resolutions for reference.

BRIDGES ACROSS THE KENTUCKY RIVER.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE, of Kentucky, introduced a bill (H. R. 11573) to authorize the construction of bridges across the Kentucky River; which was read a first and second time, referred to the Committee on Commerce, and ordered to be printed.

SUPPRESSION OF INFECTION IN UNITED STATES.

Mr. DOUGHERTY introduced a joint resolution (H. Res. 230) to suppress infection in the interstate commerce of the United States; which was read a first and second time, referred to the Committee on Commerce, and ordered to be printed.

INVESTIGATION OF CERTAIN NATIONAL BANKS.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, I desire to submit what I believe to be a question of privilege.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. MASON. On the 27th day of August I introduced the following resolution:

Whereas a large sum of money belonging to the United States of America has been loaned to the national banks of this country by direction of the present Administration; and

Whereas said large sums of money have been so loaned to the said banks without interest, thereby giving advantage to such banks over other banks and private individuals not having the use of public funds without interest; and

Whereas, also, it is charged in the public press, upon information and belief, that those national banks are being called upon and requested to contribute to the campaign funds of the national Democratic committee representing the present Administration; and

Whereas it is also charged, upon information and belief, that said banks are contributing large sums of money to said committee in consideration of such deposits without interest, which said contributions should go to the United States Treasury instead of the national Democratic committee; and

Whereas such conduct, if true, on the part of the present Administration and the banks is detrimental to the best interests of the people of the United States and a dangerous practice to establish for the use of public moneys: Therefore,

Resolved, That a special committee of five members be appointed with full and complete power to send for persons and papers, and to investigate the subject-matter herein fully and completely, and ascertain and report to this House, first, the amount of money belonging to the Government of the United States held on special dep sit by the different banks of the country; second, the amount of interest, if any, paid by said banks; third, at whose instance such deposits are made and by what authority of law the same was done; and, fourth, what, if any, contributions have been asked, demanded, or received by the national committee representing the present Administration from the said banks, their agents, officers, directors, stockholders, or employés; the amount asked and received; by whom and to whom paid in each case, and to report the same at as early a date as practicable to this House.

Without caring particularly to discuss it, unless it is desired, I wish to state that under the rules of the House, as I understand it, this resolution should have been reported back within ten days. It was re-

ferred to the Committee on Banking and Currency on the day mentioned. I desire now——

The SPEAKER. Is it a resolution of inquiry?

Mr. MASON. It is a resolution of inquiry, and also asks the appointment of a special committee to investigate the subject-matter therein specified.

The SPEAKER. Under the rules of the House, resolutions of that character are not privileged. The only privileged resolutions are those calling upon the heads of Departments for information.

Mr. McMILLIN. And I make the further point that the resolution embracing one subject-matter which is privileged and another that is not privileged loses its privileged character by reason of embodying the non privileged matter.

The SPEAKER. The Chair has so decided. If the gentleman desires to have a privileged resolution on the subject, he had better introduce one calling for information simply upon the head of the Department, and not asking an investigation by a special committee of the House.

The rule of the House is explicit upon the subject.

Mr. MASON. If the Chair will permit me a moment, I will state that when I introduced this resolution charging the deposit, for instance of $60,000,000 in national banks without interest, and charging upon information and belief that by reason of these deposits certain sums are being solicited to aid a certain campaign committee, as I understand the rule, I asked for information from the department, and at the same time asked for the appointment of a special committee to ascertain what, if any, contributions or solicitations are being made by the national banks by reason of these deposits. Now, if it is not a question of privilege, I desire to move that the committee be discharged from the further consideration of the resolution, and that it be put upon its passage.

Mr. McMILLIN. That motion is not in order.

The SPEAKER. That can only be done by unanimous consent. The Chair thought the gentleman's motion was of a privileged character when he asked for recognition.

Mr. MASON. I understood so from other and older members of the House. I now ask unanimous consent [cries of "Regular order!"] that the committee be discharged from the further consideration of the resolution, and that the same be put upon its passage.

Mr. HEARD. Will the gentleman from Illinois yield for a question?

Mr. MASON. Certainly.

Mr. HEARD. Will the gentleman permit an amendment to his resolution in the same line of inquiry.

Mr. MASON. I will permit it.

Mr. McMILLIN. I demand the regular order.

The SPEAKER. The regular order is demanded, which cuts off amendments and all debate.

Mr. MASON. I desire to know who objects?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. McMILLIN] demands the regular order. This being Monday——

CHANGE OF REFERENCE.

Mr. DOUGHERTY. Mr. Speaker, I desire to make a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. DOUGHERTY. A few moments since I introduced a resolution appropriating $200,000 for the suppression of yellow fever in the interstate commerce and the Chair referred that resolution to the Committee on Commerce; should it not be referred to the Committee on Appropriations?

The SPEAKER. The Committee on Appropriations is not authorized to consider any bills except those making appropriations for the support of the Government, and this resolution by its title proposes to suppress infection in the interstate commerce. But if the gentleman desires to refer it to the Committee on Appropriations the Chair will submit the motion to the House.

Mr. DOUGHERTY. I would state that this resolution, except in the amount to be appropriated, is identical with the one that had been referred to the Committee on Appropriations and reported to the House. Therefore I make the motion.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Florida moves to refer the resolution, which he introduced a moment ago to the Committee on Appropriations. If there be no objection, it will be so referred.

There was no objection, and it was so ordered.

ORDER OF BUSINESS.

The SPEAKER. This being the second Monday of the month, the remainder of the day is set apart for the consideration of business from the Committee on the District of Columbia if claimed by that Committee.

Mr. WHEELER. I ask unanimous consent that gentlemen having reports to make be permitted to file them with the Clerk.

There was no objection, and it was so ordered.

FILING OF REPORTS.

The following report was filed by being handed in at the Clerk's desk:

CAMPS FOR YELLOW-FEVER REFUGEES.

Mr. WHEELER, from the Committee on Expenditures in the Treasury Department, reported back favorably the bill (H. R. 11530) to provide camps for yellow-fever refugees; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

DISTRICT BUSINESS.

Mr. HEMPHILL. I will state, Mr. Speaker, that the only business the Committee on the District of Columbia have is such as will invoke some opposition, and in view of the fact that the House is so thin the committee has determined not to ask for the consideration of that business.

ORDER OF BUSINESS.

The SPEAKER. The next business in order is the call of committees, but unanimous consent has just been given that gentlemen having reports to make can file them with the Clerk for reference to the appropriate calendars.

Mr. NELSON. I ask if the resolution of the gentleman from Maine [Mr. MILLIKEN] is not now the unfinished business.

The SPEAKER. There is an hour for the consideration of bills and resolutions. The hour begins at 2 minutes to 1 o'clock.

RAILROAD AT HOT SPRINGS, ARK.

Mr. McRAE. I call up for consideration the bill (S. 2110) granting the right of way for the construction of a railroad through the Hot Springs reservations in the State of Arkansas.

The SPEAKER. The Chair is informed that bill is in Committee of the Whole.

Mr. McRAE. I move the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole for the purpose of considering the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is this a private bill?

Mr. McRAE. It is.

The SPEAKER. Then it is not in order. The rule confines the hour to the consideration of public bills which have been reported by committees on previous days.

YELLOWSTONE PARK.

Mr. McRAE. Then I call up Senate bill 283.

The SPEAKER. That bill is in Committee of the Whole.

Mr. McRAE. I move that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole for the purpose of considering this bill.

The motion was agreed to; and the House accordingly resolved itself into Committee of the Whole, Mr. RICHARDSON in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The House is in Committee of the Whole for the purpose of considering the bill the title of which the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read the title of the bill, as follows:

To amend sections 2474 and 2475 of the Revised Statutes of the United States, setting apart a certain tract of land lying near the headwaters of the Yellowstone River as a public park.

Mr. McRAE. I move to dispense with the first reading of the bill and that it be now considered by sections.

Mr. EZRA B. TAYLOR. I object. I want to know what the bill is.

The question was put on dispensing with the first reading of the bill; and the Chair announced that the "noes" seemed to have it.

Mr. WHEELER. The bill is very long, and there is but little change from existing law.

Mr. EZRA B. TAYLOR. I want to know what the bill is.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will announce that the gentleman has the right to have the bill read, and inasmuch as it is not waived by unanimous consent, the bill will have to be read.

The Clerk proceeded to read the bill.

Mr. EZRA B. TAYLOR (before the reading of the first section was concluded). Mr. Chairman, I wanted to know what change was made by this bill in the boundaries; and having learned that, I withdraw the demand for the further reading.

The CHAIRMAN. Does any member demand the further reading of the bill?

Mr. NELSON. I wish to inquire whether this bill has been before the Committee on Public Lands of the House?

Mr. McRAE. It has been.

Mr. NELSON. Is it a unanimous report?

Mr. McRAE. I think it is. There is no minority report; and I think the bill meets the approval of all the members of the committee.

Mr. NELSON. I wish the gentleman would state to what extent the bill changes the boundaries of the reservation.

Mr. McRAE. It enlarges the reservation. I yield to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. WHEELER], who will explain the matter.

Mr. WHEELER. This bill makes an enlargement in the reservation to the extent of about 1,600 square miles. It takes off a little strip in Montana Territory and another little strip in Idaho Territory——

Mr. NELSON. Does it enlarge or diminish the reservation?

Mr. WHEELER. It enlarges it, as I have said, about 1,600 square miles.

Mr. NELSON. Is it recommended by any of the Departments of the Government?

Mr. WHEELER. I think that the Department recommended the Senate bill; we have made some amendments in it, but nothing material in the way of additions, except the proviso regarding the railroad; with that exception this is substantially the bill as recommended by the Department.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will finish the reading of the first section.

Mr. HATCH. Before the Clerk proceeds I desire to occupy the floor a few minutes. The gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. McRAE] yields to me.

Mr. McRAE. For a few minutes.

Mr. HATCH. I hope the gentleman will not limit me. I shall not occupy any more time than may be necessary.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk has not concluded the reading of the first section of the bill.

Mr. HATCH. I desire to occupy time in general debate before the reading of the bill by sections is begun.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will proceed.

Mr. HATCH said: Mr. Chairman, I am sure that under the circumstances the Committee of the Whole will pardon me if I digress somewhat from a discussion of the features of this bill, as I have not had during the last few days an opportunity to be in the House to make a statement which I now desire to make.

A short time ago, in a speech which I delivered in my own district, in the State of Missouri, and repeated at Williams' Grove, Pennsylvania, I made the statement that farm implements and farm machinery manufactured in this country were exported and sold to foreign buyers, both in Canada, and in Mexico, as well as in Europe, at lower prices than they were sold to the American farmer. I said further that I had authority for the statement that the Oliver Chilled Plow Works, at South Bend, Ind., exported their plows to Canada and sold them there, or to Canadian dealers, at an average price $4 less than they are sold to the American farmer. I send to the Clerk's desk to be read a letter addressed to a gentleman in my State by the establishment referred to.

The Clerk read as follows:

SOUTH BEND, IND., *August* 31, 1888.

DEAR SIR: Your favor of the 29th ultimo is at hand and carefully noted. We do not suppose that Hon. W. H. HATCH, Congressman from your district, would willfully misrepresent us, but the statements made in his speech at your place on the 28th instant have no foundation in fact whatever. The truth is, we have little or no trade in Canada, as the 35 per cent. duty most effectually shuts us out from that market. There may be imitations of our plows, produced by Canadian manufacturers, but we know nothing of them and are in no wise responsible for them. We do not favor foreign trade in the least, and all reports that we do are false. We export our plows largely to Europe, Mexico, South America, and elsewhere, but buyers for those countries pay us exactly the same price that American dealers do. As to the retail price, take your number 40, which is our standard plow. It is retailed in this country, complete with wheel and jointer, for $14, while the same plow is sold in Great Britain for several dollars more. It is gratifying to us to have our plows so well thought of abroad, but we can say without egotism that their popularity is due solely to their merit.

The United States is the home of the plow and its manufacture has been brought nearer to perfection in this country than elsewhere on the face of the globe. Competition is brisk; factories are plenty, and not only do Americans produce the best plows made, but they are sold cheaper to the user here than in any foreign land. The statements made by Mr. HATCH are not new, and each Presidential year "bob up serenely" as a factor in politics, but we are somewhat surprised that a gentleman of his reputation should make such charges without satisfying himself of their truth. What we have said to you is the truth, pure and simple, and we are prepared to substantiate the same on any or all occasions.

Mr. P. M. Smith, of your place, writes us in regard to this same subject, and we reply to him as we do to you. Thanking you both for calling our attention to the matter, and hoping that we may be set right in your community, we beg to remain,

Yours, truly,

OLIVER CHILLED PLOW WORKS.

H. F. MILLAN, Esq., *Kirksville, Mo.*

Mr. HATCH. I ask the Clerk now to read my reply to that letter, as a foundation for official documents which I shall submit in a few moments.

The Clerk read as follows:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, UNITED STATES,
Washington, D. C., October 8, 1888.

GENTLEMEN: Your letter, addressed to H. F. Millan, esq., Kirksville, Mo., dated August 31, and subsequently published in the Kirksville Journal and other Republican papers in Northeast Missouri, has just been brought to my attention, the delay having been caused by my unavoidable absence from this city from September 13 until Saturday last.

In a speech delivered by me in Kirksville, Mo., August 28, I stated that farm implements and machinery manufactured in this country and sold to American farmers were exported to foreign countries, notably Canada and Mexico, and after paying a duty to such countries were retailed at a less price than in this country, and, instancing the Oliver chilled plows, stated further that I was informed by good authority that these plows were shipped to Canada and sold at retail to the Canadian farmer at an average of $4 less than the same plows could be bought by the American farmer.

I certainly had no intention of "misrepresenting" the facts or doing your works or any other company in the United States the slightest injustice; on the contrary, I had the highest authority for the statements made, and now have abundant evidence to sustain them.

At the great Interstate Grange meeting at Williams' Grove, Pennsylvania, August 30, I reiterated these statements, without mentioning individual instances, in the presence of one of the largest, most intelligent, and well-informed assemblages of American farmers that has congregated this year, and also in the presence of the largest display of farm implements and machinery to be seen on this continent, with their respective owners or representatives in charge.

I invited, pressed for, and challenged a denial from any such owner or representative present but in vain. Not one of them dared, in such a presence and with the facts at hand, to venture a denial of the truth of these statements.

You are the only manufacturing company in the United States, so far as I know, whose goods have been, or are being, exported for sale, or sold to foreign buyers, that have ventured upon a denial of the facts stated.

In regard to the prices of sewing machines, reapers, mowers, and other high-priced farm machinery, in this country and Europe, as well as Canada and Mexico, no well informed person of respectability will question the oft-repeated and proven statement that such American manufactured articles are sold at greatly reduced prices abroad over those charged the American purchaser.

I am somewhat surprised at the character of your denial; it is evasive and unsatisfactory. You admit that you have some trade with Canada, but are careful to omit that country from the list of those enumerated to which you export your plows. But this will not avail you, nor will the insinuation that "imitations of our plows produced by Canadian manufacturers" may be sold for less money, or be the ones referred to, in the light of the facts so plainly stated in the official correspondence, copies of which I herewith submit to your careful consideration. My statements at Kirksville and elsewhere were made on the authority of Mr. Washington, and I now submit his own statement of the facts from which he derived his information.

I also invite your attention to the cumulative evidence contained in the accompanying correspondence, which fully explains itself without further comment. The statements made may not be "new" to the manufacturers, but they will prove "mighty interesting reading" to thousands of farmers throughout the United States.

Very respectfully, your obedient servant,

W. H. HATCH.

OLIVER CHILLED PLOW WORKS,
South Bend, Ind.

Mr. HATCH. I now ask the Clerk to read a letter from the Assistant Secretary of State, and the report accompanying it.

The Clerk read as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE, *Washington, September* 18, 1888.

SIR: In pursuance of the verbal promise made to you by Assistant Secretary Rives a week or ten days ago, and confirmed by my personal note of last week, I have pleasure in transmitting to you herewith copy of a report by Mr. Washington, our commercial agent at London, Ontario, on the prices of American agricultural implements in his district.

I have the honor to be, sir, your obedient servant,

ALVEY A. ADEE,
Second Assistant Secretary.

Hon. WILLIAM H. HATCH, M. C.,
House of Representatives.

Inclosure: Consul Washington to Department of State, No. 67, London, Ontario, September 15, 1888.

Mr. Washington to Mr. Rives.

No. 67.] UNITED STATES CONSULAR AGENCY,
London, Ontario, September 15, 1888. (Received September 18.)

SIR: In reply to the circular of the Department of State, dated September 4, 1888, requesting information as to imports of agricultural machinery and tools from the United States into Canada, inquiry elicits the following facts:

I find that plows of American manufacture are among the most prominent of the imports in this line. The Oliver chilled plows (made at South Bend, Ind., and the one, I am told, that has the largest sale in the United States), the Syracuse plow, and the South Bend plow seem to be most in demand and to have the largest sale. I have before me on my desk an offer from an Ontario dealer in the Oliver plows to sell same in f. o. b. at this city in Canada for $10 each in quantities. The retail price here is $12, and numerous transactions take place at that figure.

The same plows, I understand, are sold in quantities at the factory (not for export) at $14 each, and cost the American farmer at retail $16.

The Syracuse plow retails at $11 or $12 here, and, I am informed, sells for from $14 to $16 in the United States at retail, and the South Bend at $11 here and and $14 at home.

It is pleasing to observe how cheaply our manufacturers must be able to turn out these goods, from the fact that the Canadian duty on this class of goods is 35 per cent. ad valorem. Even admitting that the manufacturer makes no profit on his sales in Canada, these figures are of interest:

	Per plow.	
Price at which plow is sold in Canada		$10.00
Duty at 35 per cent. ad valorem and freight	$3.50	
Profit to Canadian dealer probably	1.50	
		5.00
Leaving actual cost to manufacture		5.00
Retailed to American farmer at		16.00
Profit to manufacturer on all home sales		11.00

It would thus seem that the Canadian farmer has an advantage over his American neighbor in the purchase of necessary implements produced in his own country, and the latter before purchasing his plows might well figure as follows:

Price of plows at retail in United States		$16.00
Price of same in Canada	$12.00	
Freight to return same to United States (duty is free on American goods returned)	1.00	
		13.00
Profit to American farmer by purchasing American-made plow in Canada		3.00

Plows with tempered steel mold-boards and beams, which sell in the United States for $17 and upwards, are manufactured in Canada (from Pittsburgh steel on which duty has to be paid, and the wages of the workmen are substantially the same as in the United States), and are sold for $14 retail; thus showing excess of profit made by American manufacturing over Canadian manufacturing, $3 on each plow. When it is considered that the Canadian manufacturer has to pay a duty on his materials and freight upon same to Canada from Pittsburgh, it will be readily seen at a glance that the excess of profits to the American over the Canadian manufacturer is much greater than the sum named, $3.

I am credibly advised by a very prominent Canadian farmer that he has just bought an American self-binding reaper (Walter A. Woods) for $110. Laid down in an American city near the lines the price of same machine in same place to an American farmer would be from $150 to $170.

In addition to the larger implements mentioned, farmers' or agricultural hardware imported from the United States consists of light shelf goods, dry paints, whilst agricultural hand-tools (such as spades, shovels, forks, etc.), on which articles the duty varies from 35 to 70 per cent., although the printed tariff reads only from 30 to 35 per cent. This Government has, however, instructed its customs officers to advance prices on invoices in certain lines which brings the duty up to a very high rate. Thus, on scythes, for instance, by means of a specific and ad valorem duty they have to pay from 60 to 70 per cent.

Notwithstanding these tremendous charges, a careful comparison of the wholesale and retail prices of the above tools shows that in all cases American goods

can be bought in Canada as cheap, and in many cases cheaper, than in the United States.

It is conclusively proven by these facts that the American farmers are not receiving the full benefit of the low prices at which these goods can be produced in the United States. These benefits are apparently reserved for the Canadians and other foreigners to whose markets we export goods; but existing conditions enable the American manufacturer to compel the purchase of his goods by the American farmer at exorbitant profits.

So great has been this discrimination by American manufacturers in favor of foreign purchasers that the Canadian customs authorities have come to regard with suspicion the prices on nearly all American invoices, as they can not understand why these goods should be sold to Canadians at such great reductions from the prices at which they are sold at home at the point of manufacture. As a consequence they have, during the past two years, largely adopted the plan of appraising these goods for duty at the home figures in preference to the prices stated in the invoices. For instance, an American manufacturer may be willing to sell a certain article for $5 to the Canadian trade, the price for the same article at home being $8. The valuation is placed at the latter figure, and even though he sells for the former the purchaser has to pay duty on $3 more than the goods cost him. The result of this practice is that we are losing our export trade to this and probably other foreign countries.

The falling off of the American export trade to this port on dutiable articles in one year having been $211,058.

The shortsightedness of our manufacturers in this respect, no less than the development of manufacturing in Canada, is closing this (as it does other outside markets to our goods), and is driving us back to trade only within ourselves, to the injury of our great agricultural interests, to the reduction of the wages of our workingmen, and to the lessening of the products of our factories.

Replying thus to your circular by an enumeration of facts, I remain, sir,

Your obedient servant,

WM. DE H. WASHINGTON,
Commercial Agent.

Hon. GEO. L. RIVES,
Assistant Secretary of State, Washington, D. C.

Mr. HATCH. I have another letter which I would be glad to read and make a short comment upon it, but as I do not wish to take up further time I ask unanimous consent to print this letter, with additional remarks, in connection with the report which has just been read.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. HATCH] asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD. If there be no objection, that leave will be granted. The Chair hears no objection.

HOW THE HIGH TARIFF WORKS—MANUFACTURERS SELLING GOODS CHEAPER TO FOREIGNERS THAN TO HOME CUSTOMERS.

The Hagerstown (Md.) Mail gives the following striking instance of the practical operation of the protective tariff, showing the enormous bonus obtained by the monopolists and their perfect ability to compete on equal terms with foreign manufacturers:

The people of the United States have voluntarily taxed themselves to an enormous amount for the benefit of the manufacturers, and in return for making them wealthy they discriminate against their benefactors and sell to foreigners at a much lower price than they will sell to citizens of the United States.

A gentleman told us recently that he went to New York to buy certain machines to sell in South America. The regular price to American dealers was $12 apiece, but this foreigner, upon signing a pledge to sell none of them within the United States, got all he wanted at $7 each.

After getting them beyond our borders they could not be brought back again without paying the tariff tax, and that tax added to the $7 would bring the price up to $12.

The reason of this is apparent. In selling to South America our manufacturer is brought into direct competition, upon entirely equal terms, with European manufacturers, without even the cost of crossing the ocean in their favor.

The fact that under these terms they can compete successfully with Europe should satisfy all that they will not go to ruin while they are protected in this country with a revenue tariff and the freight across the ocean.

The only difference will be that their profits will not be quite so enormous.

The letter given below is a striking illustration of this point. The firm of Ladner & Brother has two stores, one at Eagle Pass, Tex., and the other immediately across the Rio Grande at Piedras Negras, Mexico. He buys his goods for both stores, apparently, from the United States.

Our manufacturers, who are so excited about the interests of our American labor, will sell the Mexican Greaser his shovel for less than one-half what he charges the American workman.

The shovels referred to are the Ames shovels, manufactured in New England.

The letter is as follows:

"OFFICINA DE L. LADNER Y HNO.,
"COMERCIANTES EN ESTUFAS, FERRETERIA Y OJALATERIA,
"*Piedras Negras, Mexico, August* 9, 1888.

"DEAR SIR: Yours of the 2d at hand. In reply take pleasure in giving you the figures asked for as nearly as possible. First, in regard to shovels. Our shovels bought for our Eagle Pass store cost us about $6 per dozen, exclusive of freight. Our shovels of the same class and material cost us laid down in Piedras Negras $2.91 per dozen. Another item: Agate ironware can not be bought for delivery anywhere in the United States at better than 35 per cent. discount. In Piedras Negras we can buy the same articles from the same houses at 60 per cent. discount. The list is the same in both cases. These are not the only articles. Disston's saws can be bought with an additional 20 per cent. discount, showing that the manufacturers could sell in home markets in competition with the outside producers. These figures are only a partial list. Every article known to the hardware trade can be bought from the American manufacturers for export cheaper than they can for home consumption. Hoping this will answer your purpose, we remain,

"Very truly, yours,

"A. J. LADNER & BRO.
"Per H.

"Mr. WALTER NEGLEY, *Hagerstown, Md.*"

Mr. Walter Negley, to whom this letter is addressed, is, as is well known to most of our readers, a son of the late Hon. Peter Negley, for many years United States subtreasurer at Baltimore and editor of the Herald and Torchlight. Mr. Walter Negley was raised a Republican, and for all we know may be one now, but is ardently in favor of reforming the present unequal and iniquitous tariff and of the Mills bill, notwithstanding the fact that he is an extensive woolgrower, having many thousand sheep in Texas, and is deeply interested in the wool industry, which Mr. Mills places on the free-list.

In a recent interview published in one of the Washington City papers, Mr. C. T. Campbell, of the city of Mexico, a native of Prince Edward Island, but a citizen of the State of New York, stated: "I have been in Mexico for twelve years. Mexico is forging ahead. Several new lines of railroad are being pushed through. There are wonderful natural resources, but it needs a stronger stream of immigration to develop them. The native peons are a hopeless lot for effective work. The educated classes are, on the other hand, bright and alert. They have sense enough to hold on to a good thing. They know what a good mine is, and rarely will sell one. They are now importing the most improved mining machinery and developing the mines fast. The silver mines of Mexico are undoubtedly the richest in the world. Mining machinery comes in duty free, which gives Mexican miners considerable advantage over American. One thing they get from the States, however, cheaper than anywhere else—that is blasting powder. In fact, the American companies will sell for export cheaper than they will sell at home. There is a trust in that, I suppose, about as there is in everything else."

Mr. HATCH. I have taken the opportunity to make this statement in the House of Representatives in order that it may go upon the record. In view of the fact that the company referred to has seen proper to call in question the truth of the statement made by me on several important public occasions, I have regarded it of importance to the agriculturists of the country that these statements should go upon record; and if any manufacturers of farm implements or machinery in the United States desire to furnish any additional testimony on this subject, I shall be glad to hear from them.

In reply to numerous inquiries I desire at this time to state officially, as chairman of the Committee on Agriculture, the present status of (H. R. 8191) a "bill to enlarge the powers and duties of the Department of Agriculture, and to create an executive department to be known as the Department of Agriculture."

Members interested in this bill will readily recall its history during the past ten years, but for the information of the people of the United States it may be well to repeat it:

In the third session of the Forty-sixth Congress, February 7, 1881, Mr. AIKEN, from the Committee on Agriculture, moved to suspend the rules and pass House bill 4909, on which motion the yeas were 164, nays 83, not voting 45, failing by 1 vote to receive the necessary two-thirds.

Again in the first session of the Forty-seventh Congress, House bill 4429 was reported to the House by Mr. ANDERSON, from the Committee on Agriculture, made a special order, and after full consideration and discussion, on May 10, 1882, passed the House by the overwhelming vote of yeas 183, nays 7, not voting 101.

Again in the second session of the Forty-eighth Congress, December 15, 1884, Mr. Aiken, from the Committee on Agriculture, moved to suspend the rule and pass House bill 1457, which, after discussion under the rules, passed the House by the decisive vote of yeas 166, nays 69, not voting 88.

And again, in the Forty-ninth Congress, January 11, 1887, Mr. HATCH, from the Committee on Agriculture, having reported bill H. R. 5189, after mature deliberation and discussion by the House, the same was passed by the overwhelming vote of yeas 226, nays 26, not voting 67.

This bill passed the Senate February 23, 1887, with amendments, was returned to the House February 25, 1887, referred to the Committee on Agriculture, and, February 26, 1887, reported back to the House with the recommendation that said amendments be concurred in.

Owing to the short time intervening before the final adjournment of the Forty-ninth Congress, March 4, 1887, and the condition of the regular appropriation bills, it was impracticable to obtain consideration of the Senate amendments by the House, and this important measure again failed to become a law.

The principal amendment placed upon the bill by the Senate in the closing days of the Forty-ninth Congress, to wit, February 23, 1887, was an additional section, as follows:

SEC. 5. That the weather service of the United States Signal-Service Bureau is hereby transferred to the Department of Agriculture, to take effect July 1, 1888, and shall consist of one chief and such subordinate officers and employés as may be necessary to efficiently manage said bureau. Until otherwise provided by law, the present organization of the subordinate force of said bureau, including the second lieutenants now in service, shall continue as at present: *Provided*, That nothing in this act shall be construed as altering or affecting in any way the present status in the Army of the commissioned officers of the Signal Corps. The chief of said bureau shall receive an annual compensation of $4,500, and be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate: *Provided*, That the Chief Signal Officer of the Army, in addition to his strictly military duties, may be assigned to the charge of the Weather Bureau until a chief shall be appointed by the President and confirmed by the Senate; and the compensation now paid to the employés and enlisted men of said service shall continue as now; and the moneys appropriated for said service and hereafter appropriated shall be disbursed under the direction of the Secretary of the Department of Agriculture.

The Secretary of War is authorized and directed, within thirty days after the passage of this act, to appoint a board of three Army officers, of which the Chief Signal Officer shall be a member. The duty of said board shall be to make an inventory of all property now in the control and possession of the Signal Service Bureau, and shall separate and turn over to the Department of Agriculture such portions of the property as the said board may determine to be suitable for the work of the Signal-Service Weather Bureau. The remainder of the property shall remain in the control of the Secretary of War.

This amendment was warmly approved by the Committee on Agriculture of the House of Representatives, and they unanimously reported to the House in favor of concurring therein.

That no further delay might occur in perfecting the bill and sending it to the President for his action, the Committee on Agriculture at the present session of Congress, March 7, 1888, reported the bill to the House with this section intact and without alteration.

Without alteration or amendment the bill passed the House May 21, 1888, and was sent to the Senate.

Although it had been before that body for its action repeatedly, as heretofore stated, it was not finally acted upon until September 21, 1888, when it was returned to the House with amendments, the only one of any importance being an amendment to strike from the bill the fifth section, which had originated in the Senate and had been accepted by the House.

This was done at a time when it was notorious that no quorum was present in the House and in all probability would not be until the next session, and when a single objection under the rules would de-

feat any action upon the Senate amendments, and thus defeat the final passage of the bill at this session.

Having kept the bill four months, and finding no other pretext for emasculating it and preventing its passage at this session, the Senate deliberately struck out the only section of the bill which had originated in the Senate at the last session and which was deemed of value and importance by the farmers of America, who will not be slow to comprehend the animus of such action or to fix the responsibility of these repeated delays where it properly belongs.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will now proceed with the reading of the bill.

Mr. HATCH. I ask unanimous consent that the hour of the Committee on Public Lands may be prolonged to the extent of the time that I have occupied.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has occupied thirty minutes.

Mr. HATCH. I ask unanimous consent that the time of the committee be extended to make up for the time I have occupied.

Mr. HENDERSON, of Iowa. I must object to that request.

Mr. HATCH. There is so much time now at command—we have more time now than anything else—that I hope the gentleman will not object to a courtesy of this kind.

Mr. HENDERSON, of Iowa. I am very much opposed to this bill, and I do not feel like giving it another moment. That is my reason for the objection.

Mr. McRAE. I will say to my friend from Iowa——

Mr. HATCH. As I have taken up the time of the Committee on Public Lands through the courtesy of that committee, I ask the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HENDERSON], as a personal favor to me, to withdraw his objection to this request. The gentleman will have ample opportunity to oppose the bill.

Mr. HENDERSON, of Indiana. I never can withstand that sort of an appeal; I withdraw my objection.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there further objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri? The Chair hears none.

Mr. McRAE. Mr. Chairman, I desire to ask leave to withdraw this Senate bill and to consider a few private bills. It was the purpose of the committee to call up these bills first, but under the ruling of the Speaker we were not permitted to do so, except by unanimous consent. If I can first get unanimous consent to take up a few private bills for the relief of individual homestead settlers and also a right-of-way bill, I will withdraw this bill, in view of the fact that it meets with opposition. We can not hope to pass it, and with the knowledge of this fact I do not desire to consume further time talking about it if I can get the consent I have asked.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Arkansas asks unanimous consent to withdraw from further consideration the pending Senate bill. Is there objection?

Mr. HENDERSON, of Iowa. I think it just as well that that be done, for it will be impossible to pass the bill under the present circumstances.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair hears no objection, and the bill is withdrawn.

RIGHT OF WAY THROUGH HOT SPRINGS RESERVATION, ARKANSAS.

Mr. McRAE. Mr. Chairman, I now call up the bill (S. 2110) granting the right of way for the construction of a railroad through the Hot Springs reservation, State of Arkansas. I ask unanimous consent to dispense with the first reading of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair desires to inform the gentleman from Arkansas that this bill is on the Private Calendar, and the gentleman must ask unanimous consent for its consideration.

Mr. McRAE. I have asked consent; that was embodied in my request.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair did not so understand the gentleman. The gentleman asks unanimous consent that this private bill be considered during the present hour. Is there objection?

Mr. KILGORE. I wish to know to what extent unanimous consent is proposed to be granted? My understanding was that the gentleman from Arkansas asked to withdraw the bill then pending before the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. McRAE. In order to call up these private bills.

Mr. KILGORE. I understand whenever a private bill is submitted the Chair should ask for unanimous consent.

The CHAIRMAN. That is what the Chair is doing. Is there objection to the consideration of the bill which has been indicated?

Mr. EZRA B. TAYLOR. Let the bill be reported.

The CHAIRMAN. The bill will be reported, after which the Chair will ask for objection.

The Clerk read the title of the bill, as follows:

A bill (S. 2110) granting the right of way for the construction of a railroad through the Hot Springs reservation, State of Arkansas.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

The committee informally rose; and Mr. ROGERS having taken the chair as Speaker *pro tempore*, a message from the Senate, by Mr. McCOOK, its Secretary, announced that that body had passed without amendment the bill (H. R. 9447) to restore certain money to the fund for erecting a public building at the city of Detroit.

It further announced that the Senate had agreed to the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 2742) to incorporate the Brightwood Railway Company of the District of Columbia.

It further announced that the Senate had directed its Secretary to furnish to the House, in compliance with its request, a duplicate engrossed copy of the bill (S. 577) for the relief of the American Grocer Association of the city of New York.

It further announced the passage of the bill (S. 577) for the relief of the American Grocer Association of the city of New York; in which concurrence was requested.

It further announced that the Senate had agreed to the House concurrent resolution providing for an investigation into the construction of the aqueduct tunnel, with an amendment in which concurrence was requested.

AQUEDUCT TUNNEL INVESTIGATION.

Mr. BURNES. Before the Committee resumes its session I desire to call up, by unanimous consent, the concurrent resolution just returned from the Senate with an amendment.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The committee only rose informally to receive the message from the Senate.

Mr. BURNES. The amendment will not take a moment and the matter ought to be disposed of at once.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. If there is no objection, the resolution will be taken up for consideration.

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES, *October* 8, 1888.

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That all work here before performed upon the Washington Aqueduct tunnel, together with the provisions of any contract made for the same or any portion thereof, and all the facts and circumstances connected with the bidding for and letting and making of said contracts, and all expenditures of moneys heretofore appropriated for said work, together with the extent of any force employed in said work by the Government, the nature of the same and the compensation therefor, shall forthwith be fully investigated by a joint select committee of six members, of whom three shall be members of the Senate, to be appointed by the President of the Senate, and three shall be members of the House of Representatives, to be appointed by the Speaker. Said committee shall have authority to employ a clerk, a stenographer, and such experts as it may deem necessary for the investigation. It may sit during the sessions of Congress or in recess, and shall have full power, either in full committee or in subcommittee, to administer oaths and send for persons and papers, and to conduct its investigation either in Washington or in such places as may be deemed necessary, and shall make full report of its proceedings and the conclusions arrived at, with such recommendations as it may deem proper, to Congress on or before January 1, 1889.

The Senate agree to the foregoing resolution of the House of Representatives with the following amendment:

Page 1, line 8, after the word "contract," insert the words "and subcontracts."

Mr. BURNES. The amendment is agreed to by the conferees of the two Houses. I move it be concurred in.

The amendment of the Senate was agreed to.

Mr. BURNES moved to reconsider the vote by which the Senate amendment was agreed to; and also moved that the motion to reconsider be laid on the table.

The latter motion was agreed to.

RIGHT OF WAY THROUGH HOT SPRINGS RESERVATION, ARK.

The committee resumed its session.

The CHAIRMAN. If there is no objection, the bill will be taken up for consideration.

Mr. EZRA B. TAYLOR. The reading of this bill was asked for, subject to objection after it was read. It has been read, however, only by its title, when the Speaker asked whether there was objection. I wish to reserve my right to object until the bill has been read in full.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair directed the Clerk to proceed with the reading of the bill, when some other gentleman merely asked for the reading of the title, and the title was reported, when the Chair asked if there was objection to the consideration, and no objection was raised.

Mr. EZRA B. TAYLOR. I reserved the right to object until the bill was read in full, which has not yet been done.

The CHAIRMAN. If the gentleman says that he wished to reserve the right to object until the bill was read, of course the Chair will recognize him.

Mr. EZRA B. TAYLOR. My original request was to withdraw the other bill, and then to consider these private bills which have been reported from the Committee on the Public Lands.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will state that it will hardly be in order to ask unanimous consent for the consideration of bills without reporting them. The Chair did not submit that request to the committee.

Mr. McRAE. That was the request I made to the House, and as I understand it that was what was agreed to. There is no doubt about that.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair did not so understand it. The Clerk will proceed to report the bill and amendments of the Committee on the Public Lands to the House.

The bill was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the right of way is hereby granted to the Mountain View Railway Company, of Hot Springs, Ark., incorporated under the laws of

the State of Arkansas, beginning at such point east of the line of the bath-houses, between the Army and Navy Hospital and the Arlington Hotel, as the Secretary of the Interior may approve; thence by the most eligible route to the east line of Hot Springs Mountain; thence westerly down North Mountain and West Mountain to the west line of reservation.

SEC. 2. That the right of way hereby granted shall not exceed 30 feet in width, and no part of the right of way herein granted shall in any way interfere with or obstruct the full flow of the hot waters or be so located as to cause the United States Government or any citizen thereof any expense of any kind or character, save and except the projectors of said road, its heirs and assigns.

SEC. 3. That it shall be the duty of the United States Government's superintendent of the Hot Springs reservation to see that said railway to be constructed under this act shall not obstruct or in any manner interfere with the springs, hot-water pipes, roads, or paths, now existing or contemplated to be located upon said reservation; but it shall be made safe and secure for the pleasure, comfort, and edification of the patrons of the same, and used for the conveyance of passengers only.

SEC. 4. That nothing in this act shall be so construed as to abridge the right of the city government of Hot Springs to control and regulate the privileges of the Mountain View Railway where the same may cross Central avenue in said city.

SEC. 5. That the Mountain View Railway Company shall have the right to construct observatories at different eligible locations in the vicinity of the right of way hereby granted, at such points as the Secretary of the Interior may approve.

SEC. 6. That said observatories shall not exceed 30 feet square at foundation, and to be built in good and safe manner, and that no timber shall be cut upon the mountain, or earth or rock blasted or removed, or the surface of the ground in any way defaced, except upon the actual road-bed of the said way, and no blasting shall be done on Hot Springs Mountain except as authorized by the Secretary of the Interior; and that the right of way hereby granted shall be used for the purposes herein mentioned and none other: *Provided*, That this grant shall not be construed to abridge the authority of the Secretary of the Interior over the portion of the reservation included in the right of way.

SEC. 7. That said company shall cause a map showing the proposed route of its line through the reservation to be filed in the office of the Secretary of the Interior, and said location shall be approved by the Secretary of the Interior before any grading or construction on any part of the line shall be begun, and the right of way shall be lost and forfeited unless the road is completed and in running order within two years after the passage of this act.

SEC. 8. That the company or its assignees to whom this right of way is granted, shall annually pay to the Government of the United States for the improvement of the permanent reservation at Hot Springs, Ark., 3 per cent. of its gross earnings. And Congress hereby reserves the right at any time to amend, add to, alter, or repeal this act.

The amendments of the committee were read, as follows:

In section 7, line 8, strike out "two" and insert "three;" also in the same line, after the word "act," insert:

Provided, That this condition as to construction within three years shall be construed as a condition precedent to the grant herein made, and in case of failure to so complete said road as provided, such failure shall of itself work a forfeiture of all rights hereunder.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the consideration of this bill in the morning hour?

Mr. McMILLIN. Let the Clerk again report the title of the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill granting the right of way for the construction of a railroad through the Hot Springs reservation, in the State of Arkansas.

Mr. McMILLIN. Will it not suit the purpose of the gentleman from Arkansas to let this bill be considered in the House after the committee rises? I do not believe the rule which prohibits the consideration of private bills in this hour ought to be disregarded, as it is a good one and a wise one. If I did not so believe I would not ask the gentleman to let the bill go over.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will state that it requires unanimous consent to consider the bill in this hour, and the Chair has just asked if there is objection.

Mr. McMILLIN. I am not going to make any objection to the consideration of the bill in this hour, but simply desired to call the attention of the gentleman to the fact that this rule is one that under no circumstances should be broken. For my part I am very much opposed to the consideration of private bills in this hour. It is certainly a rule that should be adhered to. I do not, however, object if the gentleman desires to consider the bill now.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chairs hears no objection to the consideration of the bill.

Mr. WHEELER. I ask unanimous consent to be permitted to make some remarks now, which I had intended to submit on the deficiency bill, the time consumed not to be taken out of this hour.

Mr. McRAE. Let us pass this bill first, and then the gentleman will have ample time afterwards. This is a good bill, but so far as the House is concerned and the general public it is of little importance. It is of importance, however, to the people there.

Mr. WHEELER. I know that when the deficiency bill comes up I can occupy the time then, but I ask unanimous consent now to be heard, the time not to be taken out of the morning hour.

Mr. EZRA B. TAYLOR. I demand the regular order.

The CHAIRMAN. There being no objection, the bill is before the committee for consideration, and the first question is on the amendment recommended by the committee.

The amendment was adopted.

The bill as amended was laid aside to be reported to the House with the recommendation that it do pass.

MOTIER HOWE.

Mr. McRAE. I now ask consideration of the bill (H. R. 11042) for the relief of Motier Howe.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is informed that this bill is also on the Private Calendar. Is there objection to its consideration in this hour?

There was no objection.

The bill is as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That there be, and is hereby, granted, relinquished, and confirmed unto Motier Howe, of Oregon, his heirs and assigns, the interest of the United States in and to the west half of the northwest quarter and northeast quarter of the northwest quarter, and northwest quarter of the northeast quarter of section 22, in township 12 south, of range 23 east, of Willamette meridian, in the State of Oregon.

SEC. 2. That in accordance herewith the Secretary of the Interior is hereby directed and authorized to issue to said Motier Howe a patent in due form to said lands.

Mr. McMILLIN. I understood the gentleman from Arkansas had withdrawn the preceding bill.

Mr. McRAE. No; I withdrew the Yellowstone Park bill. I have asked unanimous consent to consider some of these private bills, to which I supposed there would be no objection. They have been reported by the committee favorably, are on the Calendar; they are meritorious, and I hope there will be no objection to our passing these little measures when we have the hour now at our disposal.

Mr. McMILLIN. I do not feel like being captious in regard to these matters, but I hope my friend from Arkansas will not insist on overriding a rule which has operated so well heretofore and which will be entirely broken down if such action as he now proposes is taken with regard to private bills. Now, I am not going to obstruct this bill or make any objection to it. I should perhaps decline to offer objection to any bill the gentleman called up in this hour; but I hope, in view of the sentiment, as I believe, of the House, that he himself will see after this statement that the consideration of private bills in this hour will break down a rule that has the universal approbation of the House, and that he will not insist on asking consideration of private bills.

Mr. McRAE. Well, I will only call up this and one other private bill. [Laughter.]

Mr. STONE, of Kentucky. It occurs to me that this is an exceedingly unfair proceeding. This privilege has been denied to all the other committees, and especially to the Committee on War Claims.

Mr. McMILLIN. I agree with my friend from Kentucky fully.

Mr. STONE, of Kentucky. I represent a committee having bills upon the Calendar for eight months, a large number of them, and have not been able to get a day even set apart for their consideration. When the Committee on War Claims wanted to consider private bills we were informed that we could not do so under the rule.

Mr. McRAE. Did you not have other bills to consider?

Mr. STONE, of Kentucky. No, sir; we lost our hour because we had none but private bills prepared at that time.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on laying aside the bill to be reported to the House.

The bill was laid aside to be reported to the House with the recommendation that it do pass.

MARY ALICE WHITE.

Mr. McRAE. I now call up the next bill, for the relief of Mary Alice White, House bill No. 10079.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is informed that this bill is also on the Private Calendar.

Is there objection to its consideration in this hour?

Mr. HERMANN. I ask unanimous consent that it may be now considered.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

Several MEMBERS. Regular order.

The CHAIRMAN. Objection is made.

LAND OFFICE, MISSISSIPPI.

Mr. McRAE. Then I call up for present consideration the bill (H. R. 7788) to establish a new land district in the State of Mississippi. This is a public bill, and I presume there can be no objection to its consideration.

The bill was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That all that portion of the State of Mississippi comprised in the counties of Hancock, Harrison, Jackson, Green, Perry, Marion, Lawrence, Covington, Jones, Greene, and Wayne be, and is hereby, constituted a new district, to be called the Gulf land district, the land office for which shall be located at the town of Hattiesburgh, Perry County, State of Mississippi.

SEC. 2. That the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, shall appoint one man register and receiver for said land district hereby created, who shall receive such compensation as shall be prescribed by the Secretary of the Interior, who is hereby authorized to fix the same upon the establishment of the office; and said district shall be subject, as other land districts, to be changed or consolidated, and the land office changed to any other place by order of the President.

The committee recommend the following amendment:

Strike out the word "Greene," in the fifth line.

Mr. FULLER. I ask for the reading of the report in that case.

The report (by Mr. STOCKDALE) was read, as follows:

The counties named in this bill lie in a compact body and contain a large majority of all the public lands in the State, and two counties will likely be added, leaving but little public land outside of the new district.

There is but one land office in the State now, and that is located at Jackson, Miss., the capital of the State. There is no railroad communication with the city of Jackson and these counties except by a circuitous route of from 150 to 300

miles, whereas, if this district be established, the same people can reach the new office at Hattiesburgh at a distance of from 50 to 130 miles, and a very large number, perhaps a majority, can reach there by traveling less than 100 miles. The town of Hattiesburgh, the proposed site of the new land office, is on the New Orleans and Northeastern Railroad, nearly in the center of the new district.

This region is becoming settled rapidly, and settlers need homesteads, and ought to have facilities for entering them without going so great a distance. Your committee therefore report the bill back with the recommendation that it pass.

Mr. FULLER. I would like to ask if this is unanimously reported from the committee?

Mr. McRAE. I do not think there is any minority report; but I am not so familiar with the subject as the gentleman from Mississippi, who made this report.

Mr. STOCKDALE. It is the unanimous report of the committee.

The amendment of the committee was agreed to.

The bill as amended was laid aside to be reported to the House with the recommendation that it do pass.

ORDER OF BUSINESS.

Mr. McRAE. I move that the committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

The committee accordingly rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. RICHARDSON reported that the Committee of the Whole, having had under consideration sundry bills, had directed him to report the same to the House with various recommendations.

BILLS PASSED.

The bill (S. 2110) granting the right of way for the construction of a railroad through the Hot Springs in the State of Arkansas, reported from the Committee of the Whole with an amendment, was considered, the amendment agreed to, and the bill as amended ordered to a third reading; and being read the third time was passed.

The bill (H. R. 11042) for the relief of Motier Howe, reported from the Committee of the Whole favorably, was considered, ordered to be engrossed and read the third time; and being engrossed, it was accordingly read the time, and passed.

The bill (H. R. 7788) to establish a new land district in the State of Mississippi, reported from the Committee of the Whole with an amendment, was considered, the amendment concurred in, and the bill as amended ordered to be engrossed and read a third time; and being engrossed, it was accordingly read the third time. The question being on the passage of the bill—

Mr. EZRA B. TAYLOR. I demand a division on that vote.

The House divided; and there were—ayes 15, noes 2.

Mr. EZRA B. TAYLOR. No quorum.

The SPEAKER. The point of order being made that no quorum has voted, the Chair will order tellers.

Mr. EZRA B. TAYLOR and Mr. STOCKDALE were appointed tellers.

Mr. EZRA B. TAYLOR (one of the tellers). I will not insist on the demand for a quorum.

So, no further count being demanded, the bill was passed.

Mr. McRAE moved to reconsider the several votes just taken; and also moved that the motion to reconsider be laid on the table.

The latter motion was agreed to.

DANIEL T. WOOD.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HERBERT] asks leave to withdraw from the files of the Forty-fourth Congress the papers in the case of Daniel T. Wood. If there is no objection, leave will be granted.

There was no objection.

YELLOWSTONE PARK.

Mr. McRAE. I move that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole for the further consideration of the bill (S. 283) to amend sections 2474 and 2475 of the Revised Statutes of the United States, setting apart a certain tract of land lying near the headwaters of the Yellowstone River as a public park.

The motion was agreed to; and the House accordingly resolved itself into Committee of the Whole, Mr. RICHARDSON in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The House is now in Committee of the Whole for the consideration of the bill the title of which the Clerk will read.

The Clerk again reported the title of the bill.

Mr. HENDERSON, of Iowa. I would like to ask the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. McRAE] if that is not the bill we had up in the morning hour?

Mr. McRAE. It is. How much of the time remains, Mr. Chairman?

The CHAIRMAN. There are twenty-eight minutes remaining.

Mr. McRAE. I desire to yield twenty-five minutes to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. WHEELER].

Mr. WHEELER. I would like to ask the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HENDERSON] if he intends to make the point of no quorum on this bill?

Mr. HENDERSON, of Iowa. I shall make every point I can for its defeat.

Mr. WHEELER. Then it is useless for me to address the House any further this morning upon that measure. I have made a careful estimate of the members present, and it is quite clear there is less than a quorum in the House. On our last vote but 98 members answered to their names, and it is doubtful if there is now a quorum of the House in the city.

The Committee on Public Lands have finished all the bills which that committee has ready for consideration, and as the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HENDERSON] asserts that the Yellowstone Park bill shall not be considered, and as I may not be able to occupy the floor again for some days, I will take this opportunity to make a few observations regarding the substitute for our tariff bill which has just been reported by the Senate Committee on Finance.

Mr. EZRA B. TAYLOR. This bill has been called up for the purpose, I suppose, of allowing some one to make a speech on the tariff.

Mr. WHEELER. The gentleman is taking up a part of my time. I am always willing to yield for questions, but I can not yield time to be used in discussion.

Mr. EZRA B. TAYLOR. I give notice that that kind of business will not be permitted to be repeated.

Mr. WHEELER. I know that the gentlemen on the other side of the House do not like to hear debates on this subject, and I would much prefer to occupy the time in explaining the features of the bill which is on the Speaker's desk, if they would permit us to do so; but if that is refused I shall use my time as indicated.

Mr. HENDERSON, of Iowa. I suppose there is further need for making remarks on that subject on that side of the House.

Mr. WHEELER. During the consideration of the tariff bill much more time was accorded in its debate to gentlemen on the other than on this side of the House, and now that public opinion has forced the Republican party to produce a tariff measure I insist that they should not object to its discussion.

The first business laid before this Congress was the message of the President recommending a revision of the revenue laws. The necessity for such revision was clearly shown by the unanswerable logic of that remarkable state paper, and the Democrats of the House at once addressed themselves to the task. The Republicans, after a long and fruitless search for faults or defects in the present Administration, seized upon this demand for a revision of the laws and reduction of the surplus as the keynote of their campaign, and misrepresentations of Democratic purposes were relied upon as effective party ammunition.

Denunciations came with the force of an avalanche from Republicans in all stations and from all sections.

The uncrowned king, Mr. Blaine, dispatched his famous message from the imperial courts where for nearly a year he had been seeking statecraft inspiration, and the cry was echoed by leaders of all grades down to the newest-fledged aspirant for political preferment until the chorus resounded through the Republican camps from the Atlantic to the Pacific.

From the editor of the New York Tribune to the printer of the smallest and least-known Republican weekly, from Maine to Texas and from Oregon to Florida, there came but one sound, as it were the echo of the slogan from across the Atlantic.

Tinkering with the tariff, as they chose to describe our efforts, was specially denounced, and they demanded that the customs laws should be left untouched.

Every intelligent man in the United States knew that this position was taken by Republicans because they felt the necessity of aggressive antagonism.

These purely political stratagems were not concurred in by the real statesmen and sagacious business men in the Republican party.

The charge so often made by Republicans that Democrats could not unite upon a tariff measure was exploded and rebuked by the almost unanimous Democratic vote upon the excellent bill passed by the House in July last.

The most astute and far-seeing Republican politicians insisted that their best policy was to criticise all Democratic measures, and though taunted to produce something better, they, by non-action, admitted their inability to do so.

When our bill reached the Senate the party leaders, who engineer the political campaigns of the Republicans, determined that their party should not be placed upon the defensive by putting in print their partisan substitute for the House bill.

Their position was most embarrassing.

To go before the people in November admitting their inability to devise any means of relief to the tax-payers was equivalent to signing their own political death-warrant, and to submit to the country a bill consistent with their platform would drive from them every voter who thought that the material interests of the country were more important than party success.

After hesitating for three months as to which horn of the dilemma they would accept, these party magnates have decided that any action was better than none, and the long-looked-for Senate tariff bill has been laid before the public.

THE SENATE TARIFF BILL.

Yes, Mr. Speaker, the Republican tariff bill has finally been laid before the people, and a remarkable production it is. These persons, who claim to be zealous guardians of the poor man's interests, propose to bring about a reduction of $73,750,000 in the revenues of the Govern-

ment, and of this amount $52,250,000 are taken from the products of agriculture, $7,000,000 from whisky, while the tariff tax is reduced by only $14,500,000, and scarcely any of that reduction is made upon the necessities of life.

This Republican tariff bill distinctly violates the party platform. In that document they demanded—

Such a revision of the tariff laws as will tend to check imports of articles such as are produced by our people, the production of which gives employment to our labor.

Farmers are not associated together in combinations and trusts. Most of them are men who labor upon their own land. They are our best and most industrious citizens, and yet Republicans propose to make nearly all of this reduction at their expense, while these zealous partisans are careful to make scarcely any reduction upon those articles the manufacturers of which are combined in trusts that oppress the people. This unjust proposition of the Republican Senate is in strict conformity with much of that party's legislation against the interest of the mass of the people, and is the logical outcome of the pledge in their party platform which declares that the Republican party will—

Favor the entire repeal of the internal taxes rather than the surrender of any part of our protective system.

This shows that General Harrison was nominated upon a platform which the Republican Senate interprets to mean that none of the privileges of the wealthy monopolists of the Northeast are to be surrendered, but that all changes in the revenue laws are to be effected almost entirely at the expense of the hard-working farmers of the West and South.

The difference between the purposes and objects of the Democratic party and the Republican party is very clearly indicated by the characteristics of the bills, designed to reform our revenue laws, which the two parties have submitted to the country.

The effect of the bill prepared and passed by the Democratic House of Representatives will be to lighten the burdens and increase the prosperity and happiness of 20,000,000 people who earn their living by daily toil. The effect of the bill prepared by the Republican Senate will be to perpetuate the privileges whereby a few favored monopolists and corporations have gained enormous individual fortunes at the expense of the comfort and happiness of those by whose toil the wealth of the country is created.

REPUBLICANS SUSTAIN MR. CLEVELAND.

The Republican members of the Senate committee are compelled to admit the correctness of Mr. Cleveland's views, so forcibly expressed in his message.

The report submitted by Senator ALLISON, in behalf of his party allies, asserts:

The demand for a careful and thorough revision of our revenue laws is imperative. This revision is necessary:

1. To reduce the national revenues, which are now excessive.

No valid reason can be given why we should, under existing circumstances, continue to collect annually a sum approximating $60,000,000 in excess of the amount required to administer the Government economically and keep the pledges of public faith.

2. To protect honest importers and domestic producers.

3. To remedy the defects, anomalies, and incongruities which have been from time to time discovered in the tariff schedules, or which have been created by erroneous decisions of the Treasury Department.

4. To secure the proper readjustment and equalization of tariff rates rendered necessary by modified business conditions, improvements in methods of production, radical changes in prices, or by new elements or sources of competition.

These are substantially the reasons given by President Cleveland in his message of last December in which revenue reform was demanded, which document has been so severely denounced by the Senator's party associates.

The Republican authors of the Senate bill give a fifth reason for the revision of the revenue laws, framed, I would suppose, to meet the party requirements of their platform and to induce money contributions from their carefully protected monopolistic pets. This reason is in the words I will now read:

5. To give relief and protection to many industries which are now suffering on account of the inadequate rates levied on competing products.

The bill submitted to the people by the Senate is the work of Republicans only.

It appears to have been prepared by the Republican members of the committee, and in conformity to the views and wishes of dominant members of their party, and that class of manufacturers who specially insist upon maintaining and if possible increasing the present exorbitant rates of taxation, and the Democratic members of the committee were not consulted or even informed as to the provisions of the Senate substitute bill until the subcommittee made a report of the measure to the full committee on the 25th of September.

Mr. O'NEILL, of Pennsylvania. The gentleman says they were not permitted to appear before that committee.

Mr. WHEELER. I say they did not appear, and I believe that they would have appeared had they been permitted to do so. It was certainly the wish of all advocates of that kind of revenue reform which would add to the prosperity of the country and lighten the burdens of the people to appear before that committee and endeavor to impress it with their views, but as near as I can learn, no one who is known to be favorable to such a reform as is demanded by the Democratic party was either invited, and I might say permitted, to go before the subcommittee which framed the bill.

Mr. O'NEILL, of Pennsylvania. It is a notorious fact that the people of the whole country were informed that the Senate Finance Committee were in session ready to hear all persons interested upon questions relating to the revision of the tariff, and whoever did not appear did not appear upon their own motion, not because they were not welcomed by the Committee on Finance. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. WHEELER. In reply to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. O'NEILL], I beg to state that I learn for the first time that the people of the whole country were informed that the Senate Finance Committee were in session ready to hear all persons interested. The papers very generally stated that the Finance Committee would not report a bill. This statement was repeated day after day in dispatches from Washington and in the leading papers of the United States, and I am certainly correct that the impression of the people at large was that no bill would be reported, and as weeks and months rolled on and no bill emanated from the committee this view was accepted as the correct solution of the probable action of the Senate; and, as far as I can learn, it seemed that the only persons who knew that a bill was to be reported were those manufacturers who demand high, if not prohibitory, protection, and others who have confidential relations with the Republican party.

Mr. O'NEILL, of Pennsylvania. The gentleman never heard an official statement emanating from the committee that they were not going to report a bill. Every one knew that they were.

Mr. WHEELER. It was openly and repeatedly asserted, and I never saw it denied, that Mr. Blaine urged that the best policy for the Republican party to pursue was not to report a bill, and it was also stated that very many of your great leaders concurred with Mr. Blaine, and before we get through with discussing the Senate bill you will find they were right. The Senate bill is framed to benefit the few at the expense of the many.

Mr. O'NEILL, of Pennsylvania. Many members of this House appeared before that committee and took their constituents before that committee. They were not heard before the Ways and Means Committee.

Mr. WHEELER. I yielded to the gentleman from Pennsylvania for a question; but not for a speech. My time is limited, and if the gentleman wishes to make statements in the nature of a speech he must do it in his own time.

Mr. MCKENNA. Do I understand the gentleman from Alabama to say that the Democratic Senators were excluded from the consideration of the bill?

Mr. WHEELER. Their report says so. Senator HARRIS says so in his report, that they were not consulted or informed by the subcommittee of the provisions of the bill.

Mr. MCKENNA. Let me tell the gentleman from Alabama that Senator HARRIS has just said in the Senate Chamber that there is no truth in that.

Mr. WHEELER. Senator HARRIS says:

In the preparation of this substitute no member of the minority of the committee was consulted or informed as to its provisions until it was reported on the 25th day of September to the full committee.

The gentleman from California misunderstood Senator HARRIS. It is very probable that Senator HARRIS and possibly other members of the minority were admitted to certain discussions, but it is quite clear that the bill was framed without consulting with them.

Mr. MCKENNA. He has just declared in the Senate Chamber that he was present, or some member of the minority of the committee was present, during the time the testimony was taken and had ample opportunity to question witnesses during that time.

Mr. WHEELER. I yielded to the gentleman for a question, and not for a speech. I assert that the Senate bill and report has been before the country for nearly a week. It has been published in the papers of the United States, and up to this morning there has not been any denial, so far as I can learn, of the accuracy of the allegations contained in the report signed by the Democratic Senators. No member of the press has expressed a doubt as to the verity of the statement that the Democratic members were excluded from any participation in the preparation of the bill or in the preparation of the report.

Mr. FARQUHAR. Will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. WHEELER. I do not yield for a speech; I will yield for a question.

Mr. FARQUHAR. I do not suppose that the assertion will meet with a contradiction, but I want to say that possibly a score of the members of this House have been present and been heard before that committee. I have been in the Senate Finance Committee when hearings were being had by the subcommittee, when Senator HARRIS himself was present or some other Senator of the minority; sometimes Senator BECK. I know that in the hearings at that time all interested parties were heard—manufacturers and employés or workingmen.

Mr. WHEELER. I have no doubt but that certain manufacturers and such workmen as they desired to go before the committee were given a full hearing. The interests of manufacturers of the South are not in all respects in harmony with those of the Northeast. I did not hear of Alabama manufacturers being invited before the committee, and certainly no one here heard of farmers being before the Republican members of the subcommittee.

Mr. HENDERSON, of Iowa. I wish to say to the gentleman from Alabama that I know personally that the committee in the preparation of that bill has not only been open to the minority of the Finance Committee, but that the doors of the room have been open and free to every Senator without reference to party.

Mr. WHEELER. I have not been in the Senate this morning and did not hear the discussion to which reference has been made, and I do not question the accuracy of the statement; they are not at all inconsistent with the position I have taken. No doubt Democratic Senators were permitted to be present at every open session of either the subcommittee or the full committee, but no gentleman will doubt but that the essential features of the bill were framed in a committee caucus to which no Democrats were invited. Of course there was no exclusion of members at the committee meetings, and I do not question but that they were open to all Senators.

Mr. FARQUHAR. And the members of any other committee, independent of party.

Mr. WHEELER. I have no doubt the doors were open at the time the evidence was taken. There is no dispute about that because that evidence was generally published in the papers; but the question is as to whether the doors were open during the consideration of the bill and preparation of the report. The minority say they were not, and the allegations of the minority report, which has been published throughout the country, has never been denied.

I will read the exact language of the minority of the committee. The report signed by the Democratic Senators says:

In the preparation of this substitute no member of the minority of the committee was consulted, or informed as to its provisions until it was reported to the full committee on the 25th day of September, 1888.

The report further informs us that the time of the Republican members of the committee was consumed in—

Arguments and appeals of manufacturers and others, who demand that the present high rate of tariff taxation shall be maintained, and in most instances increased, prompted not by any revenue necessities, but alone for the purpose of increasing their own profits at the expense of sixty millions of tax-payers.

It could hardly be expected that such a bill would be framed so as to merit the approval of the people, and a merely casual examination shows that the measure is designed to specially promote and protect the interests of capital, and against the interests of the people.

From the minority report of the Democratic Senators I read these words:

It is safe to say that all the interests benefited by a high protective tariff have been fully heard and have had much influence in shaping this substitute, while the great body of the people, the tax-payers and victims of this policy, have not appeared and have not been heard.

But let us examine the features of this remarkable production which the Senate Finance Committee has submitted.

THE TWO BILLS COMPARED.

It is difficult to conceive of two measures more clearly indicative of the characteristics of the opposing parties.

The Republicans represent and endeavor to serve the aristocratic elements of our people, and the Senate bill is framed specially in their interests, while the House bill is framed in the interest of the Government and of the people.

The report on the Senate substitute bill submitted by the Democratic Senators states that the essential differences between the House bill and the Senate substitute bill are very great.

The report says:

The one is framed in the interest of the public Treasury; the other in the interest of private pockets. The one is framed in the interest of the whole people; the other in the interest of a few thousand manufacturers. The one is designed to reduce both Government revenue and taxation, the taxation especially which bears heaviest on the necessaries of life; the other is intended to raise public revenue indeed, but to maintain private revenues by increasing and retaining taxation on all the necessaries of life.

From beginning to end the Senate bill seeks to cut down duties on sugar and other articles which produce revenue to the Government, but steadfastly declines to reduce duties on articles where the duty is now prohibitory, and therefore does not produce revenue to the Government, the only effect being to increase private fortunes. In their report the Democratic Senators say:

The advocates of the substitute freely propose to reduce duties or abolish them on those things which yield only Government revenue, but refuse to reduce or abolish duties on those things which produce private revenue.

The principal reductions in the customs duties, as proposed by the Senate bill, are on sugar and rice, the saving on sugar being estimated at $27,759,783.95, while jute, jute-butts, curranta, and molasses, and a few other articles which are not necessaries are put on the free-list.

The House bill places iron ties on the free-list. The Senate bill increases the tax from 35 per cent. ad valorem to a specific tax, equivalent to about 118 per cent. ad valorem.

SENATE BILL MAKES NECESSARIES DEARER.

The Senate bill increases the duties upon nearly all articles manufactured from the four great staples, cotton, wool, steel, and iron. These are articles used by every one, and the largest increases in many cases are upon those articles which must be used by the poor and needy classes of our citizens.

In keeping with the dominant idea of Republicanism, salt, which of necessity is used by every one, is taxed 80 per cent. by the Republican Senate bill and made absolutely free by the bill which passed the Democratic House.

Where the Senate does not openly increase the tax on articles used by the farmer, it in some instances accomplishes that result by indirect means. For instance, a change in the dutiable value of the rods from which the wire fence used by the farmer is made increases the tariff tax on those rods. In addition to this, one size of wire, No. 6, is so changed in classification as to increase the tariff rate on wire rods of this size from 45 to about 54 per cent., making an increase of tax, according to the estimates of the Senate committee, of over $300,000 on this one size of wire rods.

Again, a new proviso is added in the Senate bill by which rods smaller than No. 6 are classified as wire, thus effecting another increase in the tax upon an article used almost exclusively by the farmers.

The tariff tax on many articles is largely increased by changing the duties from an ad valorem to a specific duty, in every case the effect being to put the largest tax upon the cheapest articles, which are used by the poorer classes. For instance, knives and forks, which are found on the poor farmers' tables, are taxed from 200 to 300 per cent., and every article, with scarcely an exception, upon which a specific tax is imposed, is so arranged as to put the heaviest rate on the cheapest article.

Implements used by the farmer have also received the attention of the Senate committee, and in nearly every instance severely to his detriment.

Trace chains and all other chains less than three-eighths of an inch in thickness are raised equivalent to an ad valorem of from 10 to 20 per cent.

In fact, the entire bill is a strike at the farmer, and if it become the law would reduce his profits and increase his already onerous burdens.

The Senate bill takes off the internal-revenue tax from what is classed as non-necessary tobacco in all its forms except cigars, cheroots, and cigarettes.

The minority report, in referring to this part of the bill, says:

Practically, the substitute offers to the people free whisky and free tobacco, leaving all the expensive machinery for the collection of the revenue and enforcement of the law in full force, while it increases taxation upon the actual and indispensable necessaries of life, and this, too, when there is a large surplus in the Treasury, and under existing laws that surplus is being increased at the rate of over $10,000,000 per month; thus withdrawing and withholding from the channels of trade, commerce, and business of the country money absolutely necessary to their successful operations.

TRUE DEMOCRATIC PRINCIPLES.

The entire measure, taking it all in all, furnishes additional proof that the principles which govern the Republican party are not the kind upon which our forefathers sought to establish a free republican government, and it admonishes us that the prosperity and happiness of the great mass of the people can only be secured by a rigid adherence to the principles of Democracy. The recent decision of the Supreme Court which asserts that the distinctive principles of that great party are those upon which our system of government is founded, should be a rebuke to those who still insist that the power of the people should be lessened and the power of the General Government increased.

Democratic principles always have been and always will be dear to the hearts of the American people who believe in equal privileges and equal rights to all mankind.

It was devotion to these principles which prompted our forefathers to brave the dangers of a tempestuous ocean, and plant a new government in the unpruned forests of the American continent.

The principles of our party, as expounded by the illustrious men who have made our system of government the envy and the wonder of the world, provide the only base upon which freedom of thought, freedom of action, and equality of rights can be surely founded.

BENEFITS OF DEMOCRATIC GOVERNMENT.

That government is most democratic which is nearest to the people, most directly responsible to the people, and most rigidly administered in the interest of and for the highest good and happiness of the great mass of its citizens.

Such a government affords equal protection to all sorts and conditions of men, and its strong arm sternly forbids the encroachment of any upon the rights of all.

These beneficent principles must ever command the approval of a virtuous and intelligent people, and the strength with which they have impressed our citizens assures us that the political organization which has always been governed by them and by which they have been reduced to practice will be kept in power by the American people, and enables those who advocate such a system of government to rejoice in the fact that the prospects of their party, and therefore of the country, were never brighter or more promising than at this time.

Under the wise and fearless administration of President Cleveland all of the numerous and diversified interests of our active, energetic, and enterprising population have been vigilantly guarded and zealously promoted; the public expenditures have been reduced; the different Departments have been rendered more efficient, while being purified of fraud and corruption, and have been converted from reckless and extravagant party agencies into model business establishments.

Notwithstanding the increase in the population of the country, and the consequent greater expense of carrying on their affairs, the Democratic administration has cost less than the Republican administration which preceded it.

DEMOCRATIC ECONOMY.

On the 30th of June last the Democratic administration had been in power during three fiscal years, and a comparison with the three fiscal years preceding establishes this fact beyond doubt. This comparison will show that the cost of the Indian service has been, in round numbers, $1,800,000 less under President Cleveland than under President Arthur. In the War Department the expenditures nave been $19,604,000 less, and in the Navy Department the expenditures have been $2,622,000 less. And to this sum of $24,026,000 there should be added $5,300,000 which this Administration has had to pay for Alabama claims and expenses of commission, for refund of duties and drawbacks on exports, for the purchase of the Louisville and Portland Canal, and for the New Orleans Exposition, all of which were legacies from its predecessor.

In the Post-Office Department, comparing the fiscal years 1888 and 1885, there has been an increase of 6,124 in the number of post-offices established, an increase of 3,037 in the number of mail routes, and an increase of 15,128 miles in the length of routes on which mail service is performed. And yet, notwithstanding this increased service, there has been, relatively, a diminution in the expenditures of that Department. In 1885 the excess of expenditures over the receipts was $7,221,775.26, while in 1888 the expenditures were only $2,016,420.87 in excess of the receipts.

And then, too, the number of employés has been reduced in nearly all of the Departments and the interest on the public debt has been steadily diminished.

The admitted sectionalism which, during a period of twenty years, had disgraced the administration of every branch of the public service has disappeared, and the South now receives equal consideration with the North, the East, and the West; the constitutional duty of interposing the veto of the Executive to prevent improper legislation has been fearlessly exercised with the most salutary results; and the authority to prevent wrongful and injurious restrictions upon or discriminations against our citizens by Canada has been demanded from the Republican branch of the National Legislature, that the Executive may thereby effectually protect the honor and dignity of the Government and the interests of its citizens.

REDUCTION OF TAXATION.

The long-continued and steadily increasing oppressions of our present unequal and unjust tariff laws, under which the vast majority of our citizens are forced to pay tribute to a specially favored few, resulting in the accumulation of a large surplus in the Treasury to the detriment of every branch of industry and every character of enterprise, have been impressed upon the attention of the people more forcibly than ever before, with the result of the formulation and presentation to Congress of a careful, conservative, and judicious measure of tariff reform.

This wise and just effort to readjust our present iniquitous revenue laws is shown to be necessary by the President's terse and unanswerable statement, "unnecessary taxation is unjust taxation."

The tariff reforms insisted upon by the President and embodied in the measure submitted to the country by the House of Representatives are designed to relieve the great body of the people of oppressive and needless burdens, while carefully maintaining and preserving every interest of the manufacturer or capitalist, and promoting the welfare and prosperity of all of our citizens who must gain their livelihood by labor.

And it is gratifying to note that this necessary modification of our revenue laws is sought to be accomplished in a manner which will materially benefit all of our farming and most of the manufacturing industries of Alabama, while the method proposed to be adopted will not operate to the detriment of any of the great manufacturing or other interests of the country.

THE BENEFITS OF REVENUE REFORM.

If the experience of the past can be relied upon as a safe basis upon which to build expectations for the future, the reductions in the existing tariff now sought to be effected by the Democrats must inevitably result in giving more constant and more remunerative employment to those of our laborers who toil in the manufacturing industries, while the cost of their daily living will be materially lessened.

The tariff was lowered in 1846, and at the close of 1847 it was found that a larger number of operatives, mill-hands, etc., had been employed during the year than during any similar preceding period, and at higher wages. And this was shown to be the fact in every branch of manufacturing industry.

Under the present laws it is impossible for us to compete with other peoples in the markets of the world for the manufactured products of American skill, ingenuity, and industry—one reason for this inability being that we impose a heavy tax upon the products of other countries and practically prohibit international trade.

During that period of our history when our home market was able to consume all the products of our factories the arguments then made in advocacy of prohibitory protection, non-intercourse, and restriction of commercial relations with other countries had a certain plausibility which is in no manner warranted by the conditions with which we are now confronted.

I have laboriously compiled and carefully compared the statistics, and find that under existing conditions the aggregate value of our agricultural and manufactured products exceeds by $5,000,000,000 our capacity to purchase them. It is, therefore, as clear as any proposition can be that we must either find a foreign market for this surplus production or the producers must diminish the excessive production by reducing the hours of labor and the earnings of their laborers.

In his letter of acceptance President Cleveland refers to this important subject in this vigorous language:

We know that, confined to a home market, our manufacturing operations are curtailed, their demand for labor irregular, and the rate of wages paid uncertain.

And, explaining the effect of the contemplated changes in the law, he says:

We propose, too, by extending the markets for our manufacturers, to promote the steady employment of labor, while by cheapening the cost of the necessaries of life we increase the purchasing power of the workingman's wages and add to the comforts of his home.

THE PARTY PRINCIPLES AT ISSUE.

In the campaign now being waged for supremacy the two great political parties are asking the confidence and support of sixty million Americans who, on the 6th of November, by the mighty force of the freeman's ballot, are to decide under which party and by what political principles they are to be governed.

It is not a question of men so much as it is a question of measures. To quote the pithy utterance of our fearless leader, "It is a condition which confronts us—not a theory."

Go through our broad land and we find the rank and file, and most of the leaders of both parties, honest and fearless men, who desire nothing so much as the welfare of their country.

I trust, therefore, I may be pardoned if I allude to the cardinal, underlying, and controlling principles of the two great political organizations.

The Republican party contends for the establishment of a strong, consolidated government, in which the greatest power possible shall be centralized in one head.

The Democratic party demands that the least necessary power be given to the central Government and the largest power be reserved to the people.

Centralization generates classes giving a favored few unequal, unconstitutional, and un-American privileges; privileged classes speedily become powerful and arrogant; power and arrogance infallibly tend to foster and encourage pretentious display and lavish expenditure; unbridled extravagance—be it public or private—inevitably lowers the standard of public morals, and in all governments corruption in classes, parties, and individuals has ever preceded the decline of liberty; and it has been this tendency of Republican theories and Republican legislation to generate fraud that has driven so many of the purest and best Republicans into the ranks of their party opponents.

Alexander Hamilton, the ablest advocate of a strong centralized government this country ever produced, and who had devoted his life to the study of the effects of different systems, boldly and frankly admitted that such a government must necessarily be corrupt, but still contended it was the best, because if too much power were given to the people the government would be unstable and could not be durable.

That Hamilton failed to comprehend the ability of the people to govern themselves the history of our country abundantly proves.

THE FRUITS OF A VICIOUS SYSTEM.

We therefore make no reflection upon men, but only point out the evils of the system which an experience of twenty-four years has proved to be subversive of free institutions.

I shall not dwell upon the many wrongs suffered by the people during this long period of Republican supremacy. They are passed, and have often been rebuked.

I will only briefly mention the stupendous Credit Mobilier fraud which once disgraced the American Congress, the Whisky-Ring frauds which stained, as with blood, the steps and doors and inner portals of the mansion once occupied by Washington, by Jefferson, by Jackson, by Lincoln, and now by Grover Cleveland—frauds committed by trusted officials so near the Executive that his integrity might have been suspected had not his open, frank, and honest character precluded the pos-

sibility that he could have been cognizant of the crimes of those who abused his confidence.

I shall barely refer to the Naval frauds, whereby at least $100,000,000 were squandered to enrich a Secretary of the Navy and his favored friends. I shall only drop a tear over the atrocity by which the ermine of the Supreme Court was dragged from the lofty place it held in the estimation of Americans and the world when members of that tribunal consented to aid party purposes and deprived 45,000,000 people of their constitutionally and legally elected President, and placed in the Presidential chair a man who had no shadow of legal right or title to the position; and I shall revive for but a moment the unsavory memories of the post-tradership scandals, the unparalleled rascalities of the star routes, and the wholesale robberies of the carpet-bag governments, whose officials "thrust their larcenous fingers into the pockets of posterity and mortgaged the labor of children yet unborn."

All these are things of the past, but they are a part—an important and inseparable part—of the history of the party that was swept from power by an indignant people in 1884.

DEMOCRATS REDRESS REPUBLICAN WRONGS.

I will, however, venture to remind you that, in the interest of banks and accumulated wealth, the Republican party enacted laws to retire or destroy all the greenback circulation, and demonetized silver as a circulating medium, thus confining our money circulation to gold and national-bank currency.

The Democratic party, in the interest of the people, repealed one of these laws and preserved for them $346,000,000 of paper currency. That party also restored silver as money of exchange and required its continued coinage.

During the period from 1862 to 1866 the Republican party gave to corporations more than 185,000,000 acres of the public domain, nearly equal to the entire area of the original thirteen States of the Union.

The conditions upon which these lands were donated were not complied with, but nevertheless the donees were allowed to retain this empire of land until power was regained by the Democratic party.

During the last four years we have restored to the people 103,000,000 acres, and a Democratic House has enacted laws which restore 55,000,000 acres in addition, the total, 158,000,000, being an extent of territory exceeding the combined area of the twelve great States of New York, Pennsylvania, New Jersey, Maine, Ohio, Maryland, Delaware, Massachusetts, Rhode Island, Vermont, New Hampshire, and Connecticut; and in doing this we have declared that the public domain shall be retained as a sacred legacy for homesteads for the American people.

REPUBLICAN LAWS TO CHEAPEN LABOR.

The fallacy of the pretensions of the Republican party that they are, and have ever been, peculiarly solicitous for the welfare of the workingmen, is shown by the general tenor of nearly all the laws enacted by them which affect labor, and notably by the fact that the first and only law sanctioning and legalizing the importation of cheap foreign labor under contract was enacted when the Republicans had more than two-thirds majority in both Houses of Congress. The passage of this law was urged by Senator SHERMAN upon the ground that "labor is too high in this country."

Democrats rebuked this insult to Americans, repealed the law, and made it an indictable offense to import cheap contract labor. In the face of this General Harrison, the candidate of the Republican party, says the difference is little—

Whether the cheap laborer is across the street or over the sea.

If cheap contract labor is brought to America it enables Mr. Blaine and others who employ it to increase their gains by reducing the price of labor, while Democrats have demanded that cheap labor shall remain "over the sea," where it belongs.

The Republican party have built up, fostered, and encouraged all kinds of "combines," monopolies, and trusts, the exactions of which have developed great wealth and arrogance on the one side, and poverty, privation, and suffering on the other.

In a recent Washington paper I find a dispatch, which I will read:

BY ORDER OF THE SUGAR TRUST.

Pursuant to the order issued by President Havemeyer, of the sugar trust, the two large sugar refineries of the firm of DeCastro & Donner were closed down to-day at noon, and one thousand men were thrown out of work.

This illustrates the arbitrary manner in which the wrongly-acquired power of these trusts, created and protected by Republican legislation, is exercised to the great injury of the people. One thousand men are deprived of the opportunity of providing for themselves and families, and a necessity of life is made more costly. This is not an isolated case. Diminution of production, enforced idleness of working men and women are the natural, the inevitable, consequences of the partial Republican legislation, which the Democratic party is now striving to modify in the interest of the people.

For many months past orders of the same import as that of the sugar trust I have just read have appeared in the papers of the country almost daily.

UNJUST TAX LAWS.

The absolute falsity of the claim that the Republican party have protected the interests of the workingmen is further shown by the fact that while that party was in unrestricted control of the Government it abolished nearly every tax which fell upon the rich, but took no steps to lighten the burden of taxation laid upon the poor.

The tax on incomes, paid only by the wealthy or the comparatively well-to-do, was repealed; the railroad, express, and insurance companies were relieved of the taxes they had paid; the taxes on banks, bankers, bank circulation, bank deposits, and bank checks were abolished; and the Republican party, with an audacity almost inconceivable, claims credit for thus lightening the burdens of the people.

But the farmer, the mechanic, and the laboring man, whose "income" had been reduced by imported foreign cheap labor—imported because, as a prominent Republican leader asserted, "labor was too high in this country"—have still to pay exorbitant taxes on the implements he must use and on the tools he works with. They still pay taxes on plows, trace-chains, axes, hammers, files, nails, saws; on the shingles upon his roof, the panes of glass in his rooms, the wood in his infant's cradle, and on the shroud and coffin which cover his dead.

Then, too, as I have before stated, the Republican party alone is responsible for the laws which have fostered and protected all the trusts and combinations of capital by which, with the aid of tariff laws in the interest of accumulated capital, the price of almost every necessary of life has been enhanced and the cost of living to the poor man greatly increased.

THE EVILS AND WRONGS OF TRUSTS.

One trust adds 2 cents a pound to the price of sugar; another adds 1 cent a pound to the price of salt; another adds 30 per cent. to the price of slate pencils; another adds 40 per cent. to the price of oil-cloth; another adds 80 cents a gallon to castor-oil; another adds 25 per cent. to paper envelopes; another 100 per cent. to cotton bagging; another rests upon a tariff tax of $17 a ton on steel rails, and materially increases the cost of railroad travel and transportation; another adds 1½ cents per pound to the price of nails; another adds 2 cents per pound to the cost of iron nuts and washers; another adds more than one-half a cent per pound to the cost of barbed fence wire; another adds 2½ cents a pound to the price of copper; another adds 1½ cents a pound to the price of lead; another rests upon a tax of 15 cents a pound on nickel; another adds 30 per cent. to the price of cordage; another rests upon a 35 per cent. tax on gutta-percha; another adds 25 cents per gallon to the price of linseed-oil; another adds 5 cents a pound to the price of borax and boracic acid, 3 cents a pound to the price of crude borax and borate of lime, and 4 cents a pound to the price of commercial boracic acid; and still another adds 2½ cents a pound to the price of zinc.

Every one of these trusts and "combines" is hostile to the interests of those who labor, and they have therefore been attacked by the Democratic party, and this character of legalized extortion has been defended against these attacks by the most influential and most prominent Republican leader, Mr. Blaine, who declared in one of his speeches—

They (trusts) are largely private affairs, with which neither President Cleveland nor any private citizen has any particular right to interfere.

To this dogmatic and authoritative exposition of the Republican party's attitude toward trusts an honored and able leader of the Democracy very pertinently replied:

Larceny is a private affair—a very private affair—and yet it is not supposed to be improper to interfere with it by law. The highwayman who demands your money or your life is engaged in a private enterprise, but still the law takes cognizance of his act and punishes it as a crime.

PARTY ATTITUDES ON TRUSTS.

And these two utterances forcibly indicate the striking difference in the views entertained by the Democratic and Republican parties regarding these combinations which have for their object to exact tribute from the great body of the people to satisfy individual greed and rapacity.

The Republicans say they must not be interfered with, because they violate no law. Democrats insist that the welfare and safety of the people is the highest law, and demand that all laws which render oppression of the people possible must be promptly modified or repealed. Witness the following ringing declaration of our platform:

Judged by Democratic principles the interests of the people are betrayed when, by unnecessary taxation, trusts and combinations are permitted and fostered, which, while unduly enriching the few that combine, rob the body of our citizens by depriving them as purchasers of the benefits of natural competition.

And upon this explicit declaration of Democratic principles President Cleveland in his letter of acceptance comments in this vigorous and unequivocal language:

Such combinations have always been condemned by the Democratic party. The declaration of its national convention is sincerely made, and no member of our party will be found excusing the existence or belittling the pernicious results of these devices to wrong the people. Under various names they have been punished by the common law for hundreds of years, and they have lost none of their hateful features because they have assumed the name of trusts instead of conspiracies.

We believe that these trusts are the natural offspring of a market artificially restricted; that an inordinately high tariff, beside furnishing the temptation for their existence, enlarges the limit within which they may operate against the people and thus increase the extent of their power for wrongdoing.

With an unalterable hatred of all such schemes we count the checking of the baleful operations among the good results promised by revenue reform.

Mr. Cleveland is by no means alone in this assertion that these combinations and trusts have always been condemned by the Democratic party. Mr. Blaine, in the speech I have before referred to, said:

When President Cleveland delivered his message he had something to say to the American people about the danger of "trusts." I think there have been since no Democratic papers in the country, whether they understood the meaning of the word or not, that have not been constantly warning the people of the horrible danger of trusts.

And as if in anticipation of the inevitable results of this system of centralization, a prominent Republican, nearly a quarter of a century ago, made this remarkable prediction:

As a result of the war corporations have been enthroned and an era of corruption in high places will follow, and the money power of the country will endeavor to prolong its reign by working upon the prejudices of the people until all wealth is aggregated in a few hands and the Republic is destroyed. I feel at this moment more anxiety for the safety of my country than ever before, even in the midst of the war. God grant that my suspicions may prove groundless.

MISSION OF THE DEMOCRATIC PARTY.

These are some of the wrongs which it is our duty to correct, and they bring to my mind reflections which the pending contest between the two parties has forced upon my consideration, and which I think should properly be laid before the people. Can there be any doubt as to the result? Principles dear to American freemen on the one side, and those abhorred by them on the other.

The mission of the Democratic party is a grand and lofty one. It seeks to bring our country back to the golden days of honest purity, when all industrious and frugal men could acquire a competence, and when the upward march of the prosperous was not upon the blighted hopes and broken fortunes of their fellow beings. Can any one whose breast retains a spark of love for his country and for humanity hesitate when the prize to be sought involves the welfare and happiness of over 20,000,000 American citizens who toil for the support of themselves and their families.

Some gentlemen have demanded that we cease the struggle, at least for a time, promising that it shall be renewed at another session or another Congress. I have opposed and will continue my opposition to a moment's truce or the surrender of an inch of the vantage ground gained by our party. I insist, and I believe a large majority of the Democratic party will insist, that the fight should be continued until the battle is won. As our ancestors at Runnymede wrung from King John the "Magna Charta"—that priceless grant of liberty and constitutional government—so we will wring from the Senate of the United States a concession as valuable to the people of this land of freedom as was the Magna Charta to the down-trodden subjects of the proud English monarch. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN (before Mr. WHEELER had concluded his remarks). The time of the gentleman from Alabama has expired.

Mr. WHEELER. Will the consideration of this bill be resumed to-morrow?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. MCRAE] has three minutes remaining before the hour expires.

Mr. MCRAE. My purpose is to withdraw this bill and call up another which I hope will not meet with such objection.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman withdraw the bill?

Mr. MCRAE. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. The bill is withdrawn. There are two minutes of the hour remaining.

Mr. MCKENNA. Then the bill which was under consideration and to which the gentleman from Alabama addressed his remarks, is no longer before the House.

INDEMNIFICATION FOR SWAMP AND OVERFLOWED LANDS.

Mr. MCRAE. I desire to call up the bill (S. 758) to relieve purchasers of, and to indemnify certain States for, swamp and overflowed lands disposed of, and for other purposes.

The Clerk proceeded to read the bill; but before the reading was concluded,

The CHAIRMAN said: The hour for the consideration of bills reported by committees has expired. The committee will rise.

The committee accordingly rose; and the Speaker having resumed the Chair, Mr. RICHARDSON reported that the Committee of the Whole on the state of the Union having had under consideration the bill (S. 758) to relieve purchasers of, and to indemnify certain States for, swamp and overflowed lands disposed of, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED.

Mr. KILGORE, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that the committee had examined and found duly enrolled bills of the following titles; when the Speaker signed the same:

A bill (S. 869) for the relief of the sufferers by the wreck of the United States steamer Tallapoosa;

A bill (S. 1856) to establish a life-saving station on the Atlantic coast between Indian River Inlet, Delaware, and Ocean City, Md.;

A bill (S. 3234) to abolish circuit-court powers of certain district courts of the United States and to provide for writs of error in capital cases, and for other purposes;

A bill (S. 3573) granting the right of way to the Pensacola and Memphis Railroad Company over and through the public lands of the United States in the States of Florida, Alabama, Mississippi, and Tennessee, and granting the right of way to said railroad company over and through the United States naval and military reservation near Pensacola, in the State of Florida;

A bill (S. 3390) to create the Lincoln land district in the Territory of New Mexico; and

A bill (H. R. 7516) to increase the pension of Sylvester Stearns.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

Mr. FRENCH, by unanimous consent, obtained indefinite leave of absence, on account of important business.

ORDER OF BUSINESS.

Mr. MCMILLIN. I move that the House now adjourn.

Mr. HIESTAND. I ask the privilege of presenting a proposition to print a document.

Mr. MCMILLIN. I believe, Mr. Speaker, that does not cut off the motion to adjourn.

The SPEAKER. It does not.

Mr. MCMILLIN. The gentleman can bring up that matter to-morrow.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Tennessee declines to yield.

The question being taken on the motion to adjourn, it was agreed to—ayes 36, noes 14.

The House accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 30 minutes p. m.) adjourned.

PRIVATE BILLS INTRODUCED AND REFERRED.

Under the rule private bills of the following titles were introduced and referred as indicated below:

By Mr. BINGHAM: A bill (H. R. 11574) authorizing the Secretary of the Navy to donate certain condemned arms to the Naval Post No. 400, Department of Pennsylvania, Grand Army of the Republic, located at Philadelphia—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. W. C. P. BRECKINRIDGE: A bill (H. R. 11575) granting a pension to Judith M. Springate—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HEARD: A bill (H. R. 11576) granting a pension to Thomas J. Meriott—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. RYAN: A bill (H. R. 11577) granting a pension to Andrew M. Jackson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SAWYER: A bill (H. R. 11578) to increase the pension of Rowland Ward—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SENEY: A bill (H. R. 11579) granting a pension to George F. Orwick—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. STOCKDALE: A bill (H. R. 11580) for the relief of Julia A. Nutt—to the Committee on War Claims.

PETITIONS, ETC.

The following petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk, under the rule, and referred as follows:

By Mr. BINGHAM: Memorial and other papers of the Naval Post No. 400, Grand Army of the Republic, for the passage of a bill to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to donate to that post certain condemned arms—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. MCCOMAS: Petition of Michael William Fout, for reference of his claim to the Court of Claims—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. MARTIN: Petition of W. J. ——— and 86 other citizens of Anderson County, Texas, in favor of pure food and pure lard—to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. MONTGOMERY: Petition of Elizabeth Landolt, of Joseph McDower, of Silas Jourdan, of John Keith, of John A. Rains, of Anthony McElvay, of Harvey Slaughter, of S. W. D. Stone, of James S. Stull, of William D. Wood, and of Pius Boothe, of Kentucky, for reference of their claims to the Court of Claims—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. OSBORNE: Nine petitions of sundry citizens of the Twenty-fifth district of Pennsylvania, in favor of pure food and pure lard—to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. RICHARDSON: Petition of heir of Samuel Smith, of Franklin County, Tennessee, for reference of his claim to the Court of Claims—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. ROGERS: Petition of citizens of Arkansas, for the passage of House bill No. 11027—to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. SCULL: Petition of John Lorrick and 42 others, of Blair County, and of G. W. Osler and 24 others, of Osterburgh, Pa., in favor of pure food and pure lard—to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. STONE, of Kentucky: Petition of Mary A. Baker, of Joseph Spencer, of Daniel Rings, of John C. Lummis, of Scott Noel, of Samuel Goodwin, of William W. Edwards, and of W. Carlisle, of Kentucky, for reference of their claims to the Court of Claims—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. WASHINGTON: Petition of N. J. Bradley and 43 others, of Humphrey County, Tennessee, in favor of the lard bill and pure food bill—to the Committee on Agriculture.

SENATE.

TUESDAY, *October* 9, 1888.

Prayer by Rev. C. B. RAMSDELL, of the city of Washington.
The Journal of yesterday's proceedings was read and approved.

DEFICIENCIES IN APPROPRIATIONS.

Mr. HALE. I present the report of the conference committee on the deficiency appropriation bill.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The report of the committee of conference will be read.

The Secretary read as follows:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 10896) making appropriations to supply deficiencies in the appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1888, and prior years, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 10, 13, 14, 19, 23, 26, 28, 34, 35, 36, 37, 38, 40, 43, 48, 49, 50, 51, 52, 64, 66, 67, 78, 79, 81, 82, 84, 85, 86, 90, 91, 93, 100, 103, 114, 116, 117, 137, and 231.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 15, 16, 17, 18, 20, 21, 22, 24, 25, 27, 30, 31, 32, 33, 39, 41, 44, 45, 46, 47, 53, 55, 56, 57, 58, 59, 60, 61, 62, 65, 68, 69, 70, 71, 72, 73, 74, 75, 76, 77, 80, 83, 87, 88, 89, 92, 94, 95, 96, 97, 98, 99, 101, 102, 104, 105, 106, 108, 109, 110, 111, 118, 119, 120, 121, 122, 123, 124, 125, 126, 127, 128, 129, 131, 132, 133, 134, 135, 136, 139, 140, 141, 142, 143, 144, 145, 146, 147, 148, 149, 150, 151, 152, 153, 154, 155, 156, 157, 158, 159, 160, 161, 162, 163, 164, 165, 166, 167, 168, 169, 170, 171, 172, 173, 174, 175, 176, 177, 178, 179, 180, 181, 182, 183, 184, 185, 186, 187, 188, 189, 190, 191, 192, 193, 194, 195, 196, 197, 198, 199, 200, 201, 202, 203, 204, 205, 206, 207, 208, 209, 210, 211, 212, 213, 214, 215, 216, 217, 218, 219, 220, 221, 222, 223, 224, 225, 226, 227, 228, and 229, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 11: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 11, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed, insert "$1,000;" and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 12: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 12, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed in said amendment, insert "$6,000;" and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 29: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 29, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: After the matter proposed to be inserted by said amendment insert the following:

"To refund to the heirs of C. A. J. Flemister the balance of the proceeds of a sale of certain real estate of said Flemister, covered into the Treasury over and above his indebtedness to the Government, $475."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 42: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 42, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by said amendment insert the following:

"Increase of water supply, Washington, D. C.: For expenses of the joint select committee appointed under a concurrent resolution of Congress to investigate the work upon and contracts and other matters relating to the Washington Aqueduct tunnel, $5,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary, to be disbursed by the Clerk of the House of Representatives on vouchers approved by said joint select committee."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 54: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 54, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In line 7 of said amendment strike out the word "sixty-seven" and insert in lieu thereof the word "sixty-six;" and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 63: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 63, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed in said amendment insert "$1,328.07;" and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 107: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 107, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: After the matter proposed to be inserted by said amendment insert the following:

"To provide for the payment of the claims enumerated in Senate Executive Document No. 270, Fiftieth Congress, first session, for fees of district attorneys, as follows, namely: Fiscal year 1886, $320; for fiscal year 1887, except the claim numbered 103949 in said Senate Executive Document, $3,833.70; in all, $4,153.70."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendments numbered 112 and 113: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 112 and 113, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by said amendments insert the following:

"Industrial Home in Utah Territory: The Secretary of the Treasury is hereby authorized and directed to cause all of the unexpended balances of appropriations made by two acts of Congress, one approved August 4, 1886, to aid in the establishment of an industrial home in the Territory of Utah and to provide employment and means of self-support for the dependent women who renounce polygamy and the children of such women of tender age in said Territory, with a view to aid in the suppression of polygamy therein; and the other act approved February 1, 1888, to aid the Industrial Christian Home Association of Utah in carrying on, under its articles of incorporation, the work of providing employment and means of self-support for the dependent women who shall have renounced polygamy and their children of tender age, now in the hands of Caleb W. West, or any other person or corporation, to be immediately paid over and delivered to a properly qualified disbursing officer of the United States, to be appointed by the Secretary of the Treasury. And said Secretary of the Treasury is further directed to cause a valid title to the lot or lots of ground in the city of Salt Lake in said Territory that were purchased and paid for with money of the United States appropriated in the acts before cited to be immediately vested absolutely and unconditionally in the United States forever. When said balances are fully paid over to said disbursing officer, the Utah commission shall be and become the board of management and control thereof and of all expenditures of said money, and of such as may be hereinafter appropriated, and the said board of management and control shall proceed at once, on plans and specifications to be made or approved by said board, to erect or complete on said lot or lots a building adapted and designed to carry out the purposes of this act, and which when entirely completed and finished, including the approaches and the fencing and grading of said lot or lots, shall not in cost exceed the sum of $50,000; and for these purposes the money appropriated under the two acts of Congress above recited and unexpended is hereby appropriated, and a further sum is hereby appropriated to complete the work above mentioned, not exceeding the sum of $24,000.

"There is also hereby appropriated the further sum of $4,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary, to suitably furnish said building when the same shall have been completed.

"When said building shall have been completed and furnished it shall be placed in the custody of the Industrial Christian Home Association of Utah Territory to be used and occupied by it for the purpose of aiding in the suppression of polygamy and of furnishing an industrial home and providing employment and means of self-support for the dependent women who renounce polygamy, and the children of such women of tender age in said Territory; and for the purpose of extinguishing polygamy the following classes may also be received, to wit:

"First. First or legal wives.

"Second. Women and girls with polygamous surroundings in danger of being coerced into polygamy.

"Third. Girls of polygamous parentage anxious to escape from polygamous influences.

"Fourth. Women and girls who have been proselyted elsewhere and remove into the Territory in ignorance of the existence there of polygamy.

"For aiding in the work of said association for the present fiscal year, including the transportation of inmates of the institution who desire to permanently remove from said Territory, $4,000.

"Said Utah Commission shall hereafter act as the board of control over said association, both in the erection of said building and in the conduct of the work of the association hereafter.

"Said Utah Commission shall audit all expenditures of said association under any appropriations herein or hereafter made, and shall make an annual report to Congress covering their expenditures and work hereunder, together with that of said association.

"Said Industrial Christian Home Association of Utah Territory for the work herein defined shall have the use and occupation of said building and grounds, free of rent or charge, until such time as said work shall be accomplished, or Congress shall otherwise direct, when possession and occupation of the same shall revert to the United States."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 115: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 115, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: Strike out the matter proposed to be inserted by said amendment and insert, after line 2, page 2, of the bill, the following:

"To pay out of humane consideration, and without reference to the question of liability therefor, the sum of $276,619.75 to the Chinese Government as full indemnity for all losses and injuries sustained by Chinese subjects within the United States at the hands of residents thereof."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 130: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 130, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: After the matter proposed to be inserted by said amendment insert the following:

"To reimburse the Official Reporter of the Senate for moneys paid for clerical hire during the first session of the Fiftieth Congress, and for extra clerical services and expenses occasioned by the prolongation of the session, $5,000."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 138: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 138, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: After the matter proposed to be inserted by said amendment insert the following:

"To pay all session employés of the House of Representatives authorized by the 'Act making appropriations for the legislative, executive, and judicial expenses of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1888, and for other purposes,' approved March 3, 1887, to the end of the present session of Congress, $45,000.

"To pay M. H. Clark for services as additional clerk to Committee on Enrolled Bills, from September 27 to October 7, 1888, $66."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 230: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 230, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: After the matter proposed to be inserted by said amendment, insert the following:

"SEC. 7. That for the payment of the following claims certified to be due by the several accounting officers of the Treasury Department under appropriations the balance of which have been exhausted or carried to the surplus fund under the provisions of section 5 of the act of June 20, 1874, and under appropriations heretofore treated as permanent, being for the service of the fiscal year 1886 and prior years, and which have been certified to Congress under section 2 of the act of July 7, 1884, as fully set forth in House Executive Document No. 455, Fiftieth Congress, first session, there is appropriated as follows:

"WAR DEPARTMENT CLAIMS ALLOWED BY THE SECOND AUDITOR AND SECOND COMPTROLLER.

"For pay of two and three year volunteers, 1871 and prior years, $27,708.15.

"For bounty to volunteers and their widows and legal heirs, 1871 and prior years, $20,069.46.

"For bounty, act of July 28, 1866, 1880, and prior years, $4,525.89.

"For pay, and so forth, of the Army, 1886 and prior years, $369.47.

"For pay, and so forth, of the Army, 1887, $606.20.

"For pay, and so forth, of the Army, 1888, $225.75.

"INTERIOR DEPARTMENT CLAIMS ALLOWED BY THE SECOND AUDITOR AND SECOND COMPTROLLER.

"For pay of Indian agents, 1886 and prior years, $206.75.

"WAR DEPARTMENT—CLAIMS ALLOWED BY THE THIRD AUDITOR AND SECOND COMPTROLLER.

"For transportation of the Army and its supplies, 1886 and prior years, $64.81.

"For regular supplies, Quartermaster's Department, 1886 and prior years, $59.25.

"For incidental expenses, Quartermaster's Department, 1886 and prior years, $164.62.

"For clothing and camp and garrison equipage, 1886 and prior years, $88.

"For 50 per cent. of arrears of Army transportation due certain land grant railroads 1886 and prior years, $5.68.

"For commutation of rations to prisoners of war in rebel States and to soldiers on furlough prior to July 1, 1886, $435.

"For contingencies of fortifications, $49.33.

"For pay, transportation, services, and supplies of Oregon and Washington Volunteers in 1855 and 1856, 1871, and prior years, $23.67.

"For horses and other property lost in the military service prior to July 1, 1886, $5,415.16.

"NAVY DEPARTMENT—CLAIMS ALLOWED BY THE FOURTH AUDITOR AND SECOND COMPTROLLER.

"For pay of the Navy prior to July 1, 1886, $18,798.40.

"For pay, Marine Corps, prior to July 1, 1886, $11.40.
"For provisions, Navy, Bureau of Provisions and Clothing, 1886 and prior years, $2,327.93.
"For enlistment bounties to seamen, prior to July 1, 1886, $100.
"For the payment of claims for difference between actual expenses and mileage allowed under the decision of the United States Supreme Court in the case of Graham *vs.* United States, $135.50."

And the Senate agree to the same.

EUGENE HALE,
W. B. ALLISON,
F. M. COCKRELL,
Managers on the part of the Senate.

JAS. N. BURNES,
JOSEPH D. SAYERS,
THOS. RYAN,
Managers on the part of the House.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The question is upon concurring in the report of the committee of conference.

Mr. EDMUNDS. I should like to have the Senator from Maine explain, if he will, why it is that the action of the Senate in making provision for the balance of a year's salary to the widow of the late Chief-Justice appears to have fallen out of the bill.

Mr. HALE. The only explanation of that is that, try as hard as we could and did, we were unable to make any impression upon the House conferees on that matter. The subject was fully discussed over and over again. The House conferees from the beginning took the ground that they could not assent to an item of this kind, which, as they claimed, had no precedent on which it could be based, being put upon an appropriation bill.

It was intimated that if a separate bill, standing upon its own merits, providing a year's salary or the balance of it for the widow of the late Chief-Justice, should at any time be introduced and passed by the Senate, the objections, so far as those gentlemen, the members of the conference on the part of the House, were concerned, might not be as strong. My impression is that a bill of that kind, standing by itself, not put on an appropriation bill, could be passed by the other House, from what I have learned; but we have found it impossible to retain the provision of that Senate amendment in the bill.

The nearest approach to a precedent we could find was a statute which was cited to us by the Senator from Vermont [Mr. EDMUNDS], which provided for such a gratuity as this, the balance of a year's salary, or an entire year's salary, to a United States judge in Florida who died at his post from yellow fever contracted there; but that was not done on an appropriation bill.

Mr. HOAR. May I ask the Senator from Maine whether there are not abundant precedents for granting the balance of a year's salary to the widows of members of the House of Representatives and members of the Senate who die in office? In that particular did the House conferees point out any distinction in principle between the two cases, the two officers?

Mr. HALE. That has always been done and recognized, but it has not been done in the case of the family of a Chief-Justice.

Mr. HOAR. I so understand, and I was not poking the question at the Senator to indicate any want of fidelity or any inconsistency, but in order to call attention to the precedent.

Mr. HALE. There are plenty of precedents not only of that kind, but with reference to the foreign service on the death of ministers; but the answer of the other House was that the circumstances there are peculiar, that the ministers die abroad, and that is a matter which has passed into acceptance.

What they claimed was (and I had forgotten myself that the record was such) that we had not intervened in this way even in the case of Chief-Justices who have died poor and left their families under the constraint of narrow affairs. In short, we were not able to persuade the conferees on the part of the House to assent to the Senate amendment under any condition on this bill, and so rather than that the bill should fail we yielded. I am sorry we had to do so.

Mr. EDMUNDS. I have no doubt the Senate conferees did their best to carry out the expressed opinion of the Senate. It is, of course, impossible to distinguish this case from the allowances that we make to the widows of members of the House of Representatives and of the Senate and the widows of the employés of both branches. If any possible distinction could be suggested, it would be in favor of making an allowance in this case rather than in the others, for all members of Congress who have any possible means of earning money, either at farming or at the law, or in manufactures or in trade, or whatever, are authorized by the Constitution and the laws to continue those employments while they are still in the Government service, and make by their labor and industry what they can besides, while the justices of the Supreme Court of the United States, as well, I think it safe to say, as all the inferior judges of the courts of the United States, are by law prohibited from engaging in their profession of the law; and while they are not prohibited by law from engaging in business they feel it to be a bounden duty in respect of the sacredness and impartiality of their offices that they shall not engage in any active business. Of course if they have any property which is invested, that goes on, but in respect of carrying on affairs they are set aside entirely.

Therefore when Chief-Justice Waite came to this office all his practice and all his worldly affairs were set aside, and he devoted himself to the office. For two years after he might have retired and received his full salary, and when the Treasury of the United States would have paid an equal salary to another judge, he continued to do his duty well and faithfully and saved double the amount of money that this appropriation proposed to give his widow.

I am sorry that the House of Representatives could not see how proper this provision was. I am sorry that they could not see that the suitable place for it should be in an appropriation bill, as it is not a claim of the widow. It is no business contract or engagement; it relates to no private affair; but it proceeds upon the public sense of propriety and justice.

The fact that there is no precedent in respect of Chief-Justices is accounted for from the fact that there is no precedent of a case of this kind that is within my recollection. Perhaps I am mistaken, but I am confident that Chief-Justice Marshall died without leaving a widow; I am confident that Chief-Justice Taney died without leaving a widow; I am confident that Chief-Justice Chase died without leaving a widow; and so certainly for a period of more than half the life of this nation and of a century no instance of this kind has occurred where a Chief-Justice of the United States, after a long, faithful, honorable, and useful career has suddenly left the service of the country by death, leaving a widow in circumstances that make it delicate and gracious and right for Congress to make some suitable provision for and recognition of her, not as a pension, but as, once for all, a substantial gratuity in view of the services her husband had performed.

There is only one precedent that I know of in the case of a judge. It is true we provide for ourselves and our employés in both Houses and the executive branches of the Government in foreign countries, and so on; but when it comes to the judiciary we have not made such provision in so far as I know except in one instance, that of a district judge of the United States who, after a career not a quarter as long as that of the late Chief-Justice, died in Florida at his post in his field of duty of a disease peculiar to that climate, yellow fever, when Congress, without any division of parties, and only a few years ago, gave to his widow the full amount of a whole year's salary—not the balance of it. In this instance the late Chief-Justice died at his post in Washington of pneumonia, a disease incident to this climate, and the House of Representatives can not find it in their heart to make provision for his widow.

I shall try the experiment to-day or to-morrow of introducing a special bill, which was referred to, and see if the Senate will pass it, and if it will we will try it at the other end.

Mr. HALE. I hope the Senator will do that. The conferees on the part of the Senate were, so far as their action goes, fully persuaded of the justice and merit of this appropriation, and recognized fully the great services which had been rendered by the late Chief-Justice who died at his post, and that his family are in a condition where such a grant or benefaction would be most fit and appropriate. We were met by the strong and unrelenting nay of the House of Representatives, and we were unable of course to get it.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. Is the Senate ready for the question on agreeing to the report of the committee of conference?

The report was concurred in.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore* laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, recommending an appropriation for the purpose of carrying into effect the provisions of the recent Chinese-exclusion act, approved October 1, 1888, and transmitting a provision for insertion in an appropriation bill to accomplish that end; which, with the accompanying paper, was referred to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

DR. JOHN B. READ.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore* laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of War, transmitting, in response to a resolution of October 4, 1888, calling for papers in the claim of Dr. John B. Read, a copy of Department letter of June 4, 1888, communicating, in response to a similar resolution, all the papers on record in that case to the Speaker of the House of Representatives.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The communication, with the accompanying papers, will be referred to the Committee on Military Affairs and printed, if there be no objection.

Mr. EDMUNDS. I wish to suggest in this connection that the papers I saw bearing upon this subject (which is a very extraordinary one in point of principle, I think, but I do not wish to go into the merits of it now) purported to be and were undoubtedly the report of the board organized by the Secretary of War, consisting of a major, a captain, and a lieutenant in the Army, stating their findings upon the subject.

The joint resolution of Congress upon which the inquiry was had, required, if I interpret it correctly, that the evidence, and all the evidence, on which the board acted, should also be returned to Congress for consideration. I could not find in the papers that I saw—they appear now to have been original—any report of what the evidence was which was submitted or any copies of it, but only a statement of what it tended to show apparently, as a lawyer would express it.

I do not wish to delay the Senate now with any further motion, but at some time I hope the Committee on Military Affairs (as it will have ample time, now that the matter is understood to go over until December) will endeavor to obtain from the War Department all the documents and all the evidence in detail of whatever kind that was laid before that board, so that we may know exactly what the case is. With that observation, I have nothing further to say.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. Petitions and memorials are now in order.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

Mr. HOAR presented the petition of Elizabeth McHugh, of Worcester, Mass., praying to be allowed a pension; which was referred to the Committee on Pensions.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION.

Mr. VANCE. I ask consent to be permitted to make a statement in correction of something that occurred yesterday.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The Senator from North Carolina will proceed.

Mr. VANCE. At the conclusion of my remarks yesterday the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. ALDRICH] rose and said that I had made a mistake in stating that opium prepared for smoking was placed upon the free-list by the bill of the Committee on Finance. Upon examining the bill I find that he is correct and that I did make a mistake in so stating; but I desire to state that I followed the report of the committee, which states in its appendix C, published in the RECORD, that opium for smoking is placed upon the free-list, and also that the report of the committee published in pamphlet form for general distribution contains the same statement, that opium is placed upon the free-list when prepared for smoking. So I made the mistake by following the report of the committee, and I hope that will serve as a warning to my countrymen at large not to take for granted that all that is stated by that committee concerning the bill is correct.

Mr. ALDRICH. What the Senator from North Carolina says is perhaps technically correct. In one sense the appendix is a portion of the report. The clerical error referred to was made in transcribing the list of articles named in one of the appendices as placed by the bill on the free-list. The error was not brought to the attention of any member of the committee until after it was printed. The statement was no essential part of the report of the committee, as the Senator from North Carolina understands, as well as myself. I stated last night that it was printed through inadvertence, and I have now explained the manner in which the mistake occurred. An examination of the bill by the Senator from North Carolina would have disclosed the error.

Mr. VANCE. The Senator did not say that it crept in through inadvertence, but that it was a misprint, the printer being the scapegoat.

Mr. ALLISON. I think it ought to be well understood, in view of the fact that the Senator from North Carolina says he followed the committee, that the committee, in the text of the bill from the beginning, as was stated by the Senator from Rhode Island, had prohibited the importation of opium for smoking. There never was a time in the consideration of the bill when that provision was not in it, nor was there ever a time when it was not one of the provisions that was fully discussed, for the reason that there is some legal question respecting it. I supposed at least that the Senator from North Carolina, being a member of the Committee on Finance, had read the bill.

Mr. ALDRICH. I wish to say further that that provision of the bill was read in the hearing of the Senator from North Carolina, and it is a warning to him that hereafter he should get his knowledge from the bill itself, and not from newspaper reports as to what it contains.

Mr. VANCE. I beg the pardon of the Senator from Rhode Island as well as the Senator from Iowa. That portion of the bill relative to the administrative branch of the subject was not read to the committee. Nothing but the schedules of taxation were read to the committee; and I very inadvertently and unwisely took the word of the committee as to this matter. I promise never to do so again, Mr. President, if I can be excused.

HOMESTEAD ENTRIES.

Mr. DOLPH submitted the following report:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 3559) to amend section 2304 of the Revised Statutes of the United States to allow persons who have abandoned their homestead entries to make another entry, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

Amendment numbered 1: That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House numbered 1, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In line 6 strike out the word "them" and insert the words "him or her upon the lands settled upon;" in line 8 strike out the words "they have" and insert "he or she has;" and the House agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 2: That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House numbered 2, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: Strike out all of section 3 of said proposed amendment and insert in lieu thereof as follows:

"SEC. 3. That the price of all sections and parts of sections of the public lands within the limits of the portions of the several grants of lands to aid in the construction of railroads which have been heretofore and which may hereafter be forfeited, which were by the act making such grants, or have since been, increased to the double minimum price, and also of all lands within the limits of any such railroad grant and not embraced in the grant lying adjacent to and coterminous with the portions of the line of any such railroad which shall not be completed at the date of this act, is hereby fixed at $1.25 per acre."

And the House agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 3: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 3, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: Strike out all after the word "acres," in line 5, and insert as follows:

"Without proof of residence upon and cultivation of the additional entry, and if final proof of settlement and cultivation has been made for the original entry when the additional entry is made, then the patent shall issue without further proof."

Add as an additional section as follows:

"SEC. 5. That every person entitled under the provisions of the homestead laws to enter a homestead, who has heretofore complied with or who shall hereafter comply with the conditions of said laws, and who shall have made his final proof thereunder, for a quantity of land less than 160 acres, and received the receiver's final receipt therefor, shall be entitled under said laws to enter, by legal subdivisions of the public lands of the United States, subject to homestead entry, so much additional lands as, added to the quantity previously so entered by him, shall not exceed 160 acres: *Provided*, That in no case shall patent issue until the person making such additional homestead entry shall have actually and in conformity with the homestead laws resided upon and cultivated the land embraced therein, and otherwise complied with such laws."

And the House agree to the same.

Amend the title as follows:

Strike out the following words: "Amend section 2304 of the Revised Statutes of the United States to," and add, after the word "entry," the words "and for other purposes;" and the House agree to the same.

J. N. DOLPH,
J. H. BERRY,
Managers on the part of the Senate.

THOS. C. McRAE,
BINGER HERMANN,
JOS. WHEELER,
Managers on the part of the House.

The report was concurred in.

ELECTORAL MESSENGERS.

Mr. HOAR. I am directed by the Committee on Privileges and Elections to report the bill (S. 3609) supplementary to the act approved February 3, 1887, entitled "An act to fix the day for the meeting of the electors of President and Vice-President, and to provide for and regulate the counting of the votes for President and Vice-President, and the decision of questions arising thereon."

I wish to say that this bill was not referred to the committee, but it was placed upon the Calendar for the reason which I stated when it was introduced. It has been examined by the members of the committee separately without a formal reference, and they instruct me (and I suppose it comes within the general authority of the committee on the subject) to report the bill. I ask that the bill may be put on its passage.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The Chair thinks that under the statement of the Senator from Massachusetts, the bill being on the Calendar and not having been referred to the committee, it can hardly be reported from the committee except as an original bill.

Mr. HOAR. I ask unanimous consent that the bill may be treated as a report of the committee, and that it be put on its passage.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. It may be treated as an original bill. The bill just reported will be read the first time by its title.

The bill (S. 3620) supplementary to the act approved February 3, 1887, entitled "An act to fix the day for the meeting of the electors of President and Vice-President, and to provide for and regulate the counting of the votes for President and Vice-President, and the decision of questions arising thereon," was read the first time by its title.

Mr. HOAR. I ask that the bill may be now considered.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The second reading of the bill will be at length, if there be no objection.

The bill was read the second time at length, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the certificates and lists of votes for President and Vice-President of the United States, mentioned in chapter 1 of Title III of the Revised Statutes of the United States, and in the act to which this is a supplement, shall be forwarded, in the manner therein provided, to the President of the Senate forthwith after the second Monday in January, on which the electors shall give their votes.

SEC. 2. That section 141 of the Revised Statutes of the United States is hereby so amended as to read as follows:

"SEC. 141. Whenever a certificate of votes from any State has not been received at the seat of Government on the fourth Monday of the month of January in which their meeting shall have been held, the Secretary of State shall send a special messenger to the district judge in whose custody one certificate of the votes from that State has been lodged, and such judge shall forthwith transmit that list to the seat of Government."

Mr. HOAR. The bill merely changes the time at which the messenger is directed to bring the vote to Washington, to conform to the new law. I ask that the bill may be put upon its passage.

By unanimous consent, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

PREVENTION OF YELLOW FEVER.

Mr. HARRIS. The Committee on Epidemic Diseases, to which was referred the joint resolution (S. R. 111) relating to yellow fever and epidemic diseases, direct me to report a substitute. I report Senate joint resolution 111 back adversely and I shall ask that it be postponed indefinitely.

Mr. CALL. I hope the Senator from Tennessee will agree that the

joint resolution which has been adversely reported may be placed on the Calendar.

Mr. HARRIS. There is no objection to that.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. It will be so ordered.

Mr. HARRIS. The substitute is reported in the form of a separate joint resolution.

The joint resolution (S. R. 113) concerning the conference to be held in Washington, December next, to consider the best means of preventing the introduction of yellow fever and other epidemic diseases into this country, was read twice by its title.

Mr. HARRIS. I ask the unanimous consent of the Senate that the joint resolution now reported be at this time considered.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The joint resolution will be read at length for information, subject to objection.

The Secretary read the joint resolution.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. Is there objection to the present consideration of the joint resolution?

Mr. CALL. If we are to have the present consideration of the pending joint resolution, I should like to have both joint resolutions taken up. I have no objection to the matter being considered at this time.

Mr. BLAIR. I object to its consideration at this time, until the morning business is through, if there is to be debate.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. Are there further reports of committees?

PORT OF DELIVERY AT LINCOLN, NEBR.

Mr. FRYE. From the Committee on Commerce I report favorably without amendment the bill (H. R. 10606) to constitute Lincoln, Nebr., a port of delivery, and to extend the provisions of the act of June 10, 1880, entitled "An act to amend the statutes in relation to immediate transportation of dutiable goods, and for other purposes," to the said port of Lincoln.

Mr. MANDERSON. I ask the unanimous consent of the Senate that the bill, which is of local importance, may be now considered. There can be no possible objection to it.

Mr. COCKRELL. Let the bill be read for information.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The bill will be read at length, subject to objection.

The Secretary read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That Lincoln, in the State of Nebraska, be, and is hereby, constituted a port of delivery in customs collection district of New Orleans, and that the privileges of the seventh section of the act approved June 10, 1880, entitled "An act to amend the statutes in relation to immediate transportation of dutiable goods, and for other purposes," be, and the same are hereby, extended to said port. And that there shall be appointed at said port a surveyor with compensation at $250 per annum and the usual fees.

By unanimous consent, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. EDMUNDS. I am under the impression, but I am possibly wrong, as the committee has probably looked into it, that there is a later provision than the act of 1880 upon this subject, and in order that all the present laws may apply I move to amend. If the clerks will send me the bill I can state exactly where the amendment will come in.

Mr. BLAIR. I desire to reserve the right to object if the bill leads to debate.

Mr. EDMUNDS. It will not lead to any debate.

Mr. MANDERSON. This is a House bill, and I should regret very much to see an amendment made unless in the opinion of the Senator from Vermont it is an absolute necessity. I think the act of 1880 as to the immediate transportation of dutiable goods is the last general act on the subject.

Mr. DOLPH. I think that act has been amended a great many times, but the amendments are of the same character as the pending bill, simply inserting certain ports in that act as entitled to its privileges.

Mr. EDMUNDS. I am under the impression (though as I say I am not speaking by the book, but it is only safe to amend it) that whatever law is in force now regarding other ports should be in force as to Lincoln. Nobody would question that; and as the bill names that specific act and that only, any later amendment to that act would not fall under this description technically. Of course there will be no trouble about its passage, and I move to amend by inserting after the word "purposes," in line 9, the words "and all other laws in force on the subject," so as to put it in exactly the category of the existing law as to other places.

Mr. DOLPH. I should like to call the attention of the Senator from Vermont to the fact that the act of 1880 contains two important sections. The first section provides that at certain ports goods may be brought in bond and transshipped on the payment of duty. The seventh section provides as to certain other ports to which goods may be shipped. I do not think there has been any amendment that has changed the provisions of those two sections; but if there has been, I suggest whether the amendment proposed by the Senator from Vermont would not be broader than the act. By the bill the port of Lincoln, in Nebraska, would be entitled to the privileges provided in the seventh section of the act of 1880; but if there has been any general amendment of the act of 1880 since, the amendment proposed by the Senator from Vermont would confer all the privileges of the amendatory act as a port to which goods might be entered and from which they might be shipped in bond, as well as the privileges of ports to which they may be shipped in bond.

Mr. MANDERSON. I ask the Senator from Oregon if it is not a fact that the amendments to the act of 1880 have simply been the insertion of additional ports.

Mr. DOLPH. I have never known of any other amendments of that act.

Mr. MANDERSON. I do not think there has been any other change.

Mr. FRYE. We have examined a great many of those cases. We never report such a bill any different from this in its terms. It seems to me it is all that is necessary for the purposes sought.

Mr. EVARTS. Mr. President——

Mr. EDMUNDS. I will relieve the situation of my friend from New York [Mr. EVARTS] a little, if he will allow me. Under a constraint that I can not resist, but against my judgment, to save legislation I withdraw the amendment.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The amendment is withdrawn.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

KILLING OF JOSEPH HOFFMAN, WASHINGTON COUNTY, TEXAS.

Mr. MANDERSON. On behalf of my colleague who is absent [Mr. PADDOCK], I report the following resolution favorably from the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate. It is favorably reported with a proposed amendment. I ask for the present consideration of the resolution.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The resolution will be read.

The Secretary read as follows:

Whereas Joseph Hoffman, of Brenham, Washington County, Texas, a prominent German Republican of that county, and a witness before the subcommittee of the Committee on Privileges and Elections of the Senate, was recently shot down, apparently in cold blood, in said city of Brenham; and

Whereas there is some reason to believe that the taking of his life was directly attributable to his political views and activity and to the fact that he had given strong testimony before the Senate committee upon the investigation, which is still pending, under order of the Senate, into alleged election outrages perpetrated in said Washington County, Texas; and

Whereas it is of the utmost importance that witnesses before Congressional investigating committees may, without danger to their lives, freely and fully testify concerning matters under investigation: Now, therefore,

Resolved, That the Committee on Privileges and Elections be, and it is hereby, instructed to investigate, either by the subcommittee in charge of the investigation of alleged outrages in Washington County, Texas, or by another subcommittee or otherwise, the circumstances attending the killing of said Joseph Hoffman, with especial reference to ascertaining whether said killing was in any sense due to the testimony given by said Hoffman before the Senate investigating committee as aforesaid, and the said committee, or its subcommittee as aforesaid, is hereby empowered, in pursuing said investigation, to send for persons and papers, and to employ a stenographer; and said committee is directed to report at the earliest practicable day to the Senate, the testimony, with their views thereon, and such recommendation, if any, as to the committee shall seem best, and the said committee may sit during the recess.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The proposed amendment will be read.

The SECRETARY. The amendment proposed by the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate is to add:

The necessary expenses of such investigation to be paid out of the contingent fund of the Senate on vouchers duly approved.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. Is there objection to the present consideration of this resolution?

By unanimous consent, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

The amendment was agreed to.

The resolution as amended was agreed to.

WIDOW OF CHIEF-JUSTICE WAITE.

Mr. EDMUNDS. I introduce a bill which I ask may be read at length the first time, as I shall ask for its present consideration.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The bill will be read the first time at length.

The Secretary read as follows:

A bill (S. 3621) for the payment to the widow of the late Chief-Justice Morrison R. Waite the balance of a year's salary.

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and is hereby, directed to pay to the widow of the late Chief-Justice Morrison R. Waite the sum of $8,745, being a sum equal to the balance of his salary for the year in which he died.

The bill was read the second time by its title.

Mr. EDMUNDS. I venture to ask, contrary to my practice in the ordinary routine of the Senate, that this bill be now considered. I feel justified in doing so from the fact that the Committee on the Judiciary within a few weeks reported an amendment to the deficiency bill providing this very thing; it was considered by the Senate and agreed to; and under the circumstances which have been stated this morning has failed on that bill. I think therefore I am justified in asking the Senate without a reference to consider the bill at this time.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The Senator from Vermont asks that the bill may be now considered. Is there objection?

Mr. BERRY. Mr. President, I heard the statement made by the Senator from Vermont this morning of the obligations that rested upon Congress to give this money to Mrs. Waite, to none of which I agree.

I can not see that Mrs. Waite, more than the widow of any other civil officer of the United States, is entitled to receive a donation from Congress.

The Senator from Vermont said that we provided for the widows of Senators and Members of Congress, and paid them a year's salary. If that be true it ought not to be true. I do not believe that the Congress of the United States has a right to take money out of the Treasury that belongs to the whole people of this country and give it to the widows of Senators and the widows of members or the widow of any one else. When Chief-Justice Waite took his office he knew the salary attached to it. Practically it was part and parcel of his contract and understanding that he should serve for that; and we have no right, as I conceive, to give his widow or the widow of a Senator or Member of Congress or any one else money out of the Treasury of the United States. There are thousands of widows over all this land who are not widows of Senators or members or Chief-Justices, and they have the same right that the widow of the Chief-Justice of the United States has.

It is upon this principle that I oppose the bill. I believe it is building up that legislation of which I have heretofore spoken, called class legislation. I believe it is selecting a few favored individuals and taking the money that belongs to the people and providing that they shall live in luxury and ease, while thousands of others are obliged to toil from day to day. I can not vote for the bill, and I will not give my consent that it be now considered if unanimous consent be required.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. Does the Senator from Arkansas object?

Mr. BERRY. I object.

Mr. EDMUNDS. Let the bill be referred to the Committee on the Judiciary. There will be a meeting of the Judiciary Committee in about ten minutes.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The bill will be referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

BILLS INTRODUCED.

Mr. ALLISON introduced a bill (S. 3622) granting a pension to Henry Heuer; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. CULLOM introduced a joint resolution (S. R. 114) to quiet title in the United States to certain land in Miller County, Arkansas; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Lands.

Mr. SAWYER introduced a bill (S. 3623) granting a pension to Maria Gribbon; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

REVENUE-BILL TESTIMONY.

Mr. ALDRICH submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Printing:

Resolved, That in addition to the usual number, there be printed 750 copies of the testimony accompanying Senate Report No. 2332, for the use of the Senate.

ELLEN P. MALLOY.

Mr. HARRIS. A day or two ago the bill (H. R. 6348) for the relief of Mrs. Ellen P. Malloy was adversely reported and indefinitely postponed. I ask that the vote by which the indefinite postponement was had may be reconsidered and the bill placed upon the Calendar.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. It will be so ordered, if there be no objection.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. CLARK, its Clerk, announced that the House had directed him to return to the Senate in compliance with its request the bill (S. 577) for the relief of the American Grocer Association, of the city of New York.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the amendment of the Senate to the concurrent resolution providing for a joint committee to investigate the work on the Washington Aqueduct tunnel.

LOUIS RIEL.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The Chair lays before the Senate resolutions coming over from yesterday, offered by the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BLAIR], the title of which will be read.

The SECRETARY. Resolutions calling for information in relation to Louis Riel, who was hanged for the alleged crime of treason by the authorities of Canada.

Mr. BLAIR. These resolutions were offered by me yesterday in consequence of information that had been brought to my knowledge from various sources, particularly through the public press and the publication of a book of apparently considerable merit and written with care and ability, bearing upon the case of Louis Riel. I may say further that private information in the way of correspondence from at least one responsible party has also induced me, with these other considerations, to offer the resolutions. The resolutions were read at length yesterday. They are in print and before the Senate.

I will state that, in substance, they assert that Riel, who was tried and convicted of treason and executed for that crime or alleged crime on the 16th of November, 1885, by the authorities of the Dominion of Canada, was an American citizen; that his trial was without due form and process of law; that, among other causes of defense, he was an insane person, which defense failed to be made with proper force and effect; that the verdict of the jury was, to be sure, guilty, but that it was with a recommendation to mercy; that mercy was not extended, and that he was executed for the crime, somewhat differently from the manner in which we treated the rebellion which occurred in this country but a few years ago, which was upon the most tremendous proportions, and which resulted in the death of no American citizen under the accusation of crime, or, at least, crime in consequence of participation in the rebellion; that a prominent French Canadian brought the circumstances of this man's case and his American citizenship to the attention of the President and Secretary of State, urgently asking for their interference, representing the helpless condition of the man, these mitigating circumstances, and that he was entitled to at least inquiry on the part of his Government into the circumstances under which he was awaiting death; that the Government declined absolutely to interfere, or to make inquiry, or to concern itself about the man's case in any wise whatsoever.

These allegations, the resolutions set forth, were made by one Edmund Mallett, who, I believe, ordinarily has the title of major, and is said to be a gentleman of high character and responsibility, who was at the time these occurrences took place in the employ of the Government, having some function in the Treasury Department; that he, being unable to obtain the attention of his Government to the case of Louis Riel, made much complaint with great publicity and published letters giving the circumstances in regard to the alleged dereliction and reluctance of the Government in the case of Louis Riel; that since these charges were made by Mr. Mallett and since the publication of the book to which I have alluded, and which has been brought, as I understand, to the attention of the President and the Secretary of State, this gentleman has been promoted to a still higher and more responsible position under the Government with increased compensation.

The resolutions do not assume that any of these charges are true, and call for such information as the Government may be able to give us in the premises. I will read to the Senate some of the additional proof, which has, I think, justified my offering, in fact made it an imperative duty to offer the resolutions. I have in my hand a letter from one Wilbur F. Bryant, of Nebraska, which is dated Hartington, Nebr., September 25, 1888, addressed to myself, and is in reply to a letter which I sent to Mr. Bryant after reading the book, "The Blood of Abel," of which he is author, and after reading an article in a prominent New York journal in which he reiterated these charges of negligence on the part of the Government and the unfortunate circumstances of the case of Mr. Riel, and in response to that letter I received this and also the book, which the letter states to be a compilation of facts. He says:

> In regard to Louis Riel my book, mailed yesterday, furnishes an authentic account of the Riel affair. The appendix shows some of the authorities consulted. I have these documents now.

Further on he says:

> The written matter I received from him—

That is, Major Mallett—

> would make a large book of itself. He was the personal and confidential friend of Riel, and, as such, made an appeal, first, to Secretary Bayard, and next to Grover Cleveland, on behalf of the unfortunate half-breed, both of which were unsuccessful.

Further on he says:

> Major Mallett a year ago was an unfortunate applicant for promotion. After the publication of my book, I sent three copies to the White House, and one to Secretary Bayard. Major Mallett has since then been promoted and removed to the Indian service.

He further says:

> Congressman GEORGE W. E. DORSEY, from this district, knows me, also Senator CHARLES F. MANDERSON. General MANDERSON is my personal friend of ten years' standing. I refer you to these gentlemen. Go on, and meet the gratitude of Riel's countrymen all over the land.

The letter is written urging that an investigation be called for, and I have made personal inquiry of the Senator from Nebraska, who informs me that this gentleman is a lawyer of high ability. In fact, his book demonstrates that he is an accomplished gentleman, and certainly well skilled in the matter of authorship. I understand him to be an entirely responsible gentleman, and a good lawyer, and I judge from the contents of the book that he is from my own State originally. I think I know his family connections, and, in fact, there can be no doubt that these allegations come from an entirely responsible source.

It seems that Riel was the son of a French Canadian and an Indian mother. He was a half-breed and belongs to the class of inhabitants known as the Metis in Canada. He lived in Manitoba at the time when the Hudson Bay Company transferred its title, or quasi title, to the soil of Canada to the English Government, about 1869. Difficulties arose in regard to the position of the half-breeds who had become partially civilized, and this man Riel, I ought to say, was, as everything shows, an educated gentleman of great capacity, and vigor, and intelligence. The difficulties in reference to the soil arose in this way: The squatters were in occupation. They had made great improvements on their lands, which had become valuable. They had, after the fashion of the French occupants or habitans of Canada, laid out their lands with a narrow

frontage on the street, the social character of the habitans leading them to establish themselves as far as possible, even when engaged in agricultural occupations, in little villages fronting upon the streets, while the land in long narrow strips passed to the rear to the extent of their holdings. The Government, acquiring the Hudson Bay Company's title, proceeded to survey the lands in different forms, largely disregarding the occupation and the improvements of the settlers, or wholly, perhaps, and laid them out after the fashion of our own country in quarter sections, square portions of land.

If the half-breeds, many of whom were ignorant and unable to follow their titles, had made seasonable application, they might perhaps have succeeded in getting the whole of the land which they had improved; but, as a rule, they were not informed, they failed to do this, and their occupation came to be disturbed by speculators and new settlers coming into the country. Disturbances arose in which these people felt that they were fighting for their homes, and, as we all remember, the sympathy of this whole country and, I think, of the whole world was with these unfortunate people.

An insurrection resulted. Of course it was suppressed. Mr. Riel left the country. A sentence of banishment, I think, was passed upon him. He came to the United States and located in Montana, where he lived for a long time. Finally, difficulties again culminated about the year 1882 or 1883 in the same portion of Canada, Manitoba; and as he had formerly been a leader of his people, Louis Riel was, at the request of a deputation of his people, induced to go again to his former residence in Manitoba; and he undertook the management of this agitation, which was designed to be a constitutional agitation for the establishment of their rights, entirely loyal to the Government of Great Britain, though, of course, bringing them into collision with the authorities of Canada; and with that purpose the agitation proceeded.

There was an entire failure to secure the equitable recognition, as these people claimed, of their rights by the Government of Canada, and force was made use of. General Middleton was sent into the territory with an overpowering force, and the resistance, which had assumed a forcible shape, was suppressed. Riel was captured. He was accused of high treason. He was executed on the 16th day of November, 1885.

I should have stated that after Riel's banishment and his retirement to Montana, in this country, and after the expiration of the period or term of his banishment, he applied for naturalization in one of the courts of Montana, and the decree of naturalization was made in due form. He appears to have been a naturalized American citizen, if we ever had one, and I will call more specific attention to that matter a little further on. If I remember correctly, the decree of naturalization is dated in the year 1883.

During the interim between the first and second insurrections Mr. Riel became insane. He was insane on the subject of the wrongs of his people. He came to conceive that he had a mission to perform for their liberation and a project in that direction which he was charged to carry out regardless of all opposition. Various hardships and sufferings came to be inflicted upon him in the prosecution of his design, until finally his mind became deranged and by the good offices of Major Mallett he was returned to the province of Quebec and for some nineteen or twenty months was under treatment in an asylum there for his insanity. He was afterwards discharged, supposed to have been cured, but when the call to head the second agitation was made upon him and during the excitement which resulted his mind was supposed to have become again disturbed, and Major Mallett says, in several statements, that he has no doubt and believes that Louis Riel was insane at the time of his trial and of his execution.

Something induced the jury to recommend him to mercy. None was extended, no interference was made on the part of our Government, although the American citizenship of this man seems to have been fully established, and it appears to me that, under all the peculiar circumstances of this case, it is a proper subject-matter for calling upon the Department for some sort of a reply.

From the book I read the following, on page 38:

Louis Riel was born October 22, 1844, at St. Boniface, Rupert's Land, on the western bank of a small creek which runs into the Red River from the east, a little north of the site of the present city of Winnipeg. This stream is called after that historic river the Seine. The subject of this sketch was the son of Louis Riel, sr., and Julie de Lagimaudiere. The house in which the child was born was a small, one-story, straw-thatched, log structure, containing but a single room. A saw-mill now stands about 3 rods north the historic spot. Louis was the eldest of eleven children, five of whom, with the mother, survive him.

Louis Riel belonged to the "Metis" or half-breed race. He was what they call in northern New England a French Indian.

I read these extracts without that logical arrangement, which perhaps should be made with reference to their subject-matter, but as I found them in the book. On page 64, speaking of Riel's trial, conviction, and execution, I find this:

Excessive toil, bitter disappointment, and galling poverty so wrought upon his sensitive nature that reason was dethroned. He had come to Washington with $1,000, the donation of a wealthy Canadian. In the space of several months he had given this, piecemeal, to a blind Italian beggar who sat daily in front of the Presbyterian Church on Ninth street. Thus was this high-minded and generous patriot reduced at once to madness and penury in a strange city. But God provided a friend. Riel was possessed of the delusion that he must die for the salvation of his race. Major Mallett took forcible possession of his person. But finding him moneyless, he was compelled to borrow cash from Father Keane, now Bishop of Richmond, to move the unfortunate North. Riel remained for nineteen months at the Beauport lunatic asylum in the province of Quebec.

His ailment was megalomania. This word is not found in the dictionaries. It is derived from two Greek words, *megale*, great, and *mania*, madness. It is a most peculiar and deceptive form of insanity. Its victim might easily pass for a sane person amongst the unobservant. The person afflicted with this mental disorder imagines himself charged with some great mission and altogether a most important person.

Riel was incarcerated under the name of La Rochelle. He remained under the treatment of the medical superintendent, Dr. Francis Ray, until he had recovered. He was discharged from the asylum January 21, 1878. Dr. Ray found his case a most peculiar one, and one requiring careful treatment. To this gentleman Riel confessed his true name.

* * * * * * *

Afterwards he declared his intention to become an American citizen. In the month of March, 1883, he applied to the district court of the United States at Helena, Mont., and on the 16th day of that month he became a citizen. Levi Jerome and E. L. Merrill (full Christian name unknown) appeared as witnesses.

The author goes on to say later in his book on the seventy third page:

This is no party pamphlet. The writer speaks as an American to Americans. On the 16th day of November of the year 1885, Louis Riel, an American citizen, was hanged at Regina, in the Northwest Territories, within the realm of Her Britannic Majesty, for high treason against the crown and dignity of the Queen of Great Britain and Ireland. The attention of President Cleveland and Secretary Bayard was called to the facts, but they refused to act in the matter. The Secretary of State did not consider the matter of sufficient importance to be mentioned in his annual report. Was this inaction of the United States Government justified by the facts in the case? The solution of this problem is the subject before us.

For the purpose of this volume it boots little that Louis Riel was Catholic or Protestant; that he was of French or Germanic, or of Indian, or of Irish, or of Swedish extraction; that he was a patriot, fanatic, impostor, or madman. For such purpose, it matters not whether he be considered a John Brown, a Count Cagliostro, an Anacharsis Cloots, a Don Quixote, a George Francis Train, or a William Tell. One proposition is beyond cavil: He was at his death an American citizen. That undisputed fact stamped upon him a dignity which neither race, religion, character, or condition could obliterate. *Civis Americanus fuit.* Forget all beside.

Various irregularities in the progress of the trial are pointed out at length in the book. If they are true, several of them are such, in my judgment, as would have led to the setting aside of the proceedings by an American court and would have given this man a new trial. On page 111 the author says:

After the condemnation of Riel, an appeal was taken to the court of Queen's bench of Manitoba.

The errors assigned were, in substance:

"I. That the law giving a stipendiary magistrate, with a justice of the peace and a jury of six, power to try the prisoner was contrary to Magna Charta.

"II. That the law required the information to be taken before a stipendiary magistrate and a justice of the peace, instead of the stipendiary alone.

"III. That the law required the magistrate to take the testimony in writing; and a short-hand reporter's notes were not in compliance with the statute.

"IV. That the evidence was insufficient.

"V. That the powers of the Dominion Parliament were delegated, not plenary; and their act was *ultra vires*."

The evidence and its alleged insufficiency are discussed at considerable length. In the book, on the one hundred and fifteenth page, is a citation from another author, one Rambaut, who wrote another book, it seems, on the subject, and this writer devotes several pages to Riel's case considered from an international standpoint. He says—I read now the quotation from the other book, which contains the matter from the same Maj. Edmund Mallett, of whom I have already spoken:

Taking up now the features of the case that have most interest for the student of political science, we notice, in the first place, that although the affidavit of indictment was evidently prepared to meet the objection that Riel was a naturalized American citizen, and therefore no subject of the Queen, the counsel on both sides omitted all reference to this fact. It seems to be generally believed that Riel was naturalized during his residence in the United States. If this be true, there can be no doubt that he ceased to be a British subject. The effect of naturalization, long a mooted question between the English and American governments, was definitely settled by the treaty of 1870. Riel was accordingly entitled to the same protection which would be due in like case to a native citizen of the United States. When it became evident that Riel was about to be executed under sentence of the Canadian court, the United States Government was asked to interfere in his behalf on account of his American citizenship acquired during his residence in Montana. In this matter, Maj. Edmund Mallet, of Washington, D. C., acted for Riel. He has very kindly written me a letter, in which he succinctly narrates his efforts in Riel's behalf, and the position taken by our Government. He says: "I first consulted Mr. Bayard, and he took this position substantially:

"1. That it was not the duty of the Government to inquire into the fact of Riel's American citizenship; and

"2. That the Government could not interfere even if he was an American citizen, either natural or adopted. If a case was brought to the attention of his Department it would be examined into, but under no circumstances could the Government, he thought, interfere unless it was shown conclusively that he had been discriminated against during his trial by reason of his American citizenship.

"When it became apparent to me that the Canadian Government had committed itself to the execution of Riel, under the pressure brought to bear upon it by the Orange lodges of Ontario, I went to the President and appealed to him to prevent this judicial murder. I based my appeal on the following [grounds]:

"1. That Riel was an American citizen; that he had been indicted as a British citizen, his American citizenship having been entirely ignored, although offer had been made to prove the fact by documents captured at the battle of Batoche and then in the Canadian Government's hands; and that he had been tried by a half jury of six men selected by the judge, and that judge was a mere justice of the peace;

"2. That Riel was insane, and I offered testimony to that effect; and

"3. That the authority to put a human being to death for any cause whatsoever is not inherent in the Government, but is delegated from God, and that such delegated power can be exercised only in certain conditions, such as sound mind, etc.

"The President seemed much interested in the case; expressed himself in sympathy with what I told him; but he considered it a very grave matter to interfere. At last I asked that he send for Mr. Bayard and the British minis-

ter, and see if an amicable understanding could be made to save Riel. The President then said that he would consult with the Secretary of State and see what could be done.

"During the night of the same day the Associated Press announced that the President had been constrained to decline interfering in the matter.

"The position taken by Secretary Bayard rests on sound international law. Our Government would not have been justified in interfering in the matter on the basis of the case presented to the Department of State. Although Riel was a naturalized American, he owed the Queen of Great Britain temporary allegiance while living within the borders of her realm, and he made himself liable for breach of the criminal law of the land. * * *

"Not only had the United States no right to interfere in Riel's behalf, but the Canadian court was in the right in ignoring Riel's citizenship. It was absolutely immaterial."

These are the comments of this other author, who falls to the other view that although Riel was an American citizen, the American Government had no right even to inquire, but must be approached with affirmative effort on the part of the person who needs the interference of his Government, that no matter how helpless he may be he must be able to set in motion the necessary machinery to reach the Department of State and the ear of the President and the executive power of this country, although he may be incarcerated and in a condition of the utmost helplessness by reason of the undertaking to subject him to wrongs in defiance of his American citizenship. That is the gist of the resolutions, the position alleged to be taken by the Government and justified by this author, who is quoted in the book I cite from, that there must be this affirmative power on the part of the helpless and defenseless American citizen to reach his Government before that Government will even open its eye or listen to the complaint of the American citizen about to suffer death, and, as it is alleged, unjustly.

This author goes on to say, in reference to the proposition laid down here of the interest of the party being sufficiently powerful to take care of himself and secure the intervention of his government:

If this proposition was ever even the subject of serious debate since the foundation of the world, the writer is not aware of it.

Further on in the book is a statement that eight years after his banishment, and after the expiration of his five years' term of banishment, he became an American citizen in March, 1883, by regular naturalization.

This author goes on to say:

It will be contended herein that the Government should have interfered in the case of Riel.

In describing the duty of the Government in a case like Riel's the language of President Cleveland himself will be employed:

"The watchful care and interest of this Government over its citizens are not relinquished because they are gone abroad, and if charged with a crime committed in the foreign land, a fair and open trial, conducted with a decent regard for justice and humanity, will be demanded for them."

"Out of thy own mouth I judge thee."

Under this rule laid down by the President it was the duty of his Administration to interfere, for the following reasons:

First. Riel was not guilty of any act which could be considered treason, when laying the question of citizenship entirely aside.

Second. Riel was tried upon the theory that he was a citizen of Great Britain, and not of the United States.

Third. The question of the prisoner's sanity or insanity was never fairly submitted to the jury.

Fourth. There was misconduct of the court in instructing the jury.

Fifth. There was a variance between the indictment and the proof.

These points are discussed at considerable length and with apparent proof that they may have been well founded.

Mr. REAGAN. Will the Senator allow me to make a suggestion?

Mr. BLAIR. Certainly.

Mr. REAGAN. I ask whether it has ever been known that this Government or any other government in the world has interposed to protect one of its citizens who has been or is being tried abroad without that question being raised by the person on trial, and without that person having applied to his government for its interposition?

Mr. BLAIR. I think it has. I do not remember anybody making application to the United States Government in the Koszta case, for instance; and the Senator must see, I think, that the greater the helplessness and the need of an American citizen, the less likely and the less competent and able he is to make application for relief from his government.

I think it is the business of the American Government, as it has always been the business of the British Government, to pay attention to complaints, to hold itself open to inquiry, and to make inquiry upon the slightest suggestion that American citizenship in its rights is being violated either at home or abroad.

I do not say that this is a true charge, but the point of all this charge is that this man being an American citizen, and the proof being offered of his American citizenship, of the irregularities attending his trial, of his innocence, his insanity, and all these allegations being offered from responsible sources to the President and the Secretary of State, they refused to inquire, refused to listen, and said the case must be made affirmatively by the party in need, or nothing could be done.

The author says, on page 130:

II. Next Riel was tried upon the theory that he was a citizen of Great Britain and not of the United States. As before stated, the question of his citizenship was totally ignored after the motion for a continuance was disposed of.

The indictment seemed to indicate that the court was prepared for either horn of the dilemma, either his being an American citizen temporarily in the British dominions, and so subject to British law, or a British subject in full.

The author proceeds:

It may be contended—

And I call the attention of the Senator from Texas [Mr. REAGAN] to this, which I read from page 132—

It may be contended on behalf of President Cleveland that, as Riel's counsel never urged the question of his citizenship at the trial, and as he never himself petitioned the United States Government, the Government was justified in refusing to even examine into the question of his naturalization. This is too absurd for serious refutation. Such a rule would have left Martin Koszta to imprisonment and death. If the Greeks of Homer had acted upon such a theory they would have been deaf to the "groans and cries of Helen."

Then he goes on to cite many cases which may be of interest to those who care to pursue this subject further.

Mr. REAGAN. I will say, as reference was made by the Senator to the case of Martin Koszta, that it is hardly a case, as I remember it, to be cited in support of the theory presented here. He certainly made known the fact of his American citizenship and asked the interposition of the American officers.

Mr. BLAIR. No; Koszta was a Hungarian rebel, as I remember the circumstances, and in consequence of his participation in the insurrection of 1848, to save his life he fled from Austria to America, and made declaration of his purpose to be naturalized. He was not naturalized, but he declared his purpose to become a naturalized citizen, and found his way back to European waters again, not Austrian, but I think it was in the port of Smyrna, and there an Austrian man-of-war undertook his recapture and did secure his person and convey him on board an Austrian ship; but the American captain, Ingraham, who was lying with his vessel in those waters at that time, learned of the circumstance and demanded the release of Koszta, without direct authority from his Government; but by virtue of the fact that he was an American and in command of an American ship he undertook himself to interfere, without any formal application, when he found that the rights of one who had undertaken to become an American citizen were being endangered, and he demanded the delivery of Koszta to himself; which was refused. He immediately cleared his decks for action, and Austria surrendered him, and the whole world applauded his conduct. There was no application there, no contact with the Government at all.

On page 149 will be found the record of Riel's naturalization in the United States district court of the third judicial district of Montana:

In the United States district court of the third judicial district of the Territory of Montana.

Present: Hon. D. S. Wade, judge.

In the matter of the application of Louis David Riel, an alien, to become a citizen of the United States of America. In open court, March term, A. D. 1883, this 16th day of March, A. D. 1883, as yet of said term.

This name David, Riel adopted after he came to America. There is no question of the man's identity.

It appearing to the satisfaction of this court, by the oaths of E. L. Merrill and Levi Jerome, citizens of the United States of America, witnesses for that purpose, first duly sworn and examined, that Louis David Riel, a native of Canada, has resided within the limits and under the jurisdiction of the United States five years at least last past, and within the Territory of Montana for one year last past, and that during all of said five years' time he has behaved as a man of good moral character, attached to the principles of the Constitution of the United States and well disposed to the good order and happiness of the same; and it also appearing to the court by competent evidence that the said applicant has heretofore, and more than two years since, and in due form of law, declared his intention to become a citizen of the United States, and having now here, before this court, taken an oath that he will support the Constitution of the United States of America, and that he doth absolutely and entirely renounce and abjure all allegiance and fidelity to every foreign prince, potentate, state, or sovereignty whatever, and particularly to Victoria, Queen of Great Britain, it is therefore ordered, adjudged, and decreed that the said Louis David Riel be, and he is hereby, admitted and declared to be a citizen of the United States of America.

D. S. WADE, *Judge.*

Signature: LOUIS DAVID RIEL.

Office of the clerk of the United States district court of the third judicial district of the Territory of Montana, *ss:*

I, B. K. Tatem, clerk of the United States district court of the third judicial district of the Territory of Montana, said court being a court of record, having a common-law jurisdiction, and a clerk and seal, do certify that the above is a true copy of the act of naturalization of Louis David Riel, as the same appears upon the records of said court now in my office.

In testimony whereof, I have hereunto set my hand and affixed the seal of the said court this 9th day of October, in the year of our Lord 1886, and in the year of our Independence the 111th.

[SEAL.] B. K. TATEM, *Clerk.*
By C. G. REYNOLDS, *Dep'y Clerk.*

Mr. MORGAN. What is the date of the decree?

Mr. BLAIR. It is the 16th day of March, 1883.

On page 151 of the appendix is the information or indictment upon which Riel was tried. I will not read it.

The first count describes him as a subject of our lady, the queen, not regarding the duty of his allegiance, etc. The second count describes him in the same way. The fourth count opens as follows:

4. And the said Alexander David Stuart further sayeth: That the said Louis Riel, then living within the Dominion of Canada, and under the protection of our sovereign lady, the queen, not regarding the duty of his allegiance, etc.—

Evidently looking or squinting to the defense of his American citizenship, the phraseology in the other indictment speaking of him as the subject of our lady the queen, then as living in the Dominion of Canada and under the protection of our sovereign lady, the queen, and, of course, entitled to that protection, although an American citizen so long as he resided there temporarily and behaved himself as a citizen.

On the one hundred and sixty second page is a letter from Major Mallet himself, addressed to the editor of the Traveller, a translation:

WASHINGTON, D. C., *August* 24, 1885.

DEAR FRIEND GAGNON: The journals which I have received during the past two days indicate that there is great diversity of views among our Canadian journalists in the United States in regard to the rights which American citizenship confers upon Louis Riel in his present unfortunate situation. I notice, too, that the public meetings are being held and petitions signed, and that these meetings and petitions are not agreed upon the best method to proceed to arrest the execution. Evidently there is danger that the generous, humane action of our people may be devoid of influence, by reason of the diversity of views expressed or the poverty of the arguments advanced in the memorials addressed to our Government asking its interference in Riel's case.

Being desirous to ascertain the views of the Department of State in regard to this matter, so as to satisfy myself, and, if opportunity afforded, be of service to my compatriots, I called on Secretary Bayard this afternoon to talk over the matter with him. We discussed the subject together at considerable length. From our interview I can say that the following is substantially the views of the Department of State. Of course the form in which it is expressed is my own:

First. The American Government will not take the initiative in examining into Riel's citizenship or the rights thereunder.

Second. The Government has so far done nothing in the matter, except to inquire of the War Department as to the truth or falsity of a statement to the effect that Riel was captured on American soil. This information was asked for to reply to a New York correspondent who inquired concerning the matter. The Secretary read me his reply, which is unimportant.

Third. The Government will take no action in the case, unless the matter is presented to its attention in a formal manner, the facts and arguments upon which the interference of the Government is invoked to be properly stated in writing.

Fourth. The Government would not be disposed to inquire into or review the proceedings of the court which tried Riel, unless it was shown that he was discriminated against, *i. e.*, that he was tried by harsher methods than a Canadian citizen would have been tried by.

Here is a note which will save me the trouble of making a remark of my own. The author says:

It is presumed, that if Canadian courts were in the habit of using tortures in the trial of Canucks, Secretary Bayard would not object to their using it upon American citizens resident in Canada.

I do not assume that the Secretary of State took this position. I read from the statement of the president of the Canadian League of the United States, who has since this all happened been promoted to a high position under this Government.

Mr. MORGAN. The Senator will allow me to say that I do not understand that to be a quotation from anything Mr. Bayard said or wrote.

Mr. BLAIR. No. This man undertakes to state what Mr. Bayard said. I do not undertake to say that he quotes Mr. Bayard correctly.

Mr. PAYNE. Who is he?

Mr. BLAIR. This is Major Mallet, who has been appointed to a prominent position in the Indian Department after charging the Government, and the Government's attention being called to it, with the utmost negligence and dereliction in its duty in not making inquiry into the alleged wrong suffered by an American citizen.

Mr. MORGAN. What office was he appointed to?

Mr. BLAIR. It is a prominent position; superintendent of Indian schools, or inspector of Indian schools.

Mr. MORGAN. Was he confirmed by the Senate?

Mr. BLAIR. I presume he was confirmed by the Senate. He formerly held a responsible position in the Treasury Department, and I have never heard anything against him. I understand he is a gentleman of the very highest character, and I should like to know whether he tells the truth, and that is why these resolutions were offered. The Government undertake, after having had these matters brought to their attention, and three copies of this book being sent to the President and the Secretary of State, containing all these statements—after all this had been developed and brought to their attention—these accusations made, these charges made by this man, they indorse in the very highest and most significant manner possible the witness who is making these serious and venomous charges against them, if they be untrue—and I must not be misunderstood—and I wish to be explicit upon that point, as in any way impeaching the testimony of Maj. Edmond Mallet. He is the head of the French-Canadian societies of this country and is supposed to be, and in fact this author who brings these matters to our attention speaks of him in high terms as a very accomplished, truthful, Christian gentleman. I take it he is, or he would not be holding this office.

Mr. PAYNE. You say he has been appointed to office?

Mr. BLAIR. Yes, sir. There are about a million of French Canadian citizens in the United States; and I submit we are not going to permit those men, after they become naturalized, to be hanged for nothing in Canada, without inquiring of foreign powers, when it is brought to the attention of the Government of the United States that they have been wrongfully accused; that they are in a condition of mind incapable of committing crime, and that even due process of law has been violated in trying their case. I know those people have not had all the advantages of American citizenship, but there are a great many intelligent, cultivated, and eminent gentlemen among them; and as a whole population, I believe there is as much of hope in the French-Canadian population as in any of the immigration which seeks our shores.

But to proceed at the point where I was interrupted:

Fourth. The Government would not be disposed to inquire into or review the proceedings of the court which tried Riel unless it was shown that he was discriminated against—*i. e.*, that he was tried by harsher methods than a Canadian citizen would have been tried by.

Fifth. The Government recognizes the principle that every country has a right to determine for itself what constitutes treason, and it would not be disposed to question Canada's right to try Riel for treason even though he be a native or naturalized citizen of the United States.

I understand the Secretary to say that Riel's case was like some of the Irish so-called revolutionists, so far as it regards this Government, and that the American Government would do all that was proper for Riel, as it had done for the others.

With these views of the Department of State before us, it seems to me that our duty is traced more clearly.

You are aware that I knew Riel intimately, both before and after his becoming insane, knowing the material he is made of, as well as his intimate views and aspirations, I believe that when he gave himself up (when he could have escaped with Dumont) he did so with the determined purpose of having himself put to death as the best means of serving his people and country. I am of the opinion that in madness he acted with an extreme sagacity, which he might have been devoid of with his wits. If Riel is executed, mark me! the children of his executors in the not distant future will erect monuments to his memory. You know the history of Pontiac. Riel is the Pontiac of the nineteenth century

Yours, truly,

EDMOND MALLET.

Here is a copy of another letter dated February 9, 1886, in which he goes over the same ground:

FEBRUARY 9, 1886.

DEAR SIR: Your note finds me on the eve of my departure from the city for a few days, and in the midst of such occupations that is really impossible for me to find the newspaper articles which appeared relative to my efforts to have the United States Government interfere in the Riel case. I will now give you the substance of what was done, and if that does not quite answer your purpose, let me know, and I will give you fuller indications next week.

I first consulted Mr. Bayard, and he took this position substantially:

"1. That it was not the duty of the Government to inquire into the fact of Riel's American citizenship; and

"2. That the Government could not interfere even if he was an American citizen, either natural or adopted. If the case was brought to the attention of his Department it would be examined into, but under no circumstances could the Government, he thought, interfere, unless it was shown conclusively that he had been discriminated against during his trial by reason of his American citizenship."

When it became apparent to me that the Canadian Government had committed itself to the execution of Riel, under the pressure brought to bear upon it by the Orange lodges of Ontario, I went to the President and appealed to him to prevent this judicial murder. I based my appeal on the following: (1) That Riel was an American citizen, that he had been indicted as a British citizen, his American citizenship having been entirely ignored, although offer had been made to prove the fact by documents captured at the battle of Batoche, and then in the Canadian Government's hands, and that he had been tried by a half jury of six men selected by the judge, and that judge was a mere justice of the peace; (2) that Riel was insane; and I offered testimony to that effect; and (3) that the authority to put a human being to death for any cause whatsoever is not inherent in government, but is delegated from God, and that such delegated power can be exercised only in certain conditions, such as sound mind, etc. The President seemed much interested in the case, expressed himself in sympathy with what I told him; but he considered it a very grave matter to interfere. At last I asked that he send for Mr. Bayard and the British minister, and see if an amicable understanding could be made to save Riel. The President then said he would consult with the Secretary of State and see what could be done. During the night of the same day the Associated Press announced that, to my appeal, the President had been constrained to decline interfering in the matter.

Respectfully, yours,

EDMUND MALLETT.

THOMAS D. RAMBAUT, Esq., *New York, N. Y.*

I next present the letter on page 167, by J. Damiens, S. J., a Jesuit father:

ST. PETER'S MISSION,
St. Peter Post-Office, Mont., January 14, 1887.

DEAR SIR: Your favor at hand, and in reply I would say that Louis Riel was here just prior to the Northwest rebellion, and he left this place at the request of a delegation composed of three half-breed men who came after him from their northern country. He lived here about six months. He was married to a half-breed girl called Marguerite Monete, from whom he had two children, John, born 9th May, 1882, and Mary Angelia, born 11th September, 1883. The girl was born here, and the boy somewhere down the Missouri or Musselshell, while Riel was living on the prairie among the half-breeds. Politics was his principal thought [you] might say, and in the last years from the Democratic [he] passed to the Republican party. Sun River is a small place, and he lived not in town, but here around the mission, which is about 20 miles from Sun River. He was making his living teaching school, and [it] would have been better for him as he was told to stick at it and retire entirely from all politics, but his mind was changed there, and this brought the unfortunate man to such a frightful end. With kindest regards, I remain,

Yours, respectfully,

J. DAMIENS, S. J.

Mr. WILBUR F. BRYANT,
Judge, West Point, Nebr.

I do not know that there is any other matter in the book that I need to call attention to at the present time. I read from it to show that these charges are of a serious character, and, as it seems to me, they should be investigated. I have introduced these resolutions as what appeared to me the proper method of commencing an investigation. Before the taking of evidence, it seemed to me that the President and the Secretary of State should be heard to give their account of the matter, and therefore the resolutions were offered in these words:

Resolved, That the President be requested to communicate to the Senate any knowledge or information in his possession or in the possession of the Department of State relating to the case of one Louis Riel, otherwise Louis David Riel, who was hanged for the alleged crime of treason by the authorities of the Dominion of Canada on or about the 16th day of November, 1885, notwithstanding that he was recommended to mercy by the jury who convicted him, doubts being alleged of his sanity, with other mitigating circumstances; and the same Louis Riel, in whose favor judgment of naturalization is alleged to appear of record in the United States district court of the third judicial district of the Territory of Montana of the March term, 1883; and also to communicate to the Senate all information of any application made by one Edmund Mallett, now or lately president of the French-Canadian League of the United States, or by any other persons, whether verbally or otherwise, to the President or to the Secretary

of State in behalf of said Riel, prior to his execution, requesting inquiry into the circumstances of his case, his alleged citizenship of the United States, and whether the proceedings in his case had been according to due process of law, and whether there had been a full, fair, and sufficient trial thereof, including the presentation of the fact of his citizenship, and especially of the proof of his insanity, with which he had previously been afflicted, and for which he had been long confined, undergoing treatment therefor in an asylum for insane persons, and from which there was alleged to be strong proof of his being afflicted when the events occurred for which he was charged with treason, as aforesaid; also what action, if any, was taken by this Government in the premises to secure a new trial or mitigation of the punishment of the said Riel, together with copies of all papers, letters, documents, and correspondence bearing upon the subject-matter; also to inform the Senate whether the said Mallett was at the time of his said alleged application in the employ of the Treasury Department of this Government, and if so, whether since the rejection of said application, or the neglect and refusal of this Government to inquire into the case of said Riel (if said application was rejected and said inquiry was neglected and refused to be made), said Mallett has been promoted or appointed to other and more responsible and lucrative service under this Government, and if so, to what service, together with any other facts relating to the subject-matter of the trial and execution of said alleged American citizen Riel by the authorities of the Dominion of Canada.

And whereas the said Edmund Mallett, under his hand, in a letter dated at Washington, D. C., August 24, 1885, and widely published in the press and supposed to have been communicated to the President and to the Secretary of State, alleged in reference to his interviews with the President and the Secretary of State that the Government refused to inquire into said case, except upon the condition following (among others), to wit, the condition contained in these words: "First. The American Government will not take the initiative in examining into Riel's citizenship or the rights thereunder," with other matter, showing, if true, gross neglect and indifference to the rights of an American citizen when in extreme need of the protection of his Government, being without means, deprived of liberty, and about to be executed by a foreign nation: Therefore,

Resolved, further, That the President be requested to inform the Senate whether the aforesaid allegation of the refusal of this Government to institute inquiry into the case of said Riel upon the statements and petitions of the said Edmund Mallett and others is true, and if the same be not true, whether the said Mallett has ever withdrawn or retracted the same, and, if he still adheres to the same, for what reason the said Mallett, since making such public charges against this Government, has been appointed to a responsible and lucrative position in the public service, requiring a high order of ability and of personal integrity for the proper discharge of the duties thereof; and if the above charge of the said Mallett be or be not true, whether the President or the Secretary of State had knowledge thereof and of the contents of a certain book entitled "The Blood of Abel," written by one Wilbur F. Bryant, and published in the year 1887, prior to the said appointment of said Mallett, which said book relates to the case of the said Riel, and contains the aforesaid and other letters and statements of the said Mallett, with much other like evidence and allegations of fact charging this Government with gross and inexcusable negligence in the care and defense of the rights of an American citizen when in foreign parts and about to suffer an infamous death without cause.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PASCO in the chair). The hour of 2 o'clock having arrived, it is the duty of the Chair to lay before the Senate the unfinished business, being the bill (H. R. 9051) to reduce taxation and simplify the laws in relation to the collection of the revenue.

Mr. BLAIR. I will just say, if permitted, in regard to this matter that, as the resolutions are long, I do not ask that they go direct to the President without being considered by the Committee on Foreign Relations if that be thought to be the more judicious way. I only wish the matter to be inquired into in that way which to the committee may seem to be the most appropriate and the most thorough, for it concerns deeply the honor of the Government and it ought not to be, and I do not wish it to be, considered as a partisan matter at all.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It is the duty of the Chair to lay before the Senate the unfinished business.

Mr. BLAIR. I will move to refer the resolutions to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York [Mr. HISCOCK] is entitled to the floor. Does the Senator from New York yield to the Senator from New Hampshire?

Mr. BLAIR. I do not know whether there is any desire on the part of any one to say anything. I think in a matter of this complexity it will be better that the resolutions should go to the Committee on Foreign Relations for examination before proceeding further; but, of course, it is a matter in the hands of the Senate. I am personally indifferent as to what course is taken with them.

Mr. MORGAN. Let the resolutions go to the committee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no objection, as suggested by the Senator from Alabama, the resolutions will be referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations. The Chair hears no objection, and it is so ordered.

Mr. EDMUNDS. I ask my friend from New York to yield to me.

Mr. BLAIR. May I be indulged to say one thing? I suggest that the Committee on Foreign Relations, if they have any doubt at all on the subject, be empowered to send for persons and papers. I can give them some information if it shall become necessary.

Mr. EDMUNDS. The committee will consider that.

WIDOW OF CHIEF-JUSTICE WAITE.

Mr. EDMUNDS. I am authorized and instructed by the Committee on the Judiciary to report without amendment the bill (S. 3621) for the payment to the widow of the late Chief-Justice Morrison R. Waite the balance of a year's salary; and I ask for its present consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the immediate consideration of the bill?

Mr. BERRY. I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arkansas objects. The bill will go to the Calendar.

Mr. COKE subsequently said: I desire to say that I was out of the Chamber when the bill was reported by the chairman of the Judiciary Committee for the relief of Mrs. Waite. I wish to make the statement now that I would have made then had I been here. I voted against that bill in committee, and shall vote against it in the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair informs the Senator that the bill has gone to the Calendar.

Mr. COKE. The Senator from Mississippi [Mr. GEORGE], who is seated just behind me, also voted against the bill in committee.

LIGHT-HOUSES, LIGHT-SHIPS, ETC.

Mr. PALMER. The Senator from New York kindly gives way that I may make some reports. I am instructed by the Committee on Commerce to report back the bill (H. R. 1239) to extend the jurisdiction of the Light-House Board to the Sacramento and San Joaquin Rivers, California, and ask that the Senate conferees be discharged from the further consideration thereof.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It will be so ordered, if there be no objection.

Mr. PALMER. I now move that the Senate recede from its amendment to that bill, which will leave it just as it came from the House of Representatives.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It will be so ordered in the absence of objection. The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. PALMER. As there are several of these bills, for the information of the Senate I will state that the amendments refer to the appropriation. The bills came over here from the House of Representatives with a limit fixed. The Senate merely made the appropriation with each bill. The conferees can not be gotten together now after a conference has been asked, and on that ground I am instructed to report the bill back and move that the Senate recede from its amendments so that bills can be passed as they come from the House. I now report the several bills which are in the position I have indicated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The same order will be made in each case in the absence of objection. The titles of the bills will be reported by the Secretary.

The SECRETARY. A bill (H. R. 1249) for establishing a light-house and fog-signal on Roe Island, Suisun Bay, California.

Mr. DOLPH. I suggest whether it ought to appear that these bills are reported from the Committee on Commerce or reported by the Senate conferees.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair understands this comes in as a report from the Committee on Commerce.

Mr. DOLPH. I think the record will show that these bills are in the hands of a conference committee. I do not profess to be so well informed as to know precisely how the bills got before the Senate.

Mr. PALMER. I consulted with the President of the Senate in regard to this, and he regarded the *modus operandi* as being perfectly proper. The conferees have consulted with other members of the Committee on Commerce.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The conferees will be discharged from the further consideration of the bill.

Mr. DAWES. Nothing is clearer than that any motion which brings the two Houses together takes precedence of all other motions in reference to any bill pending.

Mr. DOLPH. The Senator did not understand my proposition. I think the RECORD shows that the House has non-concurred in the amendments and asked a conference, or that the Senate asked a conference and it was granted by the House? Those bills were sent to a conference committee. Now the Senator from Michigan says he reports them from the Committee on Commerce.

Mr. DAWES. As I understand the parliamentary law, no matter where a bill is, any motion that brings the two Houses together takes precedence of all other motions.

Mr. DOLPH. I am not raising a question as to precedence. I am raising the question as to whether the record should show that these bills are reported back from the Committee on Commerce or whether it should not be by a motion, without any report, by the chairman of the Senate conferees to discharge the conferees from the further consideration of the bills. It was only to get the record straight, so as not to show that the bills were reported by the Committee on Commerce when they are not before that committee, that I ventured to interpose.

Mr. PALMER. Under the circumstances of the case, I imagine, as long as the conferees of the Senate are included in those who recommend this course, there can be no doubt as to its practical operation, whatever may be the technical distinction to be observed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The order is on the motion of the Senator from Michigan that the conferees be discharged, and that the Senate recede from its amendments to each bill. That order will be entered in each case. The titles of the bills will be reported.

The Secretary read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 10183) to establish a light-ship off Grand Round Shoal, near Nantucket, Mass.;

A bill (H. R. 8855) for the establishment of a light-ship with a steam fog-signal at Sandy Hook, New York Harbor;

A bill (H. R. 7604) for the establishment of a light-house and fog-signal at or near Gull Shoal, Pamlico Sound, North Carolina;

A bill (H. R. 7421) for establishing a light off Pamlico Point, North Carolina;

A bill (H. R. 5700) to facilitate the transportation of life-saving and light-house supplies at Hog Island, Virginia; and

A bill (H. R. 1641) for the erection of a light-house at or near a point about midway between Barnegat and Navesink lights, in the State of New Jersey.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The same order will be entered in each case.

ALIEN MINING CORPORATIONS IN THE TERRITORIES.

Mr. JONES, of Nevada, from the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, to whom was referred the following resolution, submitted by Mr. STEWART, October 3, 1888, reported it without amendment, and it was considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to:

Resolved, That the Committee on Mines and Mining be instructed to ascertain and report to the Senate at the beginning of the next session of Congress the number of aliens, foreign companies, and corporations owning or working mines in the Territories of the United States, together with the length of time they have been so engaged, the amount of capital invested by them in mining operations, as near as practicable, the amount of dividends paid, and the amount of money expended by them in such mining operations, and what effect the owning and operating of mines by aliens, foreign companies, and corporations has had upon the growth and prosperity of the Territories; and for that purpose the committee, or any subcommittee thereof, may hold its sessions at such times and places as it may deem proper, and employ such clerical assistance as may be necessary. The expenses of such investigation shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the Senate.

PURCHASE OF SEEDS.

Mr. JONES, of Nevada, from the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, to whom was referred the resolution submitted by Mr. HAWLEY September 20, 1888, reported it with an amendment, after the word "oaths," to insert "also to employ a stenographer;" so as to make the resolution read:

Resolved, That the Committee on Agriculture is instructed to inquire and report concerning the purchase of seeds for distribution by the seeds division of the Department of Agriculture, and for that purpose it shall have power to send for persons and papers and administer oaths, also to employ a stenographer. The expenses of said inquiry shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of said committee.

By unanimous consent, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

The amendment was agreed to.

The resolution as amended was agreed to.

MRS. FANNIE PEARSON.

Mr. JONES, of Nevada, from the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, to whom was referred the following resolution, submitted by Mr. DAVIS September 25, 1888, reported it without amendment; and it was considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of the "miscellaneous items of the contingent fund of the Senate," to Mrs. Fannie Pearson, widow of Granville L. Pearson, deceased, late a session laborer of the Senate, the sum of $360, being an amount equal to six months' salary at the rate per annum allowed by law to the laborer aforesaid; said sum to be considered as including funeral expenses and all other allowances.

COMMITTEE ON ADDITIONAL LIBRARY ACCOMMODATIONS.

Mr. JONES, of Nevada, from the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, to whom was referred the following resolution, submitted by Mr. VOORHEES October 3, 1888, reported it without amendment:

Resolved, That the Select Committee on Additional Accommodations for the Library of Congress be, and it is hereby, authorized to sit during the coming recess of Congress, and any necessary expenses shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the Senate, upon vouchers to be approved by the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate.

Mr. COCKRELL. Let that go over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will go to the Calendar.

MISSISSIPPI RIVER BRIDGE AT LA CROSSE, WIS.

Mr. SPOONER. The Senator from New York kindly yields to me to allow me to ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the bill (H. R. 11139) to authorize the building of a bridge or bridges across the Mississippi River at La Crosse, Wis.

By unanimous consent, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill.

The bill was reported from the Committee on Commerce with amendments.

The first amendment was, in section 1, after the word "built," at the end of line 16, to insert:

And there shall be submitted to the Secretary of War for his examination and approval a design and drawing of the bridge, and a map of the location, giving, for the space of 1 mile above and 1 mile below the proposed location, the topography of the banks of the river, the shore-lines at high and low water, the direction and strength of the currents at all stages, and the soundings, accurately showing the bed of the stream, the location of any other bridge or bridges, and all other information required.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in section 2, line 4, after the word "Wisconsin," to insert "and approved by the Secretary of War;" so as to make the section read:

SEC. 2. That said La Crosse and Minnesota Bridge and Ferry Company shall have the right to charge and collect a reasonable rate of toll, not exceeding the amount limited by the laws of Minnesota or Wisconsin, and approved by the Secretary of War.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was to strike out section 6, in the following words:

SEC. 6. That this act shall take effect and be in force from and after its passage.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendments were concurred in.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed, and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time, and passed.

THE REVENUE LAWS.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 9051) to reduce taxation and simplify the laws in relation to the collection of the revenue.

Mr. HISCOCK. Mr. President, in view of the policy outlined in the President's message and the professions in his letter of acceptance in connection with the provisions of House bill 9051, known as the "Mills bill," it is just to criticise him and the recent attempts of his party to explain away and misrepresent the effect and purpose of the bill which they claim is calculated to benefit rather than injure American labor and capital.

Our people have always imported largely of those goods produced here, but in quantities insufficient for their consumption, and from the first agitation of a tariff for protection to the present time the opponents of that system have urged that the customs duties were added not only to the cost of the goods imported, but also the price of the corresponding articles we produced.

That has been peculiarly the sophism of the American free-trader, and though successfully disproved by Hamilton and by writers and statisticians since his time it nevertheless occasionally transpires that a new or fresh champion will rush into the arena of debate and parade the dogma with all the airs and consequence of a discoverer of some new and startling truth, destined to solve a great economic question; and the President, the latest of all, indorses to the people of the country this old American free-trade argument.

Were this exploded fallacy true, the President should not only urge but resort to every constitutional method to remove the oppression. Revolutionary methods, if necessary, would be approved by the people for the destruction of the system. If this sophism were true, the protective system would never have been adopted, or if adopted, after a brief period the people without distinction of party would have demanded its abandonment.

Mr. ROGER Q. MILLS, in a late magazine article discussing protection, declares:

And the time will come when all the people will rejoice to see this business relation—a darker evil than that of slavery—eliminated from the land. It is a darker evil, for while the Southern system of unrequited toil enslaved the blacks, this system is reducing white labor to slavery, and we revenue reformers or free-traders, if we may be so called, are making our fight for our own race, whose misery keeps pace with our prosperity, and we can measure our present progress, not only by the palaces of millionaires, but by the huts and hovels of oppressed labor.

If Mr. MILLS was right—if it were a darker evil than that of slavery—we would not now be discussing the merits of his bill; the oppressed country would not have waited the slow progress of his party for the last twenty years, but would have contested the question with the "barons" by the heroic and patriotic methods which "eliminated slavery from the land."

I can not consume time in computing the cost in treasure to the American consumers were it a fact that the percentage of duty upon the goods we import are added as well to the price of the similar goods produced here. The amount, I assume, which would have been exacted under the system, were that true, as has been boldly asserted by Mr. Thurman, would be far greater than the present aggregate wealth of all our people. Why, then, has not that wealth been exhausted and our people become beggars and bankrupts, instead of having been made by it the wealthiest upon the globe; and where is the misery and where the hovels and huts described by the distinguished gentleman from Texas?

I assume the President was not so disingenuous as to refer to an hour, a day, or even a year in speaking of the effect of a long approved economic system, but of its defects as a policy for the country, and was warning the people against its exactions and burdens. If he is correct, our protective system is a criminal injustice, and unless he is mistaken it would long before this have impoverished our people and made them the poorest and most degraded upon the earth. Our villages and cities would now be but aggregations of the "huts and hovels" that Mr. MILLS sees only in imagination, and our agricultural area would have been unreclaimed, unsubdued, and unpeopled by civilized man. There must be either some error in the doctrine they indorse, or else

there are countervailing benefits they have not discovered or imparted to us.

But the President says he does not mention the fact "to discredit the system." If he thoroughly believed the old fallacy he indorsed, he should have made his statement to discredit the system of protection and should continue to sound the alarm until (were he right) the burden should be removed from a long-suffering and long-enduring people; and a great national evil should be remedied; when he would be hailed as a deliverer divinely ordained—one after death to be canonized.

For nearly a century we have practically demonstrated that the effect of protection upon national industries by a country possessed of the raw material sufficient for the finished product which its people consume (or if grown upon the earth then adapted to the climate and the soil), to the extent of equalization with more favored conditions elsewhere in respect to cheaper labor or cheaper capital, has been and will be to increase the volume of the product in the market and to depress and cheapen its price; it is a stimulation to, and increases the competition which forces prices downward.

Price depends upon consumption and supply, and protection increases supply to so marked a degree and forces the price so low that it would be ruinous to producers, except for the increase in consumption. If the goods are a necessity, convenience or luxury to man, a lower price enables him to increase their uses, thus adding to his comfort or pleasure. Again the product of the mechanical industries are applied to new uses when made possible on account of their cheapened cost. Especially is this true with respect to iron and steel for building and fencing, resulting in a great saving to farmers and builders.

The facts need not be fortified by statistics. I have a right to appeal to observation. Sugar illustrates the argument. The protection afforded by the German and French Governments to the beet-sugar industries of those countries has doubled the product of the world, forcing the price to the lowest point known. This is also true not only as to iron and steel goods, but equally so with respect to cotton and woolen fabrics, manufactures of wood, chemicals, and confectionery. There is not, I believe, an exceptional line of manufactured articles in use by man that is not to-day at the lowest price in the history of the market.

In these "latter days" political writers and economists have searched for the cause of the great depression in prices which all have recognized, and they have found it largely due to the increased production in the "protected countries," and it has also resulted, as they have learned, that other countries have cheapened the cost of production, correspondingly increasing their volume, and doubtless the smaller percentage of profit upon the larger volume of business has equaled, if not exceeded, the profits upon the smaller but more expensive product.

The last ten or fifteen years have been remarkable for the constantly decreasing cost of production, and our Republican administrations enforcing the policy and system of protection have been the chief and most important force in this successful war upon high prices.

The President and our Democratic friends must have observed this. Possibly partisanship may have impaired the mental vision of the friends, but some other reason should be found for the President proclaiming and indorsing in a campaign document the old worn-threadbare fallacy.

I am quite aware that I have been thrashing old straw—I believe nothing new can be suggested on the tariff question—but the letter of acceptance justified me.

We are all aware of the reasons which vindicate the protection to our industries, even though there follow temporarily an advance in the price of foreign goods we import. They are the rapid decline in the values of both foreign and domestic goods; the diversification of labor, affording opportunity for all to apply themselves to those industries best suited to their physical conditions and mental capacities; the distribution of labor so that too many workers are not compelled to follow a single industry, overburdening it and so increasing the product as to render it unremunerative; the increased mental activity and higher education rendered necessary to engage in mechanical industries, mining and transportation, and their business management and administration; the enhanced value of our raw materials, and the development of our National resources.

Against a possible temporary increase in the price of imported goods to consumers—if advanced at all—I point to our forests made valuable by the mechanical industries that shape their wood into form for a thousand uses; to the iron ore which would be worthless if the American mechanic did not and could not adapt it to the wants of man; to our coal deposits, indispensable for supplying fuel for our manufacturing industries and transportation, practically valueless without them; to our vast system of railroads which are supported from the transportation of our natural products; but above all, to the increased value of our otherwise unproductive territory, transformed into great States by agriculture and the mechanic arts.

Against these totals place the occasional temporarily increased cost to the consumers, which the President exaggerates and deplores, and we will find to the credit of the Republican system of protection that grand sum which defrayed the expenses of our civil war, which has nearly extinguished the public debt, which has maintained and extended our system of internal commerce, has paid the pensions to our soldiers, and which has given a more general and higher education to our people, and increased beyond that of any other era or stage of our National existence the comforts and luxuries of life, and has contributed in a greater degree to individual wealth and earnings. There has been no complaint of burdensome taxation or excessive prices except in Democratic speeches, messages, and letters of acceptance.

We have become a self-supporting, self-defending Nation, with a population of 60,000,000 people, possessed of the resources, education, and skill requisite for their happiness and for the promotion of continued national progress and prosperity. The welfare and advancement of each individual is limited only by his energy and mental and physical capacity. Our Government with its protective policy has and will accomplish for each citizen all that any human Government ever has or can.

No wonder the President supplements his statement of belief in the old sophism that protection so greatly increases prices by the remark that his statement was not made "to discredit the system." But here we have the peculiarity of Democratic argument. An assertion that, were it true, would prove protection a monstrosity in government—made for effect in the November election—is followed by a disclaimer of hostility to it. This is equaled by the professions of a desire to make our labor more remunerative, and at the same time advocating the abandonment of the best market in the world for a competitive share in the poorest as the surest way to accomplish the object.

The issue is fairly joined by the two great political parties, and free trade or protection will be the American policy after March, 1889. Neither subterfuge nor new confessions of faith will conceal or obscure the real question.

Democratic orators in the manufacturing States are attempting to shift their ground and conceal the purpose of their party; but the official utterances of the President, the reports of the Secretary of the Treasury, emphasized by the Mills bill, which was indorsed by the Democratic national convention and passed the House of Representatives by a strict party vote, leave no doubt whatever as to the true position of the Democratic party upon the great economic question.

The history of the Republican party, its platforms, and, above all, the bill reported to the Senate as a substitute for the Mills bill, leaves no doubt as to the position of that party. The Democracy has declared for free trade and for the destruction of our National industries. We have a home market composed of 60,000,000 consumers of the products of our agriculture, and the goods made by our manufacturing industries. The Republican party has resolved to preserve that market for our people, and Democracy with equal resolution proposes free competition with foreign capital and foreign workmen.

It is the same question that divided the North and South, and incited a bloody and expensive war, and the division is on the same agricultural and geographical lines. It is another great struggle on the part of our Southern friends for cheap and degraded labor and against the industrial system of our Northern States; as Mr. MILLS said, "a darker evil than that of slavery."

There are several causes which have tended to increase the value of labor for the last twenty years in this country. The two most prominent are the manufacturing industries of the North and the abolition of slavery in the South. Democracy acquiesced in the latter, but is now making its final struggle for the destruction of the former.

We have a country extending over nearly one hundred degrees of longitude and from the frozen north to the borders of the tropics, rising in altitude from the shores of two oceans to pastures 7,000 feet above the sea, suited to the production of nearly everything necessary to feed and clothe human beings. Its fruits, grains, vegetables, and textile fibers supply the raw material for the necessities and luxuries of life. Our forests abound in those woods adapted to and that can be easily fashioned for all the uses of man, and are so distributed in great abundance over the whole area that with our facilities for transportation the cost when fashioned is a labor cost alone.

Nearly every chemical product required either for its medicinal qualities, for use in manufacturing, or for decoration, is found in our country and scattered throughout our States and Territories so profusely that competition as to price is assured. We are supplied with iron ore and coal from our own mines in an abundance that insures competitive prices in both; the farming area of our country has a capacity over and above the needs of our home consumption more than sufficient to supply the deficiencies in Europe. Our nation of 60,000,000 people with its boundless resources the Democratic party insist shall not be self-supporting or self-sustaining, but shall depend on other nations and the people of other countries to weave the fabrics our people wear and to grow the wool in them, to manufacture the furniture and otherwise fashion the woods they use, and to produce the iron and steel they consume in its various manufactured forms, leaving hidden, undeveloped, and valueless our vast beds of ore. More than this, our agriculture is now encountering sharp competition with the products of India, Australia, the Argentine Republic, and other South American countries, and Democracy threatens in its crusade for cheap labor to impoverish our home market.

There are about five hundred paragraphs in the Mills bill relating to

enumerated articles in the dutiable schedule of our present tariff. The Mills bill transfers to the free-list about one hundred of the paragraphs. Sixty-six relate to manufactured articles and twenty-six to the products of the farm, garden, or mine. The Mills bill reduces the duty on articles in nearly two hundred paragraphs of the present law. By it three-fifths of the products of our country are either thrown open to absolute free trade or the protection is reduced to so meager a scale as to give our market to foreign capital and foreign labor unless our labor be reduced to the foreign rates for wages.

It is cheap labor the other side is fighting for. They have as little sympathy with well-paid labor now as before the war. Their laboring class now, as then, is the colored population, and those who deny them their political rights naturally would cheapen the value of their labor, an equally effective step for their degradation and quite likely necessary to maintain supremacy over them. Well paid men are well fed, well clothed, strong, and become educated, and will not remain in political servitude.

I know the excuse is the reduction of our revenues. On that point there is no particular difference between the two parties. The substitute reported by the Senate Finance Committee provides the more surely and for a larger reduction than the Mills bill, and the necessity for reducing taxation, therefore, is not involved in this controversy.

Democracy is not distressed over the surplus question now. "One hundred million dollars wrung from the tax-payers annually to be squandered in improvident appropriations" was the party cry four years ago. This year we have but little surplus over their appropriations. The Democratic leaders have coined another phrase, and but little has been said in the present discussion about the surplus. The hungry crowd in possession of the Departments has nearly exhausted it, and for the meager amount remaining in the Treasury a hungry expectant crowd is clamoring. "Reduction of surplus" is not so industriously used to conjure with as four years ago. The Mills bill illustrates this. The most that can be claimed for the measure is reduction in our revenues of about $70,000,000. Two and four years ago we were assured by our Democratic friends that they could be reduced $100,000,000 or more.

Both sides concede that a reduction can be made and in about the same amount, still leaving a sufficient revenue to pay the interest on the public debt, the pensions to soldiers, and for the administration of the Government; therefore the question of the amount of taxation is not involved in the discussion, but that of lessening the burdens to consumers and the manner in which the reduction shall be made is involved in the controversy.

Both parties propose to raise a large proportion of our revenues from customs levied upon imports; and I maintain that independent of the incidental benefits claimed for protection it is a matter of no consequence to the American consumer or tax-payer whether the customs duties are levied and collected on four hundred articles which enter equally into general use here and that will be produced in this country (if the labor cost is equalized with that of Europe and India) in sufficient quantities to supply our wants, or upon one-half of that four hundred, the other half being placed on the free-list. The burden of taxation is not lightened by either policy.

My argument is that, independent of the incidental protection which the tariff may afford, it is not of the slightest benefit to the consumers or tax-payers whether our revenues are raised by a protective tariff upon one-half of the dutiable goods now in general use and so low rates imposed upon the other half as to surrender our market to the importers altogether.

The Southern cotton-planter, I assume, uses both the agricultural implements and the cotton-ties. How is his burden increased if the duty is distributed upon the steel of both or placed wholly upon one, and why would the burden of taxation alone be increased if his share of the duty should all be placed upon one and a prohibitory tariff imposed upon the other? Manufactures of iron and steel are consumed generally by the American people, and it is fair to say that outside of cutlery and a few other articles for personal use, from the steam engine and the steel rail to the sewing-needle, directly or indirectly, the taxation imposed is borne by the tax-payers and consumers of the country, and in about the proportion they use them or depend upon the industries in which they are employed.

How then is the tax increased or made more oppressive if levied upon all steel goods in popular or general use than only upon one-half, and the others added to the free-list? The free-list half may, of course, be so arranged as to insure an unequal distribution of taxation upon localities; if there are any articles used exclusively in one portion of the country, as cotton-ties in the cotton States, then to place them upon the free-list would be a dishonest discrimination in favor of that section and not an equalization of taxation. To further illustrate this point take the article soap. It is made from agricultural products and animal fats, largely utilizing and making valuable waste products and materials that would be worthless and become pestilential except for that industry. Of this article we make $20,000,000 worth annually. The ad valorem duty is 20 per cent., and wherein is it more burdensome than the duty upon sugar equally in use by all classes and equally a necessity? Is the tax to the consumer lightened because 67 per cent. ad valorem is placed on sugar and soap is added to the free-list rather than 50 per cent. upon sugar and 20 per cent. upon soap, or has the location of the industries something to do with it?

What I have just said illustrates the sectional character of the Mills bill, and also equally disposes of the pretense that it is not a free-trade measure.

The House bill adds one hundred and three articles to the free-list, including wool, certain manufactures of wood, salt, cotton-ties, tin-plate, soap and glycerine (both practically agricultural industries), vegetables, meats, milk, certain machinery, etc. The American products competing with foreign goods added to the free-list aggregate in value at least $600,000,000 annually. They are as generally consumed by those classes who should carry the burden of taxation as those on the dutiable-list, and no reason can be given for the line drawn between the two, and none can be imagined, unless it was to strike down a portion of our protected industries now and the remainder later. The letter of the distinguished Senator from Missouri advertises the intention equally with the magazine article by Mr. MILLS to which I have referred. I could weary the Senate with quotations from the speeches of the sponsors for and friends of the monstrosity declaring the purpose as I have indicated, but it is unnecessary, for the bill advertises rather than disguises it.

The old free-trade doctrine was to raise the revenues from those goods consumed but not produced here. That has been abandoned by modern free-traders for an equally vicious and fatal one to our industries, which, instead of distributing the import duties so as to protect the whole line of domestic goods, makes so general additions to the free-list that the many hundred millions of dollars in capital employed in our home industries would be wasted or diminished and the labor engaged therein scattered and impoverished, and the now nicely adjusted proportions of labor to our various industries disturbed to the injury of all.

In this connection I refer to a startling feature of the Mills bill. I have before me a list of the principal products of the manufactories of the United States. The value and places of manufacture are taken from the census report of 1880, and doubtless there has been some increase since, but there has been little or no change in respect to the location or percentage of product in the respective States, I am assured. The list contains about one hundred lines of goods, all now protected. The aggregate value of the product for the last census year, 1879, was nearly two thousand million dollars. Of this amount less than 5 per cent. was manufactured in those States which composed the late Southern Confederacy, and a little more than 95 per cent. was manufactured and made chiefly outside of the States which contributed their quota to the Confederate service. This is a startling fact, but I have something still to add more remarkable. The Mills bill envelopes them all within its cuttle-fish folds and provides a 38 per cent. reduction in the protection now afforded them by law.

I have a table before me from which I desire to quote:

Soap and candles—$26,260,792 worth made in the Northern States and only $291,935 in value made in the Confederate States—placed on the free-list.

Bags, other than paper, $9,635,300 worth made in the Northern States; $91,300 made in the Confederate States.

Glass manufactures, $21,154,571 in value made in the Northern States; none in the Confederate States, and there is a reduction upon some of the grades or classes.

Stone and earthen ware, $7,814,027 in value made in the Northern States; $129,702 made in the late Confederate States.

Confectionery, a luxury, $23,880,672 in valae made in the Northern States; $1,756,361 made in the late Confederate States, and a reduction of 20 per cent. of the duties or in the protection.

Brushes and brooms, $10,272,527, the value of the products made in the Northern States; $288,328 made in the Confederate States; and a reduction from 20 to 33 per cent. in the protection.

Iron-work, architectural (structural), $2,084,287 worth made in the Northern States, and $25,250 made in the Confederate States, and 11 per cent. reduction made by the Mills bill.

Files, $2,486,533 worth made in the Northern States, and none made in the Confederate States, and a reduction of duty of 40 per cent. by the Mills bill.

Nails and spikes, $5,629,240 worth made in the Northern States, none made in the Confederate States, and a 20 per cent. reduction made by our Confederate friends.

Carriages and wagons, $100,463,044 worth made in the Northern States, and $4,278,292 made in the Confederate States, and a reduction of 14 per cent. made by their representatives.

Furniture, $75,885,045 worth made in the Northern States, and $1,960,680 worth made in the Confederate States, and the Mills bill reduces the protective duties nearly one-half.

Hardware as classified in the census report, $22,644,793 worth made in the Northern States and $8,900 worth made in the Confederate States, and a reduction of 11 per cent. is made by the Mills bill.

But, Mr. President, I will not weary the Senate with calling attention to these various items.

Mr. HAWLEY. Will the Senator allow me to make a statement

right there so that it may go in in this place? I perceive that the majority of the Committee on Ways and Means which made up that bill is composed of Democrats from Confederate States in the proportion of six Democrats from Confederate States to two from Northern States.

Mr. REAGAN. If the Senator from New York will allow me, I desire to inquire in which class he puts the States of Maryland, West Virginia, Kentucky, and Missouri?

Mr. HISCOCK. I will say in reference to that that these products are largely in the North outside of those States. The comparison I speak of here, however, is between the Confederate States and the others.

Mr. REAGAN. The aggregate, then, will embrace the States of Maryland, West Virginia, Kentucky, and Missouri?

Mr. HISCOCK. Yes, sir.

A word in reference to Texas. Perhaps it is proper that I should make this statement in view of the expression I shall quote from the remarks of the Senator from Texas [Mr. COKE]. We will take the products of Texas on this list. They are:

Brick and tile	$448,418
Carriages and wagons	301,800
Lumber, planed	456,600
Lumber, sawed	2,673,449
Oil, cotton-seed, and cake	276,450
Sash, doors, and blinds	416,500
Foundry and machine-shop products	532,778
Tin-ware, copper-ware, and sheet-iron ware	491,420

Of the products of those industries I have indicated Texas contributed $5,597,415 in value only.

Something has been said in respect to the constitution of the committee that reported the House bill. Texas was most prominently represented there, and the share she has had in the formulation of the bill it is unnecessary for me to refer to.

I think Arkansas, as one of her Representatives was so prominent in the formation of the bill, should be mentioned. That State manifestly should indicate the policy that should control or shape this country in respect to manufactures and protection. I have searched through this list and I find that Arkansas contributed of those products in sawed lumber $1,793,848 worth, and oil, cotton-seed, and cake, $590,000 worth, making $2,383,848 in value as her total manufacture of the products I have indicated. And Arkansas will be potential in shaping the financial or the economic policies of the Government if the House bill is accepted by the country.

A representative of Tennessee has had something to do with the House bill. Tennessee made of brick and tile a little more than half a million dollars' worth; of carriages and wagons a little more than a million dollars in value; of foundry and machine-shop products a little more than a million dollars' worth. She furnished some lumber, some cotton goods, and the aggregate of her contribution to the volume which I have given is valued at $12,068,481.

West Virginia speaks through this same bill. The Senator from Texas has inquired whether she was represented in the list to which I have called attention. She is to the extent of having contributed $5,385,296 in manufactured goods.

Georgia, I think, has done better than the others, for her people make some cotton goods, and with her cotton manufactures the aggregate is $15,083,046.

Kentucky contributed to more items upon the list than any other of the Southern States, and the total of her manufactures in these lines of goods (I do not speak of her whisky) amounts to $18,156,335. I have them aggregated together, so that I can give the figures here. The measure which was forced through the House and in favor of which the Democracy pronounce in the Senate was formulated by gentlemen who represent the States named, and by those gentlemen alone, I may say, for they had the control of the Committee on Ways and Means.

They aggregate as follows:

Texas	$5,597,415
Georgia	15,083,046
Kentucky	18,156,385
Tennessee	12,068,481
West Virginia	5,385,286
Arkansas	2,383,848
Total	58,674,461

These States contributed of the manufactured goods enumerated in the schedule to which I have referred the value of $58,674,461 out of an aggregate of $1,867,857,392, and these Representatives assume to speak for the industries of the country, to shape our economical policy and to provide the markets for the wage-army employed by the capital invested in manufacture.

We have heard it stated in this Chamber, and it has been shouted all over the country, that the Mills bill was not a free-trade measure, that it only reduced the present protection 6 or 7 per cent. That statement is untrue, and unless made by one ignorant of the facts, was intended to deceive. It is easy enough to make a bill—the House of Representatives has made one—which will show an average reduction of only 6 or 7 per cent. in the duties upon those articles as to which duties are reduced, but which will in effect practically open our market to free foreign commerce.

The average reduction of the ad valorem rate of duty under the Mills bill is ascertained by finding what per cent. the amount collected under the present law on certain dutiable goods would be on their foreign value, and the per cent. the less amount collected under the rates of the Mills bill would be on the foreign value, assuming that importations would not be increased. The differences, Mr. MILLS claims, would be the average reduction. Therefore if the difference in the two rates upon one article is small, its importations large—as in the case of sugar—and the importations of the others comparatively small, with a large reduction of rates, still the sugar will hold up the average reduction; and this trick (I withdraw the word "trick") has been perpetrated. The high ad valorem rate upon sugar with its large importations makes the average percentage of reduction upon all to appear small; but the protection upon the other articles would be practically removed, for the purpose of protection.

But omit sugar and the liquors, wines, tobacco, and silks (upon which the rates are not changed) imported from the calculations and the average reduction of the present duties upon American manufactured articles in the dutiable-list in the Mills bill will be from 40 per cent. to 50 per cent.

In sugar, above all other importations, the duty is added to the price and without any compensatory benefits, for the reason that we do not have a competitive production here to force the foreign price down; and it is not the desire of the people, the tax-payers, the farmers, mechanics, and merchants that this burden should be levied upon a necessity in every home to the end that the American market may be opened to foreign goods, rivals of those of American manufacture. The sugar industry, however, was available to hold up the per cent. of average protection to American industries, but the fatal reduction proposed can not be concealed or escape scrutiny.

I will not refer to the gentlemen responsible for the Mills bill or to the States they represent, but I have a right to complain that sectionalism inspired them, and I denounce the National Convention that indorsed the measure and the candidates who approved the platform and accepted its nomination as committed to a monstrosity in sectional legislation.

I would prefer that the issues between the two parties should not be sectional, but that can not now be avoided. It has been forced upon Republican speakers to warn and organize the people against the sectional measure these new masters would impose upon the country. We are justified in referring to the conditions that would largely follow their attainment of the object, end, and purpose they are striving for, and to invite a comparison between the South and the North and contrast the economic policies of the two sections.

I recognize the fact that the South emerged from a civil war devastated and prostrated by it, and compelled to adapt herself to another and better civilization, and to build upon free and paid labor as the foundation for wealth and prosperity. Her laboring class now, as before the war, as I have said, is the negro, and it is most unfortunate that Southern labor is denied political rights. Contempt for, and essentially a proprietorship in, the black man are at the bottom of it all. In a condition of political servitude, the negro has no power to compel deference or respect, and therefore we see a solid South—solid at least as to that portion of it which votes—making, I hope, its last great struggle to degrade labor.

We occasionally hear that the new South would welcome Northern capital and Northern enterprise, but I confess that in the present situation I recognize hostility to both, and a sullen determination from the South to continue a prosecution of undiversified agriculture; to hold the labor in a state of political servitude and in a condition of peonage; and if they are successful the immigration which seeks cheap land to build homes upon and add to its value by improvements will be checked, if not entirely turned backed. Villages and cities will not be vitalized or made prosperous by mechanical industries promoted by Northern capital or enterprise.

The gentlemen who are responsible for and guiding this most unwise policy have again invaded the North and witness her growth and wealth and advancing prosperity, but without profit. They seem to be imbued with the spirit of a generation or two before them, which retreated before the advancement of civilization.

They are now North addressing political meetings largely composed of our highest type of manhood, the mechanics and farmers who govern our Commonwealth. Those audiences should create in patriotic hearts a desire to multiply the constituencies which compose them, and extend into and over the New South our Northern industries, I might properly say Northern civilization.

The policy of proscription and war on wages may continue for a period, but never again will be aided, in my opinion, by Northern electoral votes.

The President claims that his policy, as illustrated by the Mills bill, would increase our foreign trade. With whom, pray, and in what? In the agricultural products? Of many of those I grant we now produce a surplus and have the capacity to largely increase. It has been claimed that its price is established by the foreign market, but that is not true as to our home consumption. Its price is made in a large and valuable home market, in the cities and manufacturing centers that are supplied and fed by the country adjacent to them. These home-market prices are protected naturally by the cost of transportation from

more remote neighborhoods, and largely by reason of the perishable character of the products, while the foreign market controls the price of the surplus we send to it. Of our edible products we export less than 6 per cent. of our production; and let me briefly trace the history of the prices of that exportation for the last few years.

The average export price of wheat for 1886 was 43 per cent. lower than the average price from 1870 to 1886; the decrease from 1870 to 1875 was 13 per cent.; from 1875 to 1885 it was 20 per cent., and from 1870 to 1887 the decrease was 31 per cent.

Corn decreased in its export price from 1870 to 1875, 8 per cent.; and from 1875 to 1880 the additional increase was 33 per cent., and from 1880 to 1887 there was a further decrease of 7 per cent., making a total of 43 per cent. from 1870 to 1887.

The fine brands of wheat-flour exported have decreased in their export value in the last ten years about one quarter.

Bacon and ham from 1870 to 1875 decreased 27 per cent. in value per pound; from 1875 to 1880, 30 per cent. additional. They have a little more than held their own since 1880, but the decline from 1870 to 1887 was 50 per cent.

Cheese declined from 1870 to 1875, 13 per cent. in its pound value; from 1875 to 1880, 26 per cent., and from 1870 to 1887 we find a reduction of 40 per cent.

The foreign prices of agricultural products have been constantly falling, and it is unnecessary for me to more than briefly mention the cause. Increased facilities for transportation the world over has developed new grain-fields and vast pasturage for cattle; has cheapened the cost of transit to those markets where the supply is not equal to the demand, and the price has year by year been forced downward. The limit of capacity for production in the agricultural countries now competing with us has not been more nearly reached than with us, and confronting this fact these Democratic law-makers talk about the advantage of a foreign market for the products of our farms.

Something over one-half of our agricultural product is consumed by those engaged in that industry, excluding cotton. Two-thirds of the surplus and at least three times the amount which is exported is consumed by those engaged in manufacturing and dependent upon it. The best market in the world for the fruits of American agriculture is at home. Not exceeding 8 or 10 per cent. of its fruits, including cotton, ever finds a foreign market. To preserve our home market and extend it should be the policy of every American farmer, and this only can be done by extending and developing the other industries.

Transportation is now the important question in the West. Railroads have opened up there new States and Territories, and the Western people claim with good reason that the cost of transportation to the Eastern States and seaboard makes their land unremunerative. Grant it, and what relief have they in the foreign market to which I have referred, which involves to reach it a further carrying cost? There is a certain remedy—in developing manufacturing which will build cities with populations like those of the older States, in fostering the mechanical arts, and inviting to citizenship those outside of agricultural employment. Why should the West pay for transportation to the Eastern or to the foreign market? They would better build one at home. This the Republican party invites the West to do. On the other hand, the Democracy propose the transportation from Kansas and Minnesota of their products to Europe by rail and water at a cost that will well-nigh consume their value, and then propose the transportation back to them of their manufactured supplies. The transportation charges in a short time will add to their cost far more than the tariff required to insure home manufacture and home consumption of the agricultural products.

This question has been discussed generally with reference to its destruction of the American manufacturer, but there is equally involved the home market of 90 per cent. of the products of our agriculture, the pittance of 10 per cent. (6 per cent. excluding cotton) should not be considered except by the cotton growers, and the contest is with them. Of the cotton crop 70 per cent. is exported, and the balance is manufactured here. Of the other agricultural products 94 or 95 per cent. finds a market here, and 5 or 6 per cent. only is exported.

The chief argument made by the opponents of a protective tariff is that it is oppressive upon agriculture, but to this great industry it is as nourishing and protective as to cotton or woolen fabrics or iron or steel goods.

In this connection I beg to refer to a few of the manufacturing industries which are practically agricultural or tributary to her.

First, take paper—and we have all been amused, and many doubtless have been prejudiced against that industry by the cry of "wood-pulp." Paper is an article of necessity in one form or another in business and domestic life, and its manufacture is an absolute support of agriculture.

In the year of 1887 the value of the product of the paper manufactories of the country was $95,000,000. Paper is made from vegetable fiber, rags, old paper, straw, corn-stalks, wood, and grasses, amounting in value in 1887 to about $50,000,000, and in addition to this, $20,000,000 worth of chemicals and other materials were used in its manufacture. It is fair to say that more than one-half the value of all the paper we use is a contribution of waste material or fibrous products which would be of little or no value except to manufacture into paper.

Woolen goods also illustrate the benefit of protection to agriculture. In the last census year the value of our woolen fabrics was about $267,000,000; and last year $100,000,000 in value of American wool was purchased and manufactured into them.

The product of the starch industry amounted in 1880 to about $7,500,000. Its manufacture afforded a market for $5,000,000 worth of corn and potatoes, and I have been assured that the product for the last year has required 4,000,000 bushels of potatoes and 15,000,000 bushels of corn.

In the census year of 1880 agriculture contributed twenty-nine and a half million pounds of broom-corn to the broom industry. The amount contributed to the manufacture of glue in 1880 was nearly $3,000,000, largely a waste product from slaughtered domestic animals.

In the manufacture of linseed-oil $15,000,000 worth is made annually; purely an agricultural product.

Soap, which the Mill's bill puts on the free-list, in its manufacture consumes from $12,000,000 to $15,000,000 worth of animal grease, a large proportion of which would be waste except for that great industry and the manufacture of crude glycerine, of which 9,000,000 pounds were made in the year 1887, all from the same agricultural products.

The curled-hair industry, which furnishes us with mattresses and goods of like character, utilizes an absolutely waste agricultural product—except for it—the hair of slaughtered domestic animals, cattle, hogs, and horses. The value of the raw material is not less than $1,750,000 yearly.

Seventeen million dollars' worth of glucose is manufactured annually in this country, consuming 20,000,000 bushels of corn.

There are other equally important industries to which I might refer; but those I have mentioned illustrate the direct connection between agriculture and manufacture.

Each individual farmer may not contribute to the quantity of hair or fat of domestic animals that is utilized, nor to the immense amount of straw made into paper; his potatoes may not be disposed of to the starch factory or his corn to the glucose factory, but the total consumption of those agricultural products by the various industries increases the price and every farmer receives his proportion of benefit from the increase.

I propose now to invite your attention to that part of the President's letter of acceptance especially devoted to the manufacturing industries of our country.

I understand the letter to indorse the Mills bill, not by the title, but by referring to the consideration of that measure in the House of Representatives. He says:

> When the Democratic majority were attempting with extreme moderation to redeem the pledge common to both parties, they were met by determined opposition and obstruction, and the minority (the Republicans) refused to co-operate.

Certainly this is an unqualified approval of the House bill, and an emphatic denunciation of the Republican opposition. For the latter he has our thanks.

I have already described the extreme moderation of the proposed legislation. Earlier in the letter, the President says:

> We propose, too, by extending the market for our manufacturers to promote the steady employment of labor.

Repeatedly the President has said his policy would extend our markets; he has offered to the manufacturers free wool and free lumber as a bribe for their support. To the first, as a business proposition, they have replied that the wool product of the United States is indispensable to their success and they would prefer to have its production stimulated. To the other, that it is inconsequential in view both of meager Canadian supply and the probabilities of a Canadian export duty; and his overtures have been spurned with contempt.

Whoever has investigated protection and consulted with gentlemen administering the manufacturing industries has been convinced that it is not in Congress or places of "public trust" that we find the greater mental capacity and more intelligent comprehension of economic questions and industrial progress. I admit that, as a class, the men directing the business interests of our country are superior to any other, and they are far more capable than the President even in the ways and means to extend their markets, and almost without exception have rejected his policy as unwise and sure to prove unprofitable; and my arguments against the "policy" will not be addressed to the directors of the industries, but rather to their employés, the wage workers or earners.

The declared theory of the President is that goods are manufactured in other countries at a less cost than here; that the amount of customs duties we impose upon foreign goods exactly equals the difference between the foreign and American cost at that time. At that low foreign cost, then, we must compete in foreign markets, and that can only be successfully accomplished by a reduction of the present profit of the manufacturers or a reduction in labor cost. Labor is as perfectly organized in this as in any other country for its protection; here it is the more intelligent, and the trade and labor organizations know whether as a rule capital receives more than its due proportion of the price of the goods made. It may, at an exceptional establishment, on account of unusual facilities for procuring raw material or an advantageous market,

receive an unequal share, but as a rule labor has been successful in its struggle with capital and established an equitable division between the two. The Government can now borrow money at 2½ per cent. per annum, and railroad securities earning 4 per cent. per annum are sold at par. Our Eastern and New York savings-banks, many of them at least, pay only 4 per cent. The rates of interest do not actually measure the profits of capital in the industries, on account of the unequal risks and hazards, but when the volume of capital seeking investment at remunerative rates is large the rates of interest are not far below the business profits, if the industries are thriving. It is also true that competition has forced prices down to the lowest point remunerative to capital and consistent with the present value of labor or wages paid.

I have referred to the downward tendency of prices, but the subject will bear further mention. The highest authority furnishes twenty-two articles, combining agricultural products and manufactured goods—leading articles in common use—and the average reduction in the prices from 1865 to 1875 was 22 per cent., and from 1875 to 1885 it was 36 per cent., but the most certain proof of the decrease is the custom-house appraisal of the goods imported in 1880 compared with the importations for the last fiscal year, goods which directly compete with the American manufactures.

The average import price of woolen manufactures entered for consumption in the United States for the years 1880 and 1887 were:

Blankets:	Per pound.
1880	$0.619
1887	.513

A fall of 8.6 cents per pound, or 13.89 per cent.

Clothing, ready-made, for both sexes:	Per pound.
1880	$3.008
1887	1.812

A fall of $1.196 per pound, or 39.76 per cent.

Dress goods:	Per square yard.
1880	$0.232
1887	.209

A fall of 2.3 cents per square yard, or 9.91 per cent.

All flannels, blankets, hats of wool, knit goods, balmorals, woolen and worsted yarns, and manufactures not otherwise specified:	Per pound.
1880	$1.264
1887	.789

A fall of 47.5 cents per pound, or 37.58 per cent.

The decline in price of the goods I have mentioned is not greater or less than upon other lines, but in connection with the important fact that our people in 1887 imported more than $200,000,000 in value of goods that directly compete with the American manufactures demonstrate the small margin of profit. They would not permit importation of that which they could profitably make here; and the cost of the production of American goods, then, must be reduced to successfully compete in a foreign market, and that reduction must inevitably be in the labor cost; so then the wage-earners are invited to open the American markets or share them at the expense of a reduction in their own wages. It can only be accomplished in that way—by surrendering a market of sixty million people to obtain a competitive share in the inferior markets elsewhere.

Where are the markets of the world—the foreign markets the President invites our people to share?. Russia, Italy, Austria-Hungary, Germany, France, Roumania, Belgium—all the European nations except England and Holland—Holland is moving in that direction—preserve their markets to their own industries. So do Canada and Brazil. All the European nations I have mentioned place their surplus here and in all the markets that subsidized transportation can reach or colonial possessions provide, at prices we can not compete with. It is said by the advocates of the Mills bill that the conditions for manufacturing in this country compare with those of her European or India rivals, except that labor is more costly here. To this I agree. They also admit in public that the protective duties should equalize the labor cost of manufacturing, so as to give that protection which will compensate for our high wages; and I agree to that. But it is claimed by its advocates that the Mills bill does that, and this I most emphatically deny.

It is remarkable that reputable gentlemen should go upon the record making that claim which, like the one that the bill only reduces the protection of the present law 6 or 7 per cent., is viciously false and intended to deceive.

First, where is the compensatory duty for the labor cost in those products added to the free-list wool, lumber, certain manufactures of wood, salt, cotton-ties, soap, specified machinery, tin-plate, glycerine, extract of hemlock, needles, brick, vegetables, curled hair, beans, pease, split pease, broom-corn, fresh meats, game and poultry, milk, tallow, building and monumental stone, etc., one hundred and three articles, I think, in all. It must be remembered that the labor cost, however expended, whether in one branch of manufacture or another, or in agriculture, is equalized where mechanical industries are established.

The free-list aims practically at Northern industries. Labor on the products I have indicated is equally well paid with that engaged in the industries the Mills bill professes to protect. The American labor cost in the manufactured articles added to the free-list and in those left upon the dutiable-list is based upon the same rates of wages. Then what protection is afforded for the wage-workers here employed in their production? It amounted in 1880, according to the census report, to about $500,000,000. Last year their value is variously estimated at from $600,000,000 to $800,000,000.

I pass to the dutiable-list and their claim that in the principal dutiable schedules not less than 35 per cent. ad valorem has been given to imported articles and that that rate more than equals their labor cost.

The Senator from Texas [Mr. COKE], who declared from his seat that "if there is one thing in this world that the average Texan would go any number of miles out of his way to kick and kill and destroy it was a protective tariff," stated in debate that the percentage of labor in the cost of cotton goods is less than 23 per cent.; in glass, 50 per cent.; in iron and steel a fraction less than 19 per cent.; and he undertakes to give the percentage of labor cost and that of the material in those products, respectively; doubtless all taken from the census report, "Statistics of Manufacture," and entirely worthless as evidence of what he stated, for the reason that the labor cost of the materials used or manufactured by the various establishments is not given. The statistics do not furnish the labor cost of woolen clothing, commencing with the sheep farming, or of the other materials used, dyes, etc., and commencing with their raw material before chemical processes had been applied to them, or the cost of cotton goods, commencing with the planter who raised the cotton. Cotton is the material for the spinner, the yarn for the weaver, each furnishing a finished product, and often produced by separate establishments. Iron ore and limestone and fuel constitute the raw material for pig-iron. Iron for steel bars, blooms, or ingots, which are manufactured into wire, tools, etc. Commencing with the mine, half a dozen separate industries advance the manufacture each a stage, until the highest finished product is reached; and the Census Report does not attempt to give the labor cost in the separate stages of advancement upward.

Gentlemen who have discussed this question upon the theory that the Mills bill gives protection to the value of the labor cost in goods have drawn their facts and figures from the "Statistics of Manufacture" and the report of the Commissioner of Labor, Mr. Wright, and I will briefly refer to his table, "The Boot and Shoe Industry." He states the labor cost at varying percentages, according to the character of the goods, from a little less than 19 per cent. up to a little more than 52 per cent. That of the material used at from less than 46 per cent. to above 76 per cent. Material is principally leather; and turning to his table of "Manufactures of Leather" we find its labor cost to be at varying percentages, from less than 12 per cent. to nearly 25 per cent., and the cost of material from 71 per cent. to over 82 per cent. Hides are the principal raw material for leather, and the labor cost and the growth of the animal and the bark and materials used to manufacture the leather, the transportation, etc., are not stated. Here we have three stages of manufacture, in the first of which the labor cost is not given, and in the second only a part of the raw material used, but a careful analysis of the table with other well-established data prove that the labor cost in the boot and shoe industry would not be less than 90 per cent.

Mr. Wright's table on glass also illustrates the point. His percentage of labor cost runs from 38 per cent. to 72 per cent., depending on the quality, etc.; the cost of the material from 11 per cent. to over 60 per cent. These materials are fuel, sand, clay, lime, lumber, and soda, their price in the market being little more than their labor cost, as we well know, but Mr. Wright does not give that.

In pig-iron he states the labor cost at about an average of 12 per cent., varying at the furnaces; and of the material from 65 per cent. to 85 per cent. The labor cost of iron-ore and coal is given and runs from 50 per cent. to 65 per cent., but that of limestone, its labor cost, is not stated. We know its value is principally labor.

The Mills bill proposes to give an equivalent of an average of 50 per cent. ad valorem duty on the foreign price of a part of iron and steel manufactures, but so distributed as to destroy the industry here, and adds a part to the free-list. Mr. Wright's tables demonstrate that, considered with other verified data, their labor value is 90 per cent. of the finished product; but in respect to all his tables the labor cost is so incompletely stated in the materials used that it is impossible to arrive at it in any specified finished product.

I believe I have sufficiently illustrated the fallacy of the argument that the labor cost is covered by the protection afforded in the Mills bill.

Cotton is a raw material and free of duty, as cheap here as to the foreign manufacturer; therefore it was practicable for the gentlemen to obtain correctly the labor cost in all lines of cotton goods; but that they did not do, and in the light of their legerdemain by tables I am justified in charging that the omission was for the reason that the truth would defeat or expose them.

We have the authority of Mr. Edward Atkinson, who is interested in cotton manufacturing and a distinguished statistician, that the actual labor cost in cotton goods is upward of 90 per cent.; that the profit divided to the manufacturer of cotton goods is only 6 per cent. annually. For a production of cotton goods valued at $1,100,000 he demonstrates that $940,000 was expended for labor, commencing with growing the cotton.

To demonstrate the value added to cotton by its manufacture into

articles for use, I have been furnished the following statement by a manufacturer:

Shirtings worth 7 cents per yard are worth 30 cents per pound.
Shirtings worth 10 cents per yard are worth 36 cents per pound.
Shirtings worth 11 cents per yard are worth 40 cents per pound.
Muslin worth 11 cents per yard is worth 44 cents per pound.
Muslin worth 12 cents per yard is worth 50 cents per pound.
Muslin worth 15 cents per yard is worth 70 cents per pound.
Bleached mull worth 10 cents per yard, worth $1 a pound.
Yarns from 18 cents per pound to $1.25 a pound.

The cotton costing for each pound of goods from 12 to 16 cents, according to their value per yard and per pound, and the increase or added value above that is labor.

Labor increased the cotton in value from 250 per cent. to 600 and 700 per cent., and the average ad valorem rate of duty upon the foreign price of cotton manufactures imported in 1887 was 40.17 per cent.

Hon. Abram S. Hewitt, a leading Democratic statesman, speaking with reference to iron and steel goods—he is a manufacturer of both—asserted before the Ways and Means Committee of the House of Representatives that 90 per cent. of their value is their labor cost. And so falls the claim of the President and of the framers of the Mills bill that it gives protection to the labor employed in the industries.

Mr. President, the pretense for the Mills bill is that our protective duties are a burden upon our country, that the rich grow richer and the poor grow poorer under them. That is untrue, sir, and is proved by the increase in the rates of wages and consumption per capita of those food products and cloth fabrics that contribute to the pleasure and comfort of man. By the extended facilities for a more general education for all, but more especially for the poor; by the increase in the number of savings-bank depositors and owners of land; by the greater production of labor as now applied to new mechanical inventions and scientific discoveries in all our industries, including agriculture; it is far above the increase in the cost of the manual labor employed and 25 per cent., 50 per cent., 75 per cent., 100 per cent., and in many cases 200 per cent. and 300 per cent. more than compensatory for the higher wages paid.

Important inventions have been made in the mechanic arts and equally important discoveries in the sciences. Class distinctions and lines are undefined and in no sense are barriers to advancement; the various industries and employments contribute professional men, politicians, statesmen, merchants, manufacturers, bankers—the good, bad, rich, and poor—in their proper proportions. There has been a general improvement in condition. The poor are not growing poorer, but the protection policy has resulted in a constantly increasing prosperity of all.

Mr. President, I believe I have demonstrated the absurdity of the proposition that we can obtain foreign markets except by the equalization of the labor cost of our goods with the cost of those we must compete with and that it can only be done by lowering the wages here.

I believe I have demonstrated that we can not compete with foreign goods in our own market without protection, and that the present labor cost under the protection system, as an economic question, is more than compensated for in the prosperity of the people.

The Democratic measure was approved by that party in national convention, indorsed by the President in his letter of acceptance, and it proposes to open wide our markets to the competition of foreign goods, without their taxation, for the support of the Government, payment of the public debt, and pensions to the soldiers. Democracy maintains that American producers alone should bear the burden of taxation, and weighted by it contest with England, Germany, Belgium, and India and other markets. The effect of the Mills bill can not be disguised and should not be. The substitute reported to the Senate by the Committee on Finance is equally pronounced in character and purpose. I believe it fairly illustrates the Republican policy of protection, and when its provisions are the law they will defend the American market against foreign competition and importations, and quicken, strengthen, and extend it for the consumption of the fruits of our farms and the products of our mines and factories.

The substitute is not sectional in the protection it would afford. The industries North, South, East, and West are equally provided for. The reductions proposed in the duties on sugars and rice are large, but under the substitute they will remain higher than upon other agricultural products. The committee has not discriminated against any American industry. We did investigate to determine whether, by an equalization of their labor cost with the labor cost elsewhere, certain industries would sustain themselves here, and I do not know of any instance in which protection was refused if the committee concluded prosperity would follow. I do not believe the reduction of duties upon the goods manufactured here will reduce revenues. The experience of the past proves it otherwise, and the substitute under consideration will, in my judgment, in all instances reduce the revenues where larger duties or increased protection is proposed. In its preparation that policy was pursued if manifestly the American product might be enlarged to the demands of our home market and American competition in the manufacture could be assured.

It is probable we have not provided the requisite protection in every instance, but the omissions, I believe, will be found to be very few, and for myself—I speak only for myself—until the substitute with such amendments as may be adopted is the law, I will be willing to correct those errors; I believe it to be the purpose of the committee to continue investigation.

Mr. President, the substitute which has been presented is the opposite of the Mills bill. No comparison of their schedules in respect to the relative reduction of rates by the two bills will be tolerated by its authors; they understand that it stands for protection, and if faulty anywhere in that respect that it should be amended; and that the other stands for free trade.

I have not attempted to discuss the many paragraphs of the Senate substitute. Full tables will be prepared and submitted, and there is not a citizen in the country who will not be able to learn how it affects him and each industry.

Democracy has tendered the issue, and every effort should be made to meet it fairly, and I trust it will not be claimed that the Senate substitute avoids or obscures it. The substitute has pointed the way for the proper reduction of our national revenues (without interfering with the tax on alcohol or spirits which may be manufactured into or used as beverages) and to continue and further enlarge and strengthen the protective system and policy.

Products of manufacture of the late Confederate States and of the other States (Schedule A).

Articles.	Other States.	Southern, late Confederate States.	Reduction by Mills bill from present rates of duty.	Present rates of duty.
			Per cent.	
Jute manufactures	$926,982	None.	28	35 per cent.
Flax, hemp, and jute bagging, including cotton bagging	(a)	(a)	*b*100	40 per cent.
Bags, other than paper	9,635,300	$91,300		40 per cent.
Salt	4,616,028	213,538	100	{ 8 cts. per 100 lbs. / 12 cts. per 100 lbs.
Soap and candles	26,260,792	291,935	*c*100	20 per cent.
Dyewood extracts	5,253,038	None.	100	{ 10 per cent. / 20 per cent.
Chocolate (cocoa)	1,302,153	None.	100	2 cents per pound.
Grindstones	184,555	None.	100	$1.75 per ton.
Rattan and whalebone	526,777	None.	*d*100	10 per cent.
Glass, manufactures	21,154,571	None.	17	{ 59.14 per cent.
Stone and earthenware	7,814,027	129,702		{ 56.97 per cent.
Confectionery	23,780,672	1,756,361	20	50 per cent.
Brushes and brooms	10,272,527	288,722	*e*33.3	40 per cent.
			*f*20	25 per cent.
Ink	1,629,413	None.	33.3	30 per cent.
Oil-cloths	5,844,587	None.	37.5	40 per cent.
Iron work, architectural (structural)	2,084,287	25,250	11	45 per cent.
Files	2,486,533	None.	40	{ 35 cts. per dozen. / 75 cts. per dozen. / $1.50 per dozen. / $2.50 per dozen.
Nails and spikes	5,629,240	None.	20	1¼ cts. per pound.
Needles and pins	1,378,023	None.	*g*100	25 per cent.
			*h*43	35 per cent.
			(*i*)	50 per cent.
Toys and games	1,502,513	None.	14	35 per cent.
Wire and wire-work	19,251,423	None.		Various.
Baking and yeast powder	4,722,098	38,500		20 per cent.
Book binding and blank-book making	11,817,396	159,369		25 per cent.
Boxes, fancy and paper	7,403,515	262,638	28	35 per cent.
Brass castings	10,780,542	28,200	11	45 per cent.
Carriages, wagons, etc., and parts of	100,463,644	4,278,292	14	35 per cent.
Coffee and spices, roasted and ground	22,473,693	451,201		Spices 5 cts. p. lb.
Drugs and chemicals	38,374,051	599,607	42	52.85 per cent.
Furniture	75,885,645	1,960,680	14	35 per cent.
Glass, cut, stained, and ornamented	2,535,600	None.	11	45 per cent.
Hardware	22,644,793	8,200	11	45 per cent.
Iron bolts, nuts, washers, and rivets	9,523,330	240,000	*j*25	2 cts. per pound.
			*k*40	2½ cts. per pound.
Kaolin and ground earths	1,385,992	69,795	33.3	$3 per ton.
Lead, bar, pipe, sheet, and shot	5,690,671	None.	*l*37.5	2 cts. per pound.
			*m*25	3 cts. per pound.
Mantels, slate, marble, etc.	1,030,600	None.	33.3	30 per cent.
Castor-oil	653,900	None.	50	80 cts. per gallon.
Linseed-oil	15,393,112	700	40	25 cts. per gallon.
Neat's-foot oil	258,586	500	100	25 per cent.
Patent medicines and compounds	14,272,502	409,932	40	50 per cent.
Steel pens	164,000	None.	25	12 cents gross.
Foundry and machine-shop products	207,286,509	7,091,950	11	45 per cent.

a Total in United States, $3,511,653.
b Grain bags.
c Soap, hard and soft, not specified.
d Rattans.
e Brushes.
f Brooms.
g Needles.
h Needles, sewing-machine.
i Pins.
j Nuts and washers.
k Bolts.
l Bar.
m Pipe, sheet, etc.

Products of manufacture of the late Confederate States, etc.—Continued.

Articles.	Other States.	Southern, late Confederate States.	Reduction by Mills bill from present rates of duty.	Present rates of duty.
			Per cent.	
Steam-fittings and apparatus	$5,127,840	None.	11	
Wool manufactures of all kinds	265,452,040	$1,800,873	42	45 per cent. 67.21 per cent.
Sawed lumber	203,249,871	30,018,858	100	{$1 per M feet. {$2 per M feet.
Planed lumber	34,706,911	2,096,385	.....	50 cents per M feet additional.
Brick and tile	30,188,992	2,644,595	{a100 {b14	20 per cent. 20 per cent.
Marble and stone work	30,611,840	803,310	c40	50 per cent.
Paints	23,371,337	19,330	d50	25 per cent.
Type founding	2,220,298	10,000	40	25 per cent.
Starch	7,471,742	6,000	50	{2 cts. per pound. {2½ cts. per pound.
Cordage and twine	12,468,171	24,000	19	{3 cts. per pound. {2½ cts. per pound. {3¼ cts. per pound.
Paper manufactures	48,454,367	645,547	.....	15 per cent.
Hats and caps (not wool)	21,296,809	6,300	.....	30 per cent.
Ivory and bone work	1,454,901	None.	.....	{30 per cent, {30 per cent.
Straw goods	9,345,759	None.	.....	35 per cent.
Instruments, professional and scientific	1,601,194	37,900	28	35 per cent.
Cotton manufactures	176,151,398	15,938,712	22.5	40.17
Scales and balances	3,252,460	None.	11	45 per cent.
Sewing machines and attachments	13,863,188	None.	11	45 per cent.
Springs, steel	3,654,862	None.	11	45 per cent.
Stamped ware	3,512,423	None.	11	45 per cent.
Tin-ware, copper-ware, and sheet-iron ware	45,233,533	2,862,505	11	45 per cent.
Tools (not cutlery or hardware)	4,235,968	600	11	45 per cent.
Wooden ware	4,897,124	338,350	14	35 per cent.
Cotton-ties	262,351	None.	100	35 per cent.
Cotton-seed oil and cake	1,033,660	6,657,261	100	25 per cent.
Bells	1,065,824	None.	11	45 per cent.
Billiard tables and materials	2,289,758	None.	14	35 per cent.
Blacking	1,491,474	None.	20	25 per cent.
Boxes, cigar	2,866,365	37,100	14	35 per cent.
Boxes, wooden, packing	12,322,502	364,566	100	30 per cent.
Brass and copper rolled	14,329,731	None.	14	45 per cent.
Carpentering	89,384,655	4,767,484	14	35 per cent.
Carpets, wood	102,170	None.	25	40 per cent.
Cooperage	32,497,938	1,226,832	14	35 per cent.
Furniture, chairs	9,745,583	62,240	14	35 per cent.
Perfumery and cosmetics	2,145,004	58,000	40	50 per cent.
Sash, doors, and blinds	34,366,930	2,254,395	14	35 per cent.
Sewing-machine cases	2,064,837	None.	14	35 per cent.
Shoddy	4,980,615	None.	100	10 cts. per pound.
	1,867,857,392	91,077,230		
Per cent	95.35	4.65		
Wool	139,894,984	15,786,767	(e)	

a Brick other than fine.
b Tile.
c Marble.
d Average.
e Placed upon the free-list.

The manufactured products included in Schedule A.

TEXAS.	Value of products.
Brick and tile	$448,418
Carriages and wagons	301,800
Lumber, planed	456,600
Lumber, sawed	2,673,449
Oil, cotton-seed, and cake	276,450
Sash, doors, and blinds	416,500
Foundry and machine-shop products	532,778
Tin-ware, copper-ware, and sheet-iron ware	491,420
Total	5,597,415
GEORGIA.	
Brick and tile	409,025
Carriages and wagons	582,581
Confectionery	336,325
Foundry and machine-shop products	1,299,491
Lumber, planed	371,200
Lumber, sawed	4,875,310
Sash, doors, and blinds	306,000
Tin-ware, copper-ware, and sheet-iron ware	329,624
Cotton goods	6,513,490
Total	15,063,046
KENTUCKY.	
Brick and tile	506,705
Carriages and wagons	1,474,475
Coffee and spices, roasted and ground	296,953
Confectionery	318,540
Cooperage	1,243,930
Cordage and twine	354,750
Cotton goods	426,286
Foundry and machine-shop products	3,013,079
Furniture	949,810
Furniture, chairs	257,820
KENTUCKY—continued.	Value of products.
Glass	$388,405
Lumber, planed	950,638
Lumber, sawed	4,064,361
Marble and stone work	496,980
Paper, not specified	619,422
Soap and candles	393,325
Tin-ware, copper-ware, and sheet-iron ware	772,488
Woolen goods	1,264,988
Patent medicines	363,400
Total	18,156,355
TENNESSEE.	
Brick and tile	523,113
Carriages and wagons	1,253,721
Foundry and machine-shop products	1,191,531
Furniture	954,100
Lumber, planed	270,405
Lumber, sawed	3,744,905
Oil, cotton-seed, and cake	1,235,000
Sash, doors, and blinds	268,930
Tin-ware, copper-ware, and sheet-iron ware	710,813
Woolen goods	620,724
Confectionery	361,225
Cotton goods	934,014
Total	12,068,481
WEST VIRGINIA.	
Carriages and wagons	341,025
Cooperage	306,147
Foundry and machine-shop products	466,862
Glass	748,500
Lumber, planed	353,550
Lumber, sawed	2,431,857
Salt	380,369
Woolen goods	356,986
Total	5,385,296
ARKANSAS.	
Lumber, sawed	1,793,848
Oil, cotton-seed, and cake	590,000
Total	2,383,848

Mr. BATE obtained the floor.

Mr. COCKRELL. As it is quite late I hope the Senate will relieve the Senator from Tennessee from the necessity of proceeding this evening, and let him retain the floor for to-morrow. If he will yield to me I will move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

Mr. JONES, of Arkansas. I ask the Senator from Tennessee to yield to me, that I may ask the Senate to proceed to the consideration of the bill (H. R. 8674) for the relief of Sterling H. Tucker and others, a bill which was reported by the Committee on the Judiciary, has come from the House of Representatives, and is one of peculiar merit.

Mr. VEST. I wish to make some reports from the Committee on Commerce.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. While Senators are adjusting the differences between themselves, the Chair will lay before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. CLARK, its Clerk, announced that the House had passed the bill (H. R. 11581) making an appropriation for the enforcement of the Chinese exclusion act, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message also announced that the House had passed the following bills:

A bill (S. 3620) supplementary to the act approved February 3, 1887, entitled "An act to fix the day for the meeting of the electors of President and Vice-President and to provide for and regulate the counting of the votes for President and Vice-President and the decision of questions arising thereon; and

A bill (S. 1494) to secure to the Cherokee freedmen and others their proportion of certain proceeds of lands under the act of March 3, 1883.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES.

Mr. VEST, from the Committee on Commerce, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 11107) to amend an act entitled "An act to authorize the Fort Smith and Choctaw Bridge Company to construct a bridge across the Potean River, in the Choctaw Nation, near Fort Smith, Ark.," reported it without amendment.

He also, from the same committee, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 11338) to authorize the construction of a bridge across the Coosa River at Gadsden, in the State of Alabama, reported it with amendments.

He also, from the same committee, to whom was referred the bill (S. 3528) to authorize the construction of a bridge across the Coosa River at Gadsden, Ala., reported adversely thereon, and the bill was postponed indefinitely.

MISSISSIPPI RIVER BRIDGE AT LA CROSSE.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore* laid before the Senate the action of the House of Representatives disagreeing to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 11139) to authorize the building of a bridge or bridges across the Mississippi River at La Crosse, Wis.

Mr. SPOONER. I move that the Senate insist upon its amendments and request a conference with the House of Representatives on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses.

The motion was agreed to.

By unanimous consent, the President *pro tempore* was authorized to appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate, and Mr. SAWYER, Mr. DOLPH, and Mr. VEST were appointed.

AMERICAN GROCER ASSOCIATION.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore* laid before the Senate the bill (S. 577) for the relief of the American Grocer Association of the city of New York, returned from the House of Representatives at the request of the Senate.

Mr. SAWYER. I move that the bill be indefinitely postponed. A bill precisely like it has been passed by both branches.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The bill will be indefinitely postponed, if there be no objection.

ELECTORAL MESSENGERS.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. If there be no objection, the bill (S. 3609) supplementary to the act approved February 3, 1887, entitled "An act to fix the day for the meeting of the electors of President and Vice-President, and to provide for and regulate the counting of the votes for President and Vice-President, and the decision of questions arising thereon," being identical with the bill passed this morning on the motion of the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. HOAR], will be indefinitely postponed.

HOUSE BILL REFERRED.

The bill (H. R. 11581) making an appropriation for the enforcement of the Chinese exclusion act, was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

VIOLATIONS OF CIVIL-SERVICE LAW.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The resolution requesting the Attorney-General to inform the Senate whether he has any information concerning violations of the civil-service law, offered by the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. CHANDLER], who is now absent, will be placed on the Calendar, to be called up when he may return.

SURETIES OF JAMES W. DEMBY.

Mr. JONES, of Arkansas. The Senator from Tennessee [Mr. BATE] yields to me that I may move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the bill (H. R. 8674) for the relief of Sterling H. Tucker and others.

Mr. EDMUNDS. I very much wish, as I am compelled to go away to-morrow, that the Senate would consider the bill in respect to making a grant of some money to Mrs. Waite, to which the colleague of my friend from Arkansas objected when it was read to-day. May I ask the Senator from Arkansas if he knows whether his colleague [Mr. BERRY] is disposed to withdraw his objection? I have tried to find him, but without success.

Mr. JONES, of Arkansas. I am not authorized to speak on that subject; but I do not think that my colleague would interpose any further objection to the consideration of the bill.

Mr. EDMUNDS. If my friend is not authorized to speak for his colleague, it would not be right for me to ask nor for the Senate to take up the bill in his absence to-day. I shall not object to the consideration of the bill moved by the Senator from Arkansas, subject to objection; but after that is disposed of I think I must move that the Senate adjourn.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The bill will be read at length for information, subject to objection.

The Secretary read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That Sterling H. Tucker, William P. Grace, Elhanon J. Searle, Josiah H. Demby, Samuel H. Bard, and William G. Pennington, or their estates be, and they and each of them are hereby, released from any and all liability as the sureties upon the official bond of James W. Demby, formerly pension agent, the said release to take effect upon the payment of the legal costs heretofore accrued in the prosecution of said claim by the United States: *Provided*, That all the rights and remedies of the Government on said bond as against said James W. Demby shall in no manner be affected hereby, but remain in full force and effect in law.

By unanimous consent, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. EDMUNDS. I merely wish to say that I did not concur in the report of the committee. I do not think the bill ought to pass; but as a majority of the committee were of opinion that it ought, I shall not interpose any opposition except to state what I have stated.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ELIZA A. CUTLER JONES.

Mr. DAWES. I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 2331.

Mr. EDMUNDS. I promised that I would move an adjournment.

Mr. DAWES. This will take but a moment.

The bill (H. R. 6619) for the relief of Eliza A. Cutler Jones was reported by its title.

Mr. EDMUNDS. I shall let that go subject to objection.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The bill will be read at length subject to objection.

The bill was read, and the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to its consideration. It proposes to pay to Mrs. Eliza A. Cutler Jones, of Scottsville, Monroe County, New York, $5,000, in five annual installments of $1,000 each, out of any money that may hereafter be appropriated for the use and benefit of the Cheyenne Indians.

Mr. EDMUNDS. Let us hear the report.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. There is no report from the Senate committee.

Mr. DAWES. There is a House report which gives the facts.

Mr. EDMUNDS. Waiving the breach of privilege, let us hear the House report.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The report made in the House of Representatives will be read.

Mr. EDMUNDS. My friend from Massachusetts, the chairman of the Committee on Indian Affairs, says that he can state the case more briefly than the reading of the report made in a body with which we have nothing to do.

Mr. DAWES. Some years ago the Cheyenne Indians made a raid upon three men employed by the Government in their service in gathering stock and murdered the three men. At different times heretofore Congress has inserted in an appropriation bill in two different items an appropriation of $5,000 each, one to the widow and the other to the mother of two of these murdered men, to be paid in installments of $1,000 each annually and taken out of the appropriation made to the Cheyenne Indians. This bill is to give to the aged and poor mother of the last of these three murdered men $5,000, as has been given in the case of the other two, to be taken out of the appropriation made for the Cheyenne Indians, so that they may be punished a little each year to remind them of the crime committed.

This bill has passed the other House, and is precisely like two others that have become laws heretofore.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

WIDOW OF CHIEF-JUSTICE WAITE.

Mr. EDMUNDS. Mr. President, I wish now, as I see my friend from Arkansas [Mr. BERRY] is in the Chamber, who objected to the present consideration of the bill respecting the widow of the late Chief-Justice, to appeal to him to withdraw his objection to its consideration, as I am obliged to leave town to-morrow, and I have reported the bill, and it was the opinion of the Senate when the matter was considered, as is well known—I wish to appeal to him to withdraw his objection. Of course, if he does not, whether here or not, it can not be considered. I have no objection to my friend opposing the bill, but in respect of its consideration it will be a favor to me if he could feel it consistent with his duty to allow the bill to be now considered.

Mr. BERRY. I think the bill is thoroughly a bad one. To withdraw my objection is equivalent to consenting to its passage by the Senate, as I believe a majority of the Senate would vote to pass it. I do not think the bill ought to pass, and I believe it to be my duty to interpose whatever lawful and legal objections the rules authorize me to interpose, and therefore I can not give my consent to take the bill up this evening. The Senator can move to-morrow, I presume, to take it up, and if a majority of the Senate agree to take it up, then it will be before the Senate; but to consent now will be equivalent to a consent to its passage.

As I stated before, I do not know any character of legislation that has been brought before the Senate the principle of which I regard as more vicious than the one that is involved in this bill.

Mr. EDMUNDS. I do not wish to make any reply to the observations of the Senator from Arkansas. The case has been stated, and the precedents in the history of the Government. I only wish to give notice that to-morrow morning, as soon as it is in order, I will, if I am able to stay till to-morrow morning, and if not, somebody else of the committee will, move to take up the bill, and if a majority of the Senate are willing to take it up it will be taken up and considered. Having said that, I move that the Senate do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 4 o'clock and 8 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until to-morrow, Wednesday, October 10, 1888, at 12 o'clock m.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

TUESDAY, *October* 9, 1888.

The House met at 12 o'clock m. Prayer by Rev. J. H. CUTHBERT, D. D.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

PRIVATE LAND CLAIM IN NEW MEXICO.

The SPEAKER laid before the House a letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a report of the surveyor-general for New Mexico on the private land claim known as the Nicolas Duran de Chaves grant No. 155; which was referred to the Committee on Private Land Claims.

SENATE BILLS REFERRED.

The SPEAKER also laid before the House Senate bills of the following titles; which were read twice, and referred as indicated:

The bill (S. 3501) relating to the classification of post-offices and amend-

atory of the act approved March 3, 1883, entitled "An act to adjust the salaries of postmasters"—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post Roads.

The bill (S. 3340) for the disposition of Fort Brooke military reservation at Tampa, Fla., and for other purposes—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

AMERICAN GROCER ASSOCIATION, NEW YORK CITY.

The SPEAKER. The Chair also lays before the House a duplicate (sent to the House by request) of the bill (S. 577) for the relief of the American Grocer Association of the city of New York. The Senate has heretofore requested the return of this bill to that body. If there be no objection, the Clerk will be directed to return it. The Chair hears no objection, and it is so ordered.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

A message from the Senate, by Mr. MCCOOK, its Secretary, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment the bill (H. R. 10666) to constitute Lincoln, Nebr., a port of delivery, and to extend the provisions of the act of June 10, 1880, entitled "An act to amend the statutes in relation to immediate transportation of dutiable goods, and for other purposes," to the said port of Lincoln.

The message further announced that the Senate had passed the bill (S. 3620) supplementary to the act approved February 3, 1887, entitled "An act to fix the date for the meeting of the electors of President and Vice-President and to provide for and regulate the counting of the votes for President and Vice-President and the decision of questions arising thereon;" in which the concurrence of the House was requested.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. ROBERTSON, indefinitely, on account of important business.

To Mr. CATCHINGS, indefinitely, on account of important business.

To Mr. DAVIDSON, of Florida, indefinitely, on account of urgent business.

To Mr. YODER, indefinitely.

To Mr. HENDERSON, of North Carolina, indefinitely, from Thursday next.

CHANGE OF REFRENCE.

The SPEAKER. The bill (H. R. 8634) providing for the sale of the Fort Sedgwick military reservation in the State of Colorado and Territory of Wyoming to actual settlers, and Senate bill No. 1765 of the same title and on the same subject, have been referred to the Committee on Military Affairs. The gentleman from Colorado [Mr. SYMES] asks that the Committee on Military Affairs be discharged from further consideration of these bills, and that the same be referred to the Committee on Public Lands. In the absence of objection that order will be made.

There was no objection, and it was so ordered.

MONUMENT TO GENERAL KNOX.

Mr. DINGLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to discharge the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union from the further consideration of the bill S. 449, and assign the 4th day of December next for its consideration.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the title of the bill, after which the Chair will ask for objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 449) for the erection of a monument to the memory of Maj. Gen. Henry Knox, at Thomaston, Me.

The SPEAKER. In the absence of objection, the order requested by the gentleman from Maine will be made.

There was no objection, and it was so ordered.

Mr. DINGLEY. I desire one moment further, Mr. Speaker. As possibly on that day there may be other business occupying the attention of the House, I ask unanimous consent that if by reason of public business this bill be not considered on that day, that it be made a continuing order until it is considered.

Mr. BACON. To that request I object.

Mr. DINGLEY. But, if my friend from New York will permit me to suggest, there may be some matter of public importance to be considered on that day, and I should dislike very much to undertake to antagonize it with this special order. I hope my friend will not object, because it is a very reasonable request, simply that there may be some time for the consideration of this bill, not to interfere with public measures. I do not want it to stand in the way.

The SPEAKER. The Chair understands the gentleman from New York to insist upon his objection.

Mr. BACON. I do.

Mr. MILLIKEN. This is a monument to one of the most distinguished soldiers of the Revolutionary war, and I am sure if the gentleman from New York will remember that fact he will not insist on objecting.

Mr. BACON. I thank the gentleman from Maine for the information. I have some knowledge of the history of this country in its earlier days; still I am glad to have my memory refreshed. I did not object, however, on historical grounds.

Mr. MILLIKEN. I did not intend to undertake to instruct the gentleman, but only to recall what this bill was.

PUBLIC BUILDING, FORT WORTH, TEX.

Mr. ABBOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to discharge the Committee of the Whole House from the further consideration of the bill (S. 1974) for the erection of a public building at Fort Worth, Tex.

The SPEAKER. The bill will be read, subject to objection.

The Clerk proceeded to read the bill.

Mr. EZRA B. TAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, it is useless to consume the time in reading the bill. I shall object to its consideration.

CHINESE EXCLUSION.

The SPEAKER. The Chair has just received a communication from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury which seems to be urgent in its character, asking that an appropriation for the purpose of carrying into effect the provisions of the recent Chinese exclusion act, approved October 1, 1888, be made. The Chair will lay this communication before the House at once and order its reference to the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. SOWDEN. Regular order.

Mr. DINGLEY. What is the proposition the Chair has just submitted to the House?

The SPEAKER. It is a letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury recommending that an appropriation be made to carry into effect the provisions of the Chinese-exclusion act lately passed.

ORDER OF BUSINESS.

Mr. SOWDEN. I demand the regular order.

The SPEAKER. The regular order is the call of committees for reports.

Mr. WHITTHORNE. Will my friend from Pennsylvania yield to me to enable me to ask unanimous consent to fix a day for the consideration of a very important bill during the next session?

The SPEAKER. The regular order being demanded, the Chair will call the committees for reports.

Mr. HOOKER. I ask unanimous consent to dispense with the formal call of committees, with leave to gentlemen to file their reports with the Clerk.

The SPEAKER. In the absence of objection, that order will be made.

There was no objection, and it was so ordered.

FILING OF REPORT.

The following report was filed by being handed in at the Clerk's desk:

MARY P. MYERS.

Mr. BLISS, from the Committee on Pensions, reported back favorably the bill (S. 3540) granting a pension to Mary P. Myers; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

The SPEAKER. The regular order is the hour for the consideration of bills reported from committees, which begins at 12 o'clock and 27 minutes. The call rests with the Committee on Public Lands, which has a bill under consideration coming over from yesterday.

Mr. MCRAE. Before proceeding with the execution of that order, I would ask leave to consider Senate bill 3475.

The SPEAKER. But the regular order has been demanded by the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. MCRAE. I think if the gentleman from Pennsylvania understands the nature of the bill he will withdraw his demand. It pertains to Washington Territory, and the bill has passed the Senate. The Delegate from the Territory is now absent; but the people of that locality feel a deep interest in this bill. It involves no expenditure.

Mr. JACKSON. I would like to ask what was done with the bill which was pending when the hour expired yesterday?

The SPEAKER. That is in the Committee of the Whole. The gentleman from Arkansas asks, before proceeding with the regular order, to consider this Senate bill.

Mr. MCRAE. Does the gentleman from Pennsylvania insist on his demand?

The SPEAKER. It has not been withdrawn.

Mr. SOWDEN. If I withdrew it in this instance, others would have a perfect right to claim the same courtesy, to which they would be entitled.

Mr. MCRAE. I am not asking it as a personal favor. This is a matter for Washington Territory, the Delegate being absent.

Mr. SOWDEN. But if I withdraw the call I am bound in the interest of consistency to allow other gentlemen the same courtesy.

Mr. MCRAE. I move that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole for the consideration of the bill which was under consideration yesterday.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. MCRAE. Before the House go into Committee of the Whole I move to limit general debate to twenty minutes.

The SPEAKER. But the House has determined to go into Committee of the Whole on the state of the Union. The gentleman from Ar-

kansas [Mr. McRAE] asks unanimous consent that general debate be limited to twenty minutes. Is there objection?

Mr. JACKSON. I object.

The House accordingly resolved itself into Committee of the Whole, Mr. RICHARDSON in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The House is in Committee of the Whole, and the Clerk will read the title of the pending bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 758) to relieve purchasers of, and to indemnify certain States for, swamp and overflowed lands disposed of, and for other purposes.

The CHAIRMAN. If no member desires to address the committee the Chair will submit the question on the adoption of the amendments.

Mr. McRAE. There appears to be some objection to this bill, and believing that it should be considered in full House with a quorum, I will make a proposition that I hope will be agreed to by the committee. It is this: That the bill be reported back to the House with the recommendation that it be set for consideration on the 15th of next December.

Mr. JACKSON. Reported how—what kind of a report?

Mr. McRAE. With the request that consideration be postponed until the 15th day of next December.

Mr. JACKSON. I move to amend by striking out the day named in the motion, so that no day will be fixed for the consideration of this bill.

Mr. FARQUHAR. I would suggest in connection with a motion of that kind that there are over two hundred general bills on our Calendar that have as much merit as this bill has, and I think it is very unfair to the short session that we should set metes and bounds for the consideration of bills. I shall object to designating any time for the consideration of any bill that is on the Calendar; I will make a standing objection to setting days for the consideration of bills.

Mr. McRAE. This is a very important public bill and not on the Private Calendar.

Mr. FARQUHAR. But it is on the General Calendar with general measures which are on that Calendar, I have one or two measures on there myself which are of ten times more importance than that bill, and I feel like treating all alike. Therefore, from this time henceforth I will make a standing objection to fixing of days for the consideration of bills.

Mr. SOWDEN. I would like to ask the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. McRAE] how much is involved in this bill?

Mr. McRAE. There is no amount of money appropriated by it specially. The bill authorizes——

Mr. SOWDEN. How much is involved in it generally, if not specially? Does it involve a large sum of money?

Mr. McRAE. It does not involve any new liability, but authorizes a settlement of some that have existed for many years. It does not involve the appropriation of an additional dollar except for such lands as have been erroneously sold by the United States after granting them to the States, and then only what was paid for the land, giving money indemnity at $1.25 per acre for the dry-land indemnity now allowed by law.

A number of States have claims growing out of these old grants pending against the Government, and the Government has claims pending against these same States. This bill makes it possible for a settlement upon a money basis, without changing or enlarging in any way the original grant. It is to the interest of the States, the United States, and the settlers as well.

Mr. SOWDEN. It does not involve a large sum of money?

Mr. McRAE. It does not increase the liability of the Government unless the land allowed as indemnity is not worth $1.25 per acre. It is in fact in many instances worth more. And the same thing can be said of the lands in place where the States take the land from the purchasers of the Government. In such cases the Government refunds to the purchaser what he paid and the States take the land. The United States make nothing. The States get land and the settler is turned out of his home. This bill authorizes a settlement of such cases by refunding the money to the States, thus perfecting the title of the purchaser. It does not interfere with the original adjustment in the slightest except as I have stated.

Mr. JACKSON. I differ entirely in my judgment from the statement made by the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. McRAE]. I think this bill does involve a large amount of money.

Mr. McRAE. How much time does the gentleman wish to discuss the bill?

Mr. JACKSON. If you proceed with the consideration of this bill I will take the floor in my own right, so that I can have my own time in opposition. I consider this bill very objectionable, and intend to oppose it to the best of my ability.

Mr. McRAE. You can not take my time, and if you proceed now you must submit to a limit. I have the floor, but will divide with you.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Arkansas moves to postpone the consideration of the bill until the 15th of December, and the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. JACKSON] moves that the bill be reported to the House and that its consideration be indefinitely postponed. The Chair thinks the motion made by the gentleman from Arkansas has precedence over the motion made by the gentleman from Pennsylvania, and it is now in order.

Mr. McRAE. I made that as a proposition after I had been informed that a quorum would be demanded on the passage of the bill. I thought it would be agreed to by those who oppose the bill. As that does not meet with the approval of my friends who are opposed to the bill, I withdraw my motion or proposition.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Arkansas withdraws the motion, and the question will be on the motion of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. JACKSON] to indefinitely postpone the consideration of the bill.

Mr. JACKSON. I will not allow the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. McRAE] to be more considerate than I am; so I will withdraw my motion.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. McRAE] has the floor.

Mr. McRAE. Mr. Chairman, as it appears that we can not get rid of considering the bill at this time, I will now yield any reasonable time which any gentleman may desire to make a statement or to ask me any questions with reference to the bill. If the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. JACKSON] wishes time for that purpose, I will yield to him cheerfully.

Mr. JACKSON. If the Chair will recognize me in opposition to the bill, I will take the floor in my own right, and then I shall have something to say about it. I do not want to occupy any part of the time of the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. McRAE]. I want to be recognized in opposition to the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Arkansas yield the floor?

Mr. McRAE. I do not; but I will yield the gentleman from Pennsylvania any time he wishes, reserving the same to myself to reply to him.

Mr. JACKSON. I prefer to take the floor in my own right, as I have already stated.

Mr. McRAE. Well, you can not take it at this time in your own right, and thus talk out the hour allowed for consideration.

Mr. JACKSON. I am not asking it until the time comes to oppose this bill.

Mr. McRAE. The gentleman from Colorado [Mr. SYMES] expressed a desire to have some time to be heard upon the bill, and I now yield him five minutes.

Mr. SYMES. In explanation of this bill, and in reply to statements made by gentlemen on the floor that it is a bill calling for some new appropriation, I desire to say that it is simply a bill to pay what the Government is under absolute obligation to pay. It is a bill to carry out and execute the provisions of United States statutes which have been executed in other cases, in pursuance of the land policy of this Government for a great many years, by paying to the different States 5 per cent. of the proceeds of the public domain sold within the States after their admission into the Union.

It is beyond contradiction, sir, that every new Western State and every new Southern State wherein there was public domain at the time of its admission into the Union was guarantied this payment, and the Government thereafter carried out the guaranty in the statutes and the enabling acts by paying to the States 5 per cent. of the proceeds of the sales of the public domain thereafter disposed of within the boundaries of such new State. It is strange, sir, to hear these objections made by gentlemen who live in the East, and some of them representing States which received this 5 per cent. fund years ago.

It is not just for gentlemen to object at this late day to doing justice to these new States simply because the Government has been slow and Congress has not performed its duty by carrying out in good faith the different acts to which I have referred with reference to the 5 per cent. due new Western States, as they were carried out in the past in regard to the older States when they were represented by the predecessors of these gentlemen who now make these objections. I have stated the sum and substance of this bill, and I have made these few remarks merely for the purpose of placing it before the House in its proper status, not as a new measure, not as a bill to appropriate money, but simply as a bill to carry out laws upon the statute-books of the United States, and to fulfill to some of the new States guaranties of Congress which have been already fulfilled with reference to the older States.

Mr. JACKSON. What statutory provision does the gentleman refer to?

Mr. SYMES. The provisions are contained in a general act as well as in different special acts.

Mr. JACKSON. Do you refer to the swamp-land indemnity fund?

Mr. SYMES. Yes; I refer to that and other acts.

Mr. McRAE. Mr. Chairman, as a part of my remarks upon this bill I desire to have the report of the committee printed in the RECORD, but I will not take time to have it read.

The report is as follows:

The Committee on the Public Lands, to whom was referred the bill (S. 758) for the relief of purchasers of, and to indemnify certain States for, swamp and overflowed lands disposed of, and for other purposes, have had the same under

consideration, and report the same back, with the recommendation that it pass with the following amendment:

Strike out the following words in the first section: "except by grants to such States or to railroad corporations in such States by homestead entries."

Except section 6, which seeks to extend the provisions of the act of September 28, 1850, to the States admitted into the Union since the 17th day of March, 1860, this bill is substantially the same as H. R. 6897, reported from the said committee to the House on the 8th day of February, 1888, and the committee adopt so much of the Report 347 as is applicable to this bill, as follows:

That the full scope and effect of this bill may be understood, it will be necessary to thoroughly understand the several swamp-land grants and the action of the Interior Department with reference thereto; and to that end copies of the acts of Congress and the regulations of the Department are hereto appended. The act approved March 2, 1849 (9 Stat., 352), granted to the State of Louisiana the whole of the swamp and overflowed lands in said State found unfit for cultivation, with the exception of those tracts fronting on rivers, creeks, bayous, etc., surveyed into lots or tracts under the acts of March 31, 1811, and May 24, 1824.

The act of September 28, 1850 (9 Stat., 519), granted to each of the public land States then in the Union the whole of the swamp and overflowed lands remaining unsold within their limits, made unfit thereby for cultivation, and the Secretary of the Interior was required to make out accurate lists and plats of the lands described as aforesaid, and transmit the same to the governors of the States. For some reason the Secretary failed to make any such selections and segregation of such lands as the act clearly contemplated except as he saw fit to make partial and imperfect lists when called upon by the agents of the States from time to time. This failure or neglect has been the source of a great deal of controversy between the States and the Interior Department, and also of a great deal of vexatious and expensive litigation between those claiming under the grant and those adverse to it.

On the 21st day of November, 1850, the Commissioner of the General Land Office transmitted to the governors of all the States covered by the grant a circular of instructions as to the manner of proceeding under said act, with a request that the State elect which of the two proposed methods for designating swamp lands would be adopted.

The proposed methods were:

1. The field-notes of Government survey to be taken as the basis for selections, and all lands shown by them to be swamp or overflowed within the meaning of the act to be placed in the lists to be reported to the General Land Office.

2. The States to make the selections by their own agents and at their own cost, and report the same to the surveyor-general with proof of the character of the land.

The act approved March 12, 1860, extended the grant of September 28, 1850, to the States of Minnesota and Oregon. California, by the act approved July 23, 1866, was granted the same character of lands within her limits, but the method of selecting was much simplified and the adjustment has been much easier than in the other fourteen swamp-land States.

Michigan, Minnesota, and Wisconsin elected to make the field-notes the basis for determining the character of the land.

Alabama, Arkansas, Florida, Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Mississippi, Missouri, Ohio, and Oregon elected to make their selections by agents in the field, and they have all made their selections; but very few, if any, have been able to get their claims finally adjusted by the Department.

California did not adopt either method, because under the grant to that State such action was not necessary.

In Louisiana nearly all of the selections are made under the act of March 2, 1849, by deputy surveyors, under the direction of the United States surveyor-general, at the expense of the State. Such lands as are claimed under the act of September 28, 1850, are selected by State agents, with proof of character of the land. Within the last few years the States of Alabama, Indiana, Louisiana, Mississippi, and Ohio, with the consent of the Department of the Interior, have adopted the field-notes of survey as the basis of adjustment of their claims.

Some of the selections made by the State of Arkansas more than thirty years ago and intended to be confirmed by the act of March 3, 1857, are yet unadjusted, and a great many tracts selected and claimed under the grant of that State have been sold and disposed of by the United States. At this lapse of time it is next to impossible to furnish the Secretary of the Interior with the proof that he should have taken as soon as "practicable after the passage" of the act making the grant.

The grant as first introduced was only intended for Arkansas. That State was mentioned by name both in the title and the body of the act making the grant. It promptly and in good faith entered upon a system of levees and drains to reclaim the lands. In alphabetical order it was the second on the list of States. Notwithstanding all this, less has been done toward adjustment in that State than any other. No indemnity either in lands or money has ever been allowed, although its right to both is not denied.

At the suggestion of the Department, and in the hope that it would lead to an early adjustment of the claim of the State, the Legislature, by two acts, one approved March 17, 1885, and the other March 19, 1887, adopted the field-notes of survey. The Secretary was not satisfied that the said acts gave the governor "full power" to consent to the adjustment of said grant and the claim of the State for indemnity, and on the 16th day of May, 1887, advised the Commissioner, in a written opinion, "that no further action should be taken" by the Department relative to the claim under the swamp-land act until the governor has been given "full power" by appropriate legislation to consent to the adjustment of said grant and the claim for indemnity in accordance with the principles enunciated in the Louisiana case.

For thirty years, upon one pretext or another, the adjustment of this State's claim has been delayed, and for all this time the United States has been disposing of more or less of the lands previously granted to the State and using the money received, while all the time the State is being charged with interest on the debt due the United States. This course on the part of the Department charged with the duty of prompt adjustment, in addition to trifling with law and vested rights, is unjust to the State in that it diminishes a fund upon which it had the right to rely and also in the initiation of a series of defective titles and the lawsuits and losses that always follow such.

This injustice has extended to the other States as well as Arkansas, but in less degree. In proof of the immense litigation that has come of such action reference is made to the citations made by the Department in its circular of April 18, 1882, of nearly two hundred decisions of the court of last resort and of the Department.

The first section of the act of September 28, 1850, after giving the reason for its passage, states that the whole of the swamp and overflowed lands, made thereby unfit for cultivation and unsold, are hereby granted to the States. It was an unconditional present grant by Congress of such lands to the States within which they lie, without reference to their sections, townships, and ranges, but at the same time fixed a criterion by which it could be easily ascertained what was granted, to wit, such legal subdivisions of the public lands the greater part of which were so far swamp and overflowed as to be wet and unfit for cultivation.

All such lands were granted and the title vested September 28, 1850, and have continued to be so granted and vested ever since. This has frequently been settled by the decisions of the Supreme Court of the United States. Congress has never attempted to forfeit the grant or in the least modify the description by which they were given to the States, and such as were wet and unfit for cultivation at the time of the grant passed without any reference to the swampy or non-swampy character since or now.

The failure of the Secretary of the Interior to make the list and plats, and his action in continuing to dispose of the lands granted, became such a grievance that Congress passed two remedial acts. The first of these was approved March 2, 1855, and granted relief to the purchasers and locators of swamp and overflowed lands by giving the States the purchase-money for all such lands sold, and allowing dry lands of like quantity for such as were otherwise disposed of. Presuming upon an early adjustment, and assuming that no more erroneous sales would be made or approved by the Commissioner of the General Land Office, this act was not made prospective and continuing, as it ought to have been.

Other difficulties arose about the selections made by the States, and so Congress again, on March 3, 1857 (11 Stat., 251), passed an act declaring that the selections of swamp and overflowed lands granted to the States by the act of September 28, 1850, theretofore made and reported to the General Land Office, so far as the same remained vacant and unappropriated and not interfered with by actual settlement under existing laws of the United States, were confirmed and approved for patent, and extended and continued in force to that time the act of March 2, 1855. So under existing laws the case may be stated as follows:

1. That the respective States to which the grant applied are entitled to all the swamp and overflowed lands made unfit thereby for cultivation which remained unsold therein on the 28th day of September, A. D. 1850.

2. That for all such lands sold between September 28, A. D. 1850, and March 3, A. D. 1857, the States are entitled to the purchase money received.

3. That for all such lands otherwise disposed of than by sale between said dates the States are entitled to have indemnity in lands not swamp and overflowed.

4. That for such lands as have been sold or otherwise disposed of since September 28, A. D. 1857, no indemnity, either in money or lands, has been granted and no adjustment is possible. The land itself must be taken from the purchaser or settler by the State or its grantee, or lost. When such purchasers or settlers are evicted they come to Congress for relief or accept a return of the purchase-money.

5. That in the States where all of the public lands have been disposed of no indemnity scrip is issued, or if issued is of no value to the State, because it is held that it can only be located in the State to which it may be issued. There are certain moneys in the Treasury of the United States received for lands that passed by the said grant, which in both law and equity belong to these States. Besides this, many of them are entitled to other lands not yet sold or disposed of.

The proposed measure is for the adjustment of the claims of the States interested upon a money basis, so as to save for actual settlers all of such lands as did pass to the States by the grant, but have neither been certified for patent nor sold by the United States. It makes no new grant and does not enlarge any previously made. It does not seek to make any change in the mode of selecting or making proof of the methods of selections. Nor does it modify or reverse any decision of the courts or the Department. But it simply provides for an adjustment in accordance with the established methods of the Department and the decisions of the courts, and when such adjustments are made it gives cash at $1.25 per acre, when under the present law either the land in place or dry indemnity land would be received. This will be the effect of the first section if it should become law.

The second section provides for the certification and payment of the money or the entering of proper credits when, as in the case of the State of Arkansas, there is a debt due the United States.

The third section makes the acceptance of cash indemnity a relinquishment and waiver of all right to the land and a confirmation of the title in the United States or their grantees.

The fourth section requires the Department to consider all lists made and proofs taken in accordance with the rules of the Department to be considered in making the adjustment.

The fifth section will have the effect to redeem all outstanding indemnity script at $1.25 per acre. The following letter will show the amount issued to States where the public lands have all been sold and which can not under the rules now in force be located in the States named. These States insist that they can be located on any vacant lands; the attempt has several times been made.

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR, GENERAL LAND OFFICE,
Washington, D. C., February 4, 1888.

SIR: In reply to your oral inquiry, I have the honor to inform you that the certificates issued to the States of Illinois, Indiana, and Iowa, authorizing the location of land in lieu of swamp and overflowed lands located with warrants or scrip prior to March 3, 1857, now outstanding and unsatisfied, amount to 121,059.39 acres, as follows:

	Acres.
Illinois	99,675.83
Indiana	3,715.44
Iowa	17,668.12

Very respectfully,

S. M. STOCKSLAGER,
Acting Commissioner.

In conclusion the committee would call attention to the grants and some decisions under them, and to the fact that a similar bill was reported to the last House from the Committee on Public Lands. The bill ought to pass.

GENERAL LAND OFFICE, *November 21, 1850.*

SIR: By the act of Congress entitled "An act to enable the State of Arkansas and other States to reclaim the 'swamp lands' within their limits," approved September 28, 1850, it is directed "that to enable the State of Arkansas to construct the necessary levees and drains to reclaim the swamp and overflowed lands therein, the whole of those swamp and overflowed lands made thereby unfit for cultivation which shall remain unsold at the passage of this act shall be, and the same are hereby, granted to said State."

1. By the fourth section of this act it is directed that the provisions of it shall be extended to, and their benefits be conferred upon, each of the other States of the Union in which such swamp and overflowed lands may be situated.

2. And "that in making out a list and plats of the lands aforesaid, all legal subdivisions, the greater part of which is 'wet and unfit for cultivation,' shall be included in said lists and plats; but when the greater part of a subdivision is not of that character, the whole of it shall be excluded therefrom."

This act clearly and unequivocally grants to the several States those lands which, from being swampy or subject to overflow, are unfit for cultivation. In this class is included also all lands which, though dry part of the year, are subject to inundation at the planting, growing, or harvesting season, so as to destroy the crop, and therefore are unfit for cultivation, taking the average of the season for a reasonable number of years as the rule of determination.

You will please make out a list of all the lands thus granted to the State, des-

ignating those which have been sold or otherwise disposed of since the passage of the law, and the price paid for them when purchased.

The only reliable data in your possession from which these lists can be made out are the field-notes of the surveys on file in your office; and if the authorities of the State are willing to adopt these as the basis of those lists, you will so regard them. If not, and those authorities furnish you satisfactory evidence that any lands are of the character embraced by the grant, you will so report them.

The following general principles will govern you in making up these lists, to wit:

When the field-notes are the basis, and the intersections of the lines of swamp or overflow with those of the public surveys alone are given, those intersections may be connected by straight lines; and all legal subdivisions, the greater part of which are shown by these lines to be within the swamp or overflow, will be certified to the State; the balance will remain the property of the Government.

Where the State authorities may conclude to have the surveys made to determine the boundaries of the swamp or overflowed lands, those boundaries alone should be surveyed, taking connections with the nearest sections or township corners; or

Where the swamp or overflowed lands are on the borders of a stream or lake the stream or lake could be meandered and ordinates surveyed at suitable intervals from the borders of the stream or lake to the margin of the swamp or overflowed lands, and by connecting the ends of those ordinates next to that margin by straight lines the boundaries of the swamp or overflowed lands can be ascertained with sufficient accuracy. In no case, however, should any such boundaries or ordinates be marked in the field, as they may produce difficulty in determining the lines and corners of the public surveys hereafter, and thus lead to litigation. The selections in all these cases will be made as before directed. Where satisfactory evidence is produced that the whole of a township, or of any particular or specified part of a township, or the whole of a tract of country bounded by specified surveyed or natural boundaries, is of the character embraced by the grant, you will so report it, the adjacent subdivisions, however, to be subject to the regulations above given; and in every case, under each rule or principle herein prescribed, 40-acre lots or quarter-quarter sections will be regarded as the legal subdivisions contemplated by the law.

The affidavits of the county surveyors and other respectable persons that they understand and have examined the lines, and that the lands bounded by the lines thus examined and particularly designated in the affidavit are of the character embraced by the law, should be sufficient.

The line or boundary of the overflow that renders the land unfit for regular cultivation may be adopted as that which regulates the grant.

You will make out lists of these lands as early as practicable, according to the following form, one copy of which you will transmit to the land officers and another to this office. The land selected should be reserved from sale, and after those selections are approved by the Secretary of the Interior, the register should enter all the lands so selected in his tract books as "granted to the State by an act of 28th September, 1850, being swamp or overflowed lands," and on the plats enter on each tract "State act of 28th September, 1850." Copies of the approved lists will be sent to the registers for this purpose. Your early attention is requested in this matter, that the grant may be disposed of as speedily as possible.

Very respectfully, your obedient servant,

J. BUTTERFIELD, *Commissioner.*

Part of section.	Section.	Township.	Range.	Remarks.

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR, GENERAL LAND OFFICE,
Washington, D. C., December 13, 1886.

REGISTERS and RECEIVERS,
United States Land Offices:

GENTLEMEN: The rules heretofore in force relative to the admission of entries and filings on lands selected (and prior to their approval and certification by the Secretary of the Interior) as "swamp and overflowed and rendered thereby unfit for cultivation," are hereby modified as follows:

1. When any settler upon such lands or applicant to enter the same under the public-land laws of the United States shall apply to make a filing or entry under said laws, accompanied by a statement under oath, corroborated by two witnesses, that the land in its natural state is not swamp and overflowed and rendered thereby unfit for cultivation, the register and receiver will allow such filing or entry "subject to the swamp-land claim."

2. Upon the admission of any such filing or entry the register will at once notify the governor of the State thereof and allow him sixty days within which to object to the perfection of the entry, and to apply for a hearing of the State to prove the swampy character of the land.

3. When a hearing is ordered between the State and claimant under the public-land laws the burden of proof will be upon the State to establish the character of the land.

4. When no protest or application for a hearing is presented on the part of the State, as herein provided, the State will be deemed concluded from thereafter asserting a claim to the land under the swamp-land grant.

5. The foregoing applies only to those States whose claims are adjusted by examinations in the field.

6. Where swamp-land selections are based upon the field-notes of survey, and the land is alleged not to have been in fact swamp and overflowed and rendered thereby unfit for cultivation at the date of the swamp-land grant, the burden of proof will be upon the contestant or adverse claimant under the public-land laws.

7. You will promptly advise this office when notice is given the governor in any case, stating the date of such notice, and the description of the land involved. You will also duly report the governor's action in each case.

WM. A. J. SPARKS,
Commissioner.

Approved:
L. Q. C. LAMAR, *Secretary.*

UNITED STATES SWAMP-LAND LAWS—REGULATIONS AND DECISIONS THEREUNDER—GENERAL LAND OFFICE, APRIL 18, 1882.

An act to aid the State of Louisiana in draining the swamp lands therein.

Be it enacted, etc., That to aid the State of Louisiana in constructing the necessary levees and drains to reclaim the swamp and overflowed lands therein, the whole of those swamp and overflowed lands, which may be or are found unfit for cultivation, shall be, and the same are hereby, granted to that State.

SEC. 2. *And be it further enacted*, That as soon as the Secretary of the Treasury shall be advised, by the governor of Louisiana, that that State has made the necessary preparation to defray the expenses thereof he shall cause a personal examination to be made under the direction of the surveyor-general thereof, by experienced and faithful deputies, of all the swamp lands therein which are subject to overflow and unfit for cultivation; and a list of the same to be made out and certified by the deputies and surveyor-general to the Secretary of the Treasury, who shall approve the same, so far as they are not claimed or held by individuals, and on that approval the fee-simple to said lands shall vest in the said State of Louisiana, subject to the disposal of the Legislature thereof: *Provided, however*, That the proceeds of said lands shall be applied exclusively, as far as necessary, to the construction of the levees and drains aforesaid.

SEC. 3. *And be it further enacted*, That in making out a list of these swamp lands, subject to overflow and unfit for cultivation, all legal subdivisions, the greater part of which is of that character, shall be included in said list; but when the greater part of a subdivision is not of that character, the whole of it shall be excluded therefrom: *Provided, however*, That the provisions of this act shall not apply to any lands fronting on rivers, creeks, bayous, water courses, etc., which have been surveyed into lots or tracts under the acts of 3d March, 1811, and 24th May, 1824: *And provided further*, That the United States shall in no manner be held liable for any expense incurred in selecting these lands and making out the lists thereof, or for making any surveys that may be required to carry out the provisions of this act.

Approved March 2, 1849.

An act to enable the State of Arkansas and other States to reclaim the "swamp lands" within their limits.

Be it enacted, etc., That to enable the State of Arkansas to construct the necessary levees and drains to reclaim the swamp and overflowed lands therein, the whole of those swamp and overflowed lands made unfit thereby for cultivation, which shall remain unsold at the passage of this act, shall be, and the same are hereby, granted to said State.

SEC. 2. *And be it further enacted*, That it shall be the duty of the Secretary of the Interior, as soon as may be practicable after the passage of this act, to make out an accurate list and plats of the lands described as aforesaid, and transmit the same to the governor of the State of Arkansas, and at the request of said governor cause a patent to be issued to the State therefor; and on that patent the fee-simple to said lands shall vest in the said State of Arkansas, subject to the disposal of the Legislature thereof: *Provided, however*, That the proceeds of said lands, whether from sale or by direct appropriation in kind, shall be applied exclusively, so far as necessary, to the purpose of reclaiming said lands by means of the levees and drains aforesaid.

SEC. 3. *And be it further enacted*, That in making out a list and plats of the land aforesaid, all legal subdivisions, the greater part of which is "wet and unfit for cultivation," shall be included in said list and plats; but when the greater part of a subdivision is not of that character, the whole of it shall be excluded therefrom.

SEC. 4. *And be it further enacted*, That the provisions of this act be extended to, and their benefits be conferred upon, each of the other States of the Union in which such swamp and overflowed lands, known and designated as aforesaid, may be situated.

Approved September 28, 1850.

The grant of swamp lands, under acts of March 2, 1849, and September 28, 1850, is a grant *in præsenti*. See United States Supreme Court decisions, Railroad Company *vs.* Fremont County (9 Wallace, 89); Railroad Company *vs.* Smith (*id.*, 95); Martin *vs.* Marks (7 Otto, 345); decisions of Secretary of the Interior, December 23, 1851 (1 Lester's L. L., 549), April 25, 1862, and opinion of Attorney-General, November 10, 1858 (1 Lester's L. L., 564).

The act of September 28, 1850, did not grant swamp and overflowed lands to States admitted into the Union after its passage. See decision of Secretary Interior, August 17, 1858; Commissioner General Land Office, May 2, 1871 (Copp's L. L., 464), affirmed by Secretary June 1, 1871, and Commissioner General Land Office, January 19, 1874 (Copp's L. L., 473), affirmed by Secretary July 9, 1875.

A State having elected to take swamp land by field-notes and plats of survey is bound by them, as is also the Government. See Secretary's decision, October 4, 1855 (1 Lester's L. L., 553), August 1, 1859 (*id.*, 571), December 4, 1877 (4 Copp's L. O., 149), and September 19, 1879.

An act for the relief of purchasers and locators of swamp and overflowed lands.

SEC. 1. *Be it enacted, etc.*, That the President of the United States cause patents to be issued, as soon as practicable, to the purchaser or purchasers, locator or locators, who have made entries of the public lands, claimed as swamp lands, either with cash, or with land-warrants, or with scrip, prior to the issue of patents to the State or States, as provided for by the second section of the act approved September 28, 1850, entitled "An act to enable the State of Arkansas and other States to reclaim the swamp lands within their limits," any decision of the Secretary of the Interior or other officer of the Government of the United States to the contrary notwithstanding: *Provided*, That in all cases where any State, through its constituted authorities, may have sold or disposed of any tract or tracts of land to any individual or individuals prior to the entry, sale, or location of the same, under the pre-emption or other laws of the United States, no patent shall be issued by the President for such tract or tracts of land until such State, through its constituted authorities, shall release its claim thereto in such form as shall be prescribed by the Secretary of the Interior: *And provided further*, That if such State shall not within ninety days from the passage of this act, through its constituted authorities, return to the General Land Office of the United States a list of all the lands sold as aforesaid, together with the dates of such sale and the names of the purchasers, the patents shall be issued immediately thereafter, as directed in the foregoing section.

SEC. 2. *And be it further enacted*, That upon due proof, by the authorized agent of the State or States, before the Commissioner of the General Land Office, that any of the lands purchased were swamp lands, within the true intent and meaning of the act aforesaid, the purchase-money shall be paid over to the State or States; and where the lands have been located by warrant or scrip, the said State or States shall be authorized to locate a quantity of like amount, upon any of the public lands subject to entry, at $1.25 per acre, or less, and patents shall issue therefor upon the terms and conditions enumerated in the act aforesaid: *Provided, however*, That the said decisions of the Commissioner of the General Land Office shall be approved by the Secretary of the Interior.

Approved March 2, 1855.

An act to confirm to the several States the swamp and overflowed lands selected under the act of September 28, 1850, and the act of March 2, 1849.

Be it enacted, etc., That the selection of swamp and overflowed lands granted to the several States by the act of Congress approved September 28, 1850, entitled "An act to enable the State of Arkansas and other States to reclaim the swamp lands within their limits," and the act of March 2, 1849, entitled "An act to aid the State of Louisiana in draining the swamp lands therein," heretofore made and reported to the Commissioner of the General Land Office, so far as the same shall remain vacant and unappropriated, and not interfered with by an actual settlement under any existing law of the United States, be, and the same are hereby, confirmed, and shall be approved and patented to the said several States, in conformity with the provisions of the act aforesaid, as soon as may be practicable after the passage of this law: *Provided, however*, That nothing in this act contained shall interfere with the provisions of the act of Congress entitled "An act for the relief of purchasers and locaters of swamp and overflowed lands," approved March 2, 1855, which shall be, and is hereby, continued in force and extended to all entries and locations of lands claimed as swamp lands made since its passage.

Approved March 3, 1857.

An act to extend the provisions of "An act to enable the State of Arkansas and other States to reclaim the swamp lands within their limits" to Minnesota and Oregon, and for other purposes.

Be it enacted, etc., That the provisions of the act of Congress entitled "An act to enable the State of Arkansas and other States to reclaim the swamp lands within their limits," approved September 28, 1850, be, and the same are hereby, extended to the States of Minnesota and Oregon: *Provided*, That the grant hereby made shall not include any lands which the Government of the United States may have reserved, sold, or disposed of (in pursuance of any law heretofore enacted) prior to the confirmation of title to be made under the authority of the said act.

SEC. 2. *And be it further enacted*, That the selection to be made from lands already surveyed in each of the States, including Minnesota and Oregon, under the authority of the act aforesaid, and of the act to aid the State of Louisiana in draining the swamp lands therein, approved March 2, 1849, shall be made within two years from the adjournment of the Legislature of each State at its next session after the date of this act, and, as to all lands hereafter to be surveyed, within two years from such adjournment, at the next session after notice by the Secretary of the Interior to the governor of the State that the surveys have been completed and confirmed.

Approved March 12, 1860.

Provisions of section 2 repealed as to all States except Minnesota and Oregon by enactment in Revised Statutes. (See section 5596.)

The grant of swamp lands to the States of Oregon and Minnesota was a grant *in præsenti*, and the land so granted can not be otherwise disposed of by the Government. See Secretary's decisions, April 15, 1880; Crowley *vs.* State of Oregon (7 Copp's L. O., 28), and the State of Oregon *vs.* United States, June 4, 1880 (*id.*, 53).

Status of lands within the meander lines of shallow bodies of water at date of survey that might have been temporarily overflowed considered. See Secretary's decision, December 2, 1874 (Copp's Land Laws, 475).

CHAP. CCXIX.—An act to quiet land titles in California.

SEC. 4. *And be it further enacted*, That in all cases where township surveys have been, or shall hereafter be, made under authority of the United States, and the plats thereof approved, it shall be the duty of the Commissioner of the General Land Office to certify over to the State of California as swamp and overflowed all the lands represented as such upon such approved plats within one year from the passage of this act, or within one year from the return and approval of such township plats.

The Commissioner shall direct the United States surveyor-general for the State of California to examine the segregation maps and surveys of the swamp and overflowed lands made by said State, and where he shall find them to conform to the system of surveys adopted by the United States, he shall construct and approve township plats accordingly, and forward to the General Land Office for approval: *Provided*, That in segregating large bodies of land, notoriously and obviously swamp and overflowed, it shall not be necessary to subdivide the same, but to run the exterior lines of such body of land. In case such State surveys are not found to be in accordance with the system of United States surveys, and in such other townships as no survey has been made by the United States, the Commissioner shall direct the surveyor-general to make segregation surveys upon application to said surveyor-general by the governor of said State, within one year of said application, of all the swamp and overflowed land in such townships, and to report the same to the General Land Office, representing and describing what land was swamp and overflowed under the grant, according to the best evidence he can obtain. If the authorities of said State shall claim as swamp and overflowed any land not represented as such upon the map or in the returns of the surveyors, the character of such land at the date of the grant (September 28, 1850) and the right to the same shall be determined by testimony to be taken before the surveyor-general, who shall decide the same subject to the approval of the Commissioner of the General Land Office.

SEC. 5. *And be it further enacted*, That it shall be the duty of the Commissioner of the General Land Office to instruct the officers of the local land offices and the surveyor-general, immediately after the passage of this act, to forward lists of all selections made by the State referred to in section 1 of this act, and lists and maps of all swamp and overflowed lands claimed by said State or surveyed as provided in this act, for final disposition and determination, which final disposition shall be made by the Commissioner of the General Land Office without delay.

Approved July 23, 1866.

Mr. McRAE. Now, Mr. Speaker, unless some other gentleman desires to make remarks upon the bill or to ask a question about it, seeing that it will be impossible for us to pass the bill with the number of members now present, I shall ask to have the consideration hour considered as closed so far as this bill and the committee are concerned, so as to allow other committees a chance to do something.

Mr. JACKSON. Since debate has been entered upon and remarks have been made in favor of the bill, I think we who oppose it should at least have an opportunity to briefly state some of the objections to it. I think the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. SYMES] must certainly misapprehend the provisions of the bill or he would not have made the answers he did to my questions. The bill of the Senate (758), now under consideration, has nothing in it in regard to 5 per cent. payments. It is a bill providing for an allowance and payment to certain States at a fixed price per acre for swamp lands that it is alleged were embraced in grants made by the General Government to those States, and which lands the States have never received.

It is true, as carefully stated by the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. McRAE], that this bill does not carry an appropriation of money from the Treasury of the United States. But, Mr. Speaker, it is equally true that the passage of this bill will involve the United States in a liability for a very large sum of money. It is very similar to the bill reported at this session to the House from the Committee on the Public Lands (H. R. 6397), Report No. 347, and it will require but a very brief examination of the bill to satisfy any one that it involves a large liability on the part of the General Government, and that the zeal for its passage is wholly animated by a desire to eventually get handsome donations and allowances from the United States Treasury to certain States in the South and West that are well known to be embraced within its provisions.

Mr. Speaker, if I can be indulged for a very brief time, I would like to call attention to a few points in this case. The title of the bill is "An act to relieve purchasers of and indemnify certain States for swamp and overflowed lands disposed of, and for other purposes." This title, it will be observed, is broad enough to cover almost anything that might be desired, not only in regard to the somewhat celebrated swamp-land grants, but as to anything else. Now what, in fact, are the grants of swamp lands to the States? The original of the acts making these grants are the acts relating to Louisiana, approved 2d March, 1849, and the act relating to Arkansas, approved 28th September, 1850. The fourth section of this latter act made its provisions apply to all States then in the Union having public lands.

The purport of these acts is to grant to the States the swamp and overflowed lands within their boundaries for the purpose of reclaiming them. They were evidently only intended as a grant of such lands as are wholly unfit for cultivation without the construction of levees and drains under a system so extensive that only the State itself is competent to undertake it.

It is safe to say, Mr. Speaker, that of all the improvident legislation of Congress nothing has ever equaled these grants for abstracting public lands from the General Government without consideration. It is a well-known fact that under the different and varying systems of selection vast quantities of good arable lands have been obtained.

The very title of this bill shows that. It is to relieve purchasers who have acquired titles from the United States for lands so desirable that the settler in search of a home going upon the land never suspected the land to be swamp land. The fact is these grants accomplished no good purpose and should never have been made. No such grants, I venture to say, if attention is called to the fact, could now be obtained from Congress. Yet one of the provisions of this bill is to extend all these grants to all States admitted into the Union since 1860.

The gentleman from Colorado speaks of this bill as an innocent, harmless statute to pay some old, just debt. Yet, if I am not mistaken, his State without this act has not the shadow of a claim to any swamp lands whatever. I have not time to go into a full history of this legislation, and shall content myself with calling attention to some of the most objectionable features of this bill. Since the passage of the swamp-land acts in 1849 and 1850 the Government of the United States has been disposing of public lands in various ways—to States and corporations for public improvements by cash sales, by homesteads, by grants for public schools, and for some few other purposes.

It is claimed that the swamp-land grants are grants *in præsenti*, and that without requiring any designation whatever title at once passed to all swamp and overflowed lands to the respective States; that if by inadvertence the Government included in its gifts to a homesteader, or a sale or grant to any one, any land that can now be proven to have been swamp land, the State should now receive pay and indemnity for such lands at $1.25 per acre. No matter if the United States Government got but 12 cents per acre, or nothing at all, it should pay the State at the rate of $1.25 per acre for all such lands.

Further, no matter that it has been the State's own negligence that it has not had the swamp lands designated heretofore, it now claims indemnity for its own negligence.

These claims have no foundation in equity or justice. This bill is simply a convenient medium to get indirectly an appropriation for benefit of a State; and as it extends its benefits to many States, it of course has many friends.

It does not, as I have observed, make an immediate appropriation, but it does make it the duty of the Administration to settle and adjust these alleged claims, and it expressly provides that each State shall have indemnity at the rate of $1.25 per acre for such claims.

It further provides that the Secretary of the Treasury shall cause such State to be credited with these amounts, and he shall apply the same on any debt due the United States by such State.

But, Mr. Speaker, the drawers of this bill were careful to provide that none of this money should apply in the payment of the direct tax, as will appear from a reading of the second section. They eventually intend to have it money.

Mr. Speaker, there are other questions concerning this bill that ought to be discussed before it is voted upon. The gentleman in charge of it intimates that its consideration is not to be pressed at this time, and I hope to have further time to speak of it if it is called up again in this Congress.

Mr. McRAE. I have offered to yield time to the gentleman if he desires it, but he refused to accept it unless I would surrender to him.

Mr. JACKSON. I thank the gentleman very kindly; but in a discussion of this kind we of the opposition have a right to be heard in our own time, and the gentleman's merely yielding time is not satisfactory.

Mr. McRAE. The gentleman understands that we have only one hour altogether for the consideration of this bill, and I now say to him that I do not intend to yield the floor to him or any other gentleman to make speeches in opposition to the bill, with no chance to reply to them at this time. I have consented not to proceed with the discussion at this time because as we can not pass it no good will come from it.

If the gentleman compels the friends of the bill to go into the discussion at this time, we propose to take care of our own side. The bill

will bear discussion and I am anxious to discuss it, but I want that discussion before a House able to pass it if a majority so think. I do not care to talk to less than a quorum when I know that point will be made to defeat me.

If, however, gentlemen on the other side will not consent to let me take the course I suggest, then I propose to occupy the time allowed me under the rules of the House.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Arkansas is entitled to the floor for an hour.

Mr. NELSON. As there is no prospect of passing the bill now, I trust the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. McRAE] will withdraw it.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has that right.

Mr. McRAE. I can not consent to withdraw the bill; but if the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. JACKSON] will consent to the agreement suggested, it will obviate any trouble about the matter. If he does not, the hour will have to be consumed. It is not my purpose to stand in the way of any other committee.

I move that the committee rise.

The motion was agreed to.

The committee accordingly rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. RICHARDSON reported that the Committee of the Whole on the state of the Union having had under consideration the bill (S. 758) to relieve purchasers of, and to indemnify certain States for, swamp and overflowed lands disposed of, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

ORDER OF BUSINESS.

Mr. McRAE. I move that the hour allotted to the Committee on Public Lands for the consideration of the bill just reported from the Committee of the Whole, be now considered as closed; and on that motion I call for the previous question, if such a motion is in order.

The SPEAKER. No motion of that sort can be entertained under the rules. The rules provide imperatively that an hour shall be set apart for the consideration of bills previously reported from committees; and if at the end of the hour on any day a committee has a bill unfinished, it is allowed sufficient time on the next day, not exceeding one hour, to complete the consideration of that bill; when the consideration of that bill is completed or the bill withdrawn the time of the committee has expired.

Mr. McRAE. The motion I make has reference to a bill exactly in that condition—a bill coming over from the consideration hour of yesterday.

The SPEAKER. But the proposition of the gentleman can not be put in the form of a motion; it can be adopted only by unanimous consent, because the rule does not allow a motion to be made to dispense with the hour or any part of it. Has this bill been withdrawn in the Committee of the Whole?

Mr. McRAE. It has not. I did not desire to withdraw it.

The SPEAKER. Then the gentleman asks unanimous consent that the hour belonging to the Committee on Public Lands may be considered as closed for to-day.

Mr. NELSON. So far as relates to that committee, that proposition is satisfactory to me; but I think the gentleman ought not to ask to cut off other committees.

Mr. McRAE. I do not; and have done all I could to avoid such a result except to abandon this bill, and that I will not do.

The SPEAKER. The effect of the proposition will simply be that this committee will hereafter have a sufficient length of time to compensate for the time which may be lost this morning.

Mr. McRAE. The very object of my proposition is to enable some other committee to go on.

Mr. NELSON. To-day?

Mr. JACKSON. Well, I object. I desire that the Committee on Public Lands shall have their time on this bill to-day. I do not want the time to go over till to-morrow; I want it to be occupied this morning, so far as I am concerned.

The SPEAKER. But the Chair will state to the gentleman that immediately upon the completion of the consideration of the bill now pending, the Committee on Public Lands would lose its place, and another committee would be called. No other bill from the Committee on Public Lands could be taken up under the rule.

Mr. JACKSON. But my impression is that this bill, if considered, will consume the time.

Mr. EZRA B. TAYLOR. If the House will listen to me for one moment, I may perhaps say something which will be of interest. After careful consideration of all the circumstances I have come to this conclusion, by which I shall abide: With my consent, there shall be no other legislation during this session of Congress, in the absence of a quorum, except appropriation bills and pension bills.

Mr. O'NEILL, of Pennsylvania. And the gentleman excepts also, I hope, private bills to which there is no objection.

Mr. EZRA B. TAYLOR. I mean just what I say.

Mr. McKENNA. I ask unanimous consent to introduce for consideration the resolution which I hold in my hand.

The SPEAKER. The regular order has been insisted upon by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SOWDEN], who, being appealed to, declined to withdraw the call. Of course the Chair is bound by that demand.

Mr. McKENNA. The gentleman from Pennsylvania, I believe, is present. I ask that the resolution be read and that the Chair put the request for unanimous consent.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Pennsylvania does not seem to be present.

Mr. TAULBEE. I demand the regular order.

Mr. McKENNA. You have not heard this resolution read.

The SPEAKER. The hour for the consideration of bills reported from committees has not yet expired, and no other business can now be transacted.

Mr. O'NEILL, of Pennsylvania. I wish to say that I hope the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. EZRA B. TAYLOR] will not include in his objection private bills.

The SPEAKER. That is a matter of personal appeal to the gentleman from Ohio. The House is now acting under the rule which sets apart this hour for the consideration of bills heretofore reported from committees.

Mr. O'NEILL, of Pennsylvania. But the gentleman said he would not permit any bill to pass——

The SPEAKER. That has no reference to anything now before the House.

Mr. RICHARDSON. If the gentleman [Mr. McRAE] representing the Committee on Public Lands does not desire to call up any other bill, is it not in order to call the next committee?

The SPEAKER. If the gentleman from Arkansas makes no motion that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole for the consideration of the bill pending in that committee, the Chair would of course call another committee, and the Committee on Public Lands would lose the remainder of its hour.

Mr. McRAE. The Committee on Public Lands cares nothing about the remainder of this hour, seeing that in the present condition of the House the opposition to the pending bill will be able to prevent its passage. But we do desire that this bill shall not lose any right whatever which it may have as unfinished business.

The SPEAKER. It will not lose any right in that respect. If left undisposed of at the conclusion of this hour, it becomes unfinished business under the rules of the House.

Mr. McRAE. Then I am perfectly willing that the next committee be called.

The SPEAKER. But it becomes unfinished business in the class of business to which it belongs and in the order in which it stands on the Calendar.

Mr. McRAE. I understand that; but it goes on the Calendar as unfinished business?

The SPEAKER. It does.

Mr. McRAE. I suppose that is all I can hope to accomplish.

Mr. JACKSON. I wish to make a parliamentary inquiry. Has the Committee on Public Lands the right to call up any other bill now?

The SPEAKER. It has not. Having occupied one hour yesterday, its right to-day is simply to continue the consideration of the bill pending at the termination of that hour. The next committee is the Committee on Indian Affairs.

PIPESTONE INDIAN RESERVATION, MINNESOTA.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. Speaker, in the absence of the chairman of the Committee on Indian Affairs, and as I see no other member of the committee present, I desire to call up House bill No. 11128 and ask that it be considered in the House. It is now on the Calendar of the Committee of the Whole on the state of the Union.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Minnesota, from the Committee on Indian Affairs, calls up House bill No. 11128, and asks unanimous consent that the Committee of the Whole on the state of the Union be discharged from its consideration——

Mr. NELSON. As the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. PEEL], the chairman of the committee, has just come in, I ask to withdraw the call of that bill.

Mr. PEEL. I suppose its consideration might go on.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 11128) for the disposition of the agricultural lands embraced within the limits of the Pipestone Indian reservation in Minnesota.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Minnesota asks unanimous consent to discharge the Committee of the Whole on the state of the Union from the further consideration of this bill——

Mr. EZRA B. TAYLOR. I object.

Mr. NELSON. I move, then, that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole for the consideration of the bill.

The question being taken on the motion of Mr. NELSON, there were—ayes 20, noes 6.

Mr. EZRA B. TAYLOR. No quorum has voted.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will appoint Mr. NELSON and Mr. EZRA B. TAYLOR as tellers.

Mr. HOLMES. If in order, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The House divided; and the tellers reported—ayes 9, noes 29.

So the motion was disagreed to.

ORDER OF BUSINESS.

Mr. BURNES. I ask, by unanimous consent, to report from the Committee on Appropriations a bill making an appropriation for the enforcement of the Chinese exclusion act.

The SPEAKER. That can not be done unless the gentleman from Pennsylvania withdraws his point of order.

Mr. BURNES. I ask the gentleman from Pennsylvania to allow this bill to be presented and acted on at this time.

Mr. SOWDEN. The reason I have made the point of order is a public one.

Mr. BURNES. The bill which I desire to bring before the House is in behalf of the public business. It makes an appropriation for the enforcement of the Chinese exclusion act. It is asked for urgently in order to carry out the law Congress has just passed. It is a public matter.

Mr. NELSON. Have I the right to withdraw the matter which I have called up, and which is now pending?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman can do so if he wishes.

Mr. NELSON. Then I will withdraw the bill and yield to the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. PEEL].

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BURNES] asks unanimous consent to present a bill, the title of which will be read by the Clerk.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill making an appropriation for the enforcement of the Chinese exclusion act.

Mr. PEEL. I believe I have the floor.

Mr. BURNES. I ask the gentleman to yield to me for the purpose of presenting for consideration the bill to which I have referred.

Mr. PEEL. The committee has only one hour for the consideration of bills which it has reported, and the gentleman can call his matter up after the morning hour as well as at this time. I do not like to yield at this time, as it will come out of the morning hour. I ask the Chair whether, if I yield, the time consumed will not come out of the morning hour?

The SPEAKER. It will come out of your hour.

ENFORCEMENT OF THE CHINESE EXCLUSION ACT.

Mr. McKENNA. I ask, by unanimous consent, that the time consumed by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BURNES] in presenting the bill be not taken out of the hour belonging to the Committee on the Public Lands.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection, and it was ordered accordingly.

Mr. BURNES. I now ask, by unanimous consent, to present for consideration at this time a bill (H. R. 11581) making an appropriation for the enforcement of the Chinese exclusion act.

The SPEAKER. The bill will be read, after which the Chair will ask for objection.

The bill was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That for the purpose of carrying into effect the provisions of the act approved October 1, 1888, entitled "An act supplementary to an act entitled 'An act to execute certain treaty stipulations relating to Chinese,' approved the 6th day of May, 1882," and to defray the expenses which may be incurred in the enforcement of said act by the Secretary of the Treasury during the fiscal year 1889, the sum of $50,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary, be, and the same is hereby, appropriated out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. SOWDEN. As this is a bill of a public character and necessary for the public service, I withdraw my demand for the regular order.

The bill was read a first and second time.

Mr. BURNES. I ask for the reading of the letter which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

TREASURY DEPARTMENT, OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Washington, D. C., October 9, 1888.

SIR: The attention of the Congress is respectfully invited to the necessity of making some appropriation for the purpose of carrying into effect the provisions of the recent Chinese exclusion act, approved October 1, 1888.

The enforcement of the act necessarily devolves in the first instance upon the collectors of the several ports of entry in the United States, and from the very nature of the service must require the maintenance of a special force of inspectors, guards, and other employés, and as entry may be effected into the United States not only at the ports upon the Atlantic, Pacific, and Gulf coasts, but also across the Canadian and Mexican border lines, it is evident that a considerable force must be eventually employed in order to effectually enforce the provisions of the act.

It would be difficult to give a detailed estimate of the expenditure which might be required for this purpose, but it is recommended that an initial appropriation of $50,000 be made, and I inclose the draught of a provision to be inserted in some proper appropriation bill if this recommendation meets with the approval of the Congress.

As the act in question relates to and in a measure regulates the subject of immigration into the United States, it is believed that the money appropriated can be properly paid out of the immigrant fund provided for in the act of August 2, 1882, entitled "An act to regulate immigration." This fund is amply sufficient for this purpose, there being now to its credit upon the books of the Treasury the sum of $281,395.40.

Respectfully, yours,

HUGH S. THOMPSON,
Acting Secretary.

The SPEAKER,
United States House of Representatives.

Enforcement of Chinese exclusion act: For the purpose of carrying into effect the provisions of the act approved October 1, 1888, entitled "An act, a supplement to an act entitled 'An act to execute certain treaty stipulations relating to Chinese,' approved the 6th day of May, 1882," and to defray the expenses which may be incurred in the enforcement of said act by the Secretary of the Treasury during the fiscal year 1889, the sum of $50,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary, be, and the same is hereby, appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated.

Mr. BURNES. The Treasury asks, for the purpose of carrying into effect the provisions of the Chinese exclusion act, that the sum of $50,000 shall be paid out of the immigrant fund. We deemed that unnecessary, as that fund is in the Treasury, and therefore we have provided that the amount shall be appropriated out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time; and being engrossed, it was accordingly read the third time, and passed.

Mr. BURNES moved to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed; and also moved that the motion to reconsider be laid on the table.

The latter motion was agreed to.

THE WESTERN CHEROKEE INDIANS.

Mr. PEEL. I ask, by unanimous consent, to call up the bill (H. R. 1407) to authorize the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render final judgment upon the claim of the Old Settler or Western Cherokee Indians.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore* (Mr. STONE, of Kentucky, in the chair). The Chair is advised that the bill is upon the Private Calendar.

Mr. PEEL. I had a bill of similar nature which was decided by the Chair could not be called up on private-bill day. Now this provides for allowing these Old Settler or Western Cherokee Indians to appeal to the Court of Claims for the adjustment of their claim. They have kept up their tribal relations for the prosecution of that claim, and so far as that claim is concerned they stand as an independent tribe. I do not see, therefore, why, as it relates to a public matter, it should be referred to the Private Calendar.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. After the explanation of the gentleman from Arkansas and a brief examination of the bill the Chair thinks it is a private bill. But the Chair will submit the statement to the House.

Mr. PEEL. Permit me, Mr. Speaker, further to state to the House that there is a bill on the Calendar for the reimbursement of certain Indians that Speaker CARLISLE on last Friday decided was a public bill, and could not be called up on that day. It is a bill which embodies more of the elements of a private bill than the one now under consideration, and yet it was held by the Speaker to be a public bill within the rule. Besides the Chair on last Friday ruled that the bill disposing of the Pipestone reservation was a public bill.

Mr. RYAN. What is this bill?

Mr. PEEL. This is the Old Settler or Cherokee claim. I hope the House will consider it a public bill.

Mr. HERBERT. I submit, Mr. Speaker, one further consideration that appears to my mind a sufficient one to indicate that the gentleman from Arkansas is correct in the position he takes. As I understand it this is in pursuance of a treaty between the United States and an Indian tribe. These treaties have always been regarded as quasi public—the tribe considered as one party to the treaty and the Government as the other—and of course a bill touching such a treaty, or a right growing out of it, would seem to be, and ought necessarily to be, a public bill, just as if the other party were a foreign nation instead of an Indian tribe. Treaties can only be made with tribes of Indians or other parties upon the theory that the person with whom the treaty is made, the tribe, or whatever it may be, is an entity in itself, like a foreign nation, and a treaty so made is necessarily a public treaty.

Mr. DINGLEY. Let the bill be read.

The bill was read at length.

Mr. EZRA B. TAYLOR. Is this bill subject to objection? I was temporarily out of the Hall.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. A question has been raised as to whether it is a public or a private bill. It has been called up in the hour by the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Mr. EZRA B. TAYLOR. I shall object to it at any time.

Mr. DINGLEY. I would like to ask the gentleman from Arkansas if this is a claim on the part of a certain tribe of Indians against the United States under a treaty?

Mr. PEEL. It is.

Mr. DINGLEY. Then it is a public bill.

Mr. PEEL. Undoubtedly.

Mr. DINGLEY. But if it is a claim of individual Indians against the Government it is a private claim.

Mr. PEEL. No; it is a claim of a separate band known as the Old Settlers or Cherokees, and for the purpose of presenting the claim they are considered as a separate tribe. Under the treaty of 1846, out of which this claim arises, they are recognized as a separate and independent tribe for the purpose of carrying on this claim against the Government.

Mr. DINGLEY. I made the inquiry because I think it has been frequently held in the House that matters arising between the United

States and a tribe of Indians as an entirety have been held to be public.

Mr. PEEL. That is correct.

Mr. DINGLEY. But if the claim relates to individuals of a tribe against the United States, then it is a private matter.

Mr. PEEL. This is a public bill for the reason that the tribe of Indians here are treated and held to be a separate band, independent of the other Cherokees, for the purpose of carrying on this claim against the Government. Otherwise, I repeat, they belong to the Cherokee Nation.

Mr. RYAN. I understand that these are simply members of the Cherokee Nation of Indians. They are called the Old Settlers, although they belong to the same tribe, the name being given to them, perhaps, because they were pioneers moving into the Territory at an earlier date than the remainder of the tribe. They are simply a class of that nation who perhaps went ont there at an earlier period than the rest of the tribe. They have some rights growing out of the treaty of 1846, and this bill is intended to provide a remedy. Nevertheless, it seems to me that it is a public measure since it does not specify by name the beneficiaries. Hence, I think, under the rulings of the Speaker of the House heretofore it is a public bill.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. After the reading of the bill, and in view of former rulings of the Chair on this question, the present occupant of the chair will hold this to be a public bill, and that it has the right of consideration in this hour.

Mr. PEEL. Now, Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman from Ohio proposes to make the point of no quorum upon this bill I would like to know it.

Mr. EZRA B. TAYLOR. I certainly shall.

Mr. PEEL. I think if the gentleman will reflect for a moment on the object of this legislation he will not do that.

Mr. RYAN. I understand the objection does not go to the merits.

Mr. EZRA B. TAYLOR. When the time comes I will show the reason of the objection. I shall insist, just as I have said, on the presence of a quorum.

Mr. PEEL. Very well, then, Mr. Speaker, I ask leave to withdraw the bill for the present.

There being no objection, the bill was withdrawn.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

A message from the Senate, by Mr. MCCOOK, its Secretary, announced that the Senate had agreed to the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 2110) granting the right of way for the construction of a railroad through the Hot Springs reservation, State of Arkansas.

The message further announced that the Senate had agreed to the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 2663) granting an increase of pension to Mrs. Mary M. Ord.

The message further announced that the Senate had agreed to the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 1190) for the relief of the estate of Joseph Fenno.

The message further announced that the Senate had agreed to the report of the conferees on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 10896) making appropriations to supply deficiencies in the appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1888, and for other years, and for other purposes.

The message further announced that the Senate had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 3559) to amend section 2304 of the Revised Statutes of the United States, to allow persons who have abandoned or relinquished their homestead entries to make another entry.

The message further announced that the Senate had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 8962) for the relief of Anthony L. Woodson.

CHEROKEE FREEDMEN.

Mr. PEEL. I now ask to call up the bill (S. 1494) for present consideration.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The Clerk will report the title of the bill.

The bill was read, as follows:

A bill to secure to the Cherokee freedmen and others their proportion of certain proceeds of land, under the act of March 3, 1883.

Whereas it is provided in the ninth article of the treaty of July 19, 1866, between the United States and the Cherokee Nation of Indians, that freedmen who have been liberated by voluntary act of their former owners, or by law, as well as all free colored persons who were in the (Cherokee) country at the commencement of the rebellion, and were then residents therein, or who might return within six months, and their descendants, shall have all the rights of native Cherokees; and

Whereas by the fifteenth article of the aforesaid treaty certain terms were provided under which friendly Indians might be settled upon unoccupied lands in the Cherokee country east of the ninety-sixth degree of west longitude, and the Indians thus settled were, upon full compliance with the provisions of said article, to be incorporated into and ever after remain a part of the Cherokee Nation, upon equal terms in every respect with native citizens; and

Whereas under the provisions of the aforesaid fifteenth article an agreement was entered into between the Cherokee Nation and the Delaware tribe of Indians, on the 8th day of April, 1867, which agreement was approved respectively by the Secretary of the Interior and the President of the United States on the 11th day of April, 1867, and by the terms of which the Delaware Indians "became members of the Cherokee Nation, with the same rights and immunities and the same participation (and no other) in the national funds as native Cherokees;" and

Whereas under the provisions of the aforesaid fifteenth article an agreement was entered into between the Cherokee Nation and the Shawnee tribe of Indians, on the 7th day of June, 1869, and approved by the Secretary of the Interior and the President of the United States, respectively, on the 9th day of June, 1869, by the terms of which the Shawnee Indians were incorporated into and became a part of the Cherokee Nation on equal terms in every respect and with all the privileges and immunities of native citizens of the Cherokee Nation; and

Whereas it is provided by the sixth article of the aforesaid treaty that all laws of the Cherokee Nation shall be uniform throughout said nation; and

Whereas by an item in the act making appropriations for sundry civil expenses of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1884, and for other purposes, approved March 3, 1883, the sum of $300,000 was "appropriated, to be paid into the treasury of the Cherokee Nation, out of the funds due under appraisement for Cherokee lands west of the Arkansas River, which sum shall be expended as the acts of the Cherokee Legislature direct;" and

Whereas by an act of the Cherokee Legislature, which was passed over the veto of the principal chief and became a law on the 19th day of May, 1883, the principal chief was directed to cause the said sum of $300,000 to be paid out per capita to the citizens of the Cherokee Nation by blood, and which sum has been paid out only to Cherokee citizens by blood, as directed by said act; and

Whereas by the said act of the Cherokee Legislature the aforesaid freedmen, Delaware and Shawnee Indians have been deprived of their legal and just dues guarantied them by treaty stipulations: Therefore,

Be it enacted, etc., That there be, and hereby is, appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $75,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary, to carry out the provisions of this act; and the amount actually expended shall be charged against the Cherokee Nation, on account of its lands west of the Arkansas River, and shall be a lien on said lands, and which shall be deducted from any payment hereafter made on account of said lands. The said sum, or so much thereof as may be necessary, shall be by the Secretary of the Interior distributed per capita, first, among such freedmen and their descendants as are mentioned in the ninth article of the treaty of July 19, 1866, between the United States and the Cherokee Nation of Indians; second, among the Delaware tribe of Indians incorporated into the Cherokee Nation by the terms of a certain agreement entered into between said Cherokee Nation and Delaware Indians, under the provisions of the fifteenth article of the aforesaid treaty, on the 8th day of April, 1867, and approved, respectively, by the President of the United States and the Secretary of the Interior on the 11th day of April, 1867; and, third, among the Shawnee tribe of Indians incorporated into the Cherokee Nation by the terms of a certain agreement entered into between the said Cherokee Nation and Shawnee Indians, under the provisions of the aforesaid article and treaty, on the 7th day of June, 1869, and approved, respectively, by the President of the United States and the Secretary of the Interior on the 9th day of June, 1869, in such manner and in such amount or amounts as will equalize the per capita payment made to Cherokees by blood in accordance with the act of the Cherokee legislature aforesaid, out of the sum of $300,000 appropriated by the act of March 3, 1883, aforesaid.

Mr. PEEL. As will be observed, during the last session of the Forty-seventh Congress, in 1883, Congress appropriated $300,000 to the Cherokee Nation to be expended as the Cherokee council might direct. The Cherokee council saw proper to distribute that money to their people; that is to say, that the Cherokees by their act excluded their freedmen who had been incorporated into their citizenship under the treaty of 1866 and who under that treaty were given all the rights and privileges of native Cherokees. It also excluded from the distribution the adopted Shawnees and Delawares who under agreement arising under the treaty of 1866 became citizens of the Cherokee Nation. The excluded parties in that nation appealed to the Department. The Department investigated the question fully, but as shown by the preamble the principal chief of the Cherokee Nation vetoed the bill by which those freedmen and the other Indians were prescribed from a participation in the distribution, but the council passed it over the veto by a two-thirds vote and it became a law. When the attention of the Department was called to it they made a thorough investigation of the matter, and the bill is substantially the same as it was approved by the Commissioner of Indian Affairs and the Secretary of the Interior and sent to the Forty-ninth Congress, or, I believe, first in the Forty-eighth Congress.

It was very fully investigated by the Committee on Indian Affairs, of which I was a member at that time, and I was chairman of the subcommittee having charge of the measure. We reached the same conclusion, that these parties had been wrongfully excluded and they were entitled to their share of that money. This bill then simply proposes to appropriate $75,000, or so much money as may be necessary to pay these freedmen, Shawnees and Delawares, their proportion and to charge that to the Cherokee fund, or that so much of the Cherokee fund shall be paid over to them. I believe that is about the substance of the measure, and I will now yield five minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. PHELAN].

The SPEAKER *pro tempore* (Mr. STONE, of Kentucky). The Senate bill does not appear to have been before the committee.

Mr. PEEL. The House bill is reported by the Committee on Indian Affairs, and I will ask that the Senate bill be substituted. That may perhaps require unanimous consent.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. It does require unanimous consent. The gentleman from Arkansas asks unanimous consent that the Senate bill be substituted for the House bill under consideration. Is there objection? The Chair hears none.

Mr. PEEL. I now yield five minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. PHELAN].

Mr. PHELAN. I shall not detain the House by entering into an elaborate discussion of this bill, but will simply say that it has all

been passed upon by every department of the Government which can take it into consideration. It has been passed upon very fully and given careful and full examination by the Interior Department—by the Secretary of the Interior and by the Commissioner of Indian Affairs—and it was sent to the Committee on Indian Affairs and carefully considered there. No money is to be appropriated ultimately out of the Treasury of the United States. The money which is appropriatod is to be charged against the Cherokee Nation, and taken out of money that will be paid for some of their lands which are yet to be sold. We are merely advancing to the parties who have been treated unjustly and unfairly by the Cherokee Nation an amount sufficient to pay them out of the Cherokee funds. It is an act of justice which will not cost the United States Government a single cent.

The people who are chiefly interested in this bill, as is well known, are the freedmen of the Cherokee Nation. Under the treaty of 1866 they were given all the rights of Cherokee citizens. Under the act distributing the money which was paid to these Indians from the sale of their lands, it was distributed solely and exclusively among citizens of the Cherokee Nation of Cherokee blood. In this way the freedmen were excluded and also the Shawnees and the Delawares.

This bill is simply an act of justice, which they now request at the hands of the House, and I hope there will be no objection to it. I am sure there can be none upon any ground of equity or of law.

Mr. PEEL. I move that the Committee on Indian Affairs be discharged from the further consideration of the Senate bill.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. PEEL. I now move that the bill be put upon its passage.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. Speaker, I can not agree to the passage of this bill. I will go further than the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. EZRA B. TAYLOR], and will say that in my opinion nothing ought to pass this House now except appropriation bills and a motion to adjourn *sine die*.

Mr. HENDERSON, of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, this is a matter of such fairness and of such importance that I think it ought to go through without objection. It is a bill for the relief of the Cherokee freedmen, and the case is an exceptional one.

Mr. PEEL. I hope the gentleman from Texas [Mr. KILGORE], when he understands the nature of this bill, will not object to it. It does not appropriate a dollar of money out of the Treasury. The matter is one which rests entirely between the Cherokee Nation and these citizens. The bill is recommended by the Department, and it has twice passed the Senate.

Mr. SOWDEN. What is the amount involved?

Mr. PEEL. About $60,000. I now move that the bill be ordered to a third reading.

The motion was agreed to.

The bill was accordingly read the third time, and passed.

Mr. PEEL moved to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed; and also moved that the motion to reconsider be laid on the table.

The latter motion was agreed to.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. Speaker, do I understand that that bill has passed? Three or four gentlemen were talking to me here so that I did not take in all that was going on. [Laughter.]

Mr. HENDERSON, of Iowa. They were all good conversationalists. [Laughter.]

Mr. PEEL. I will say to my friend from Texas [Mr. KILGORE] that while he was engaged in that conversation he was doing good service for his country. [Laughter.]

Mr. PEEL. I now call up for consideration the bill (H. R. 1407) to authorize the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render final judgment upon the claim of the Old Settler or Western Cherokee Indians.

Mr. KILGORE. What is that?

Mr. PEEL. This is the same bill which was read a while ago and which the Chair ruled was a public bill. I will make a brief statement with regard to it, and I hope there will be no objection to the passage of the bill, for certainly it is nothing but an act of justice. If we owe any of our Indians anything I am sure that every honest man, and that includes, of course, every member of this House, will say that we ought to pay it. If we do not owe them anything, of course we ought not to pay them anything, and the country ought to know the facts. The subject-matter of this bill is the claim of the Old Settler Cherokees, who are known as the Western or Old Settler Cherokees of the Indian Territory. They were the first Cherokees that went west of the Mississippi River and located in the wilds in 1828. Under the treaty of 1846, made between these people as a separate band of Indians and the Cherokee Nation of Indians and the United States, they were authorized to present their claims to the proceeds of their lands that were sold west of the Mississippi River, and they have been prosecuting that claim for thirty or forty years. The Senate made two favorable reports upon that claim, which is now included in this bill.

Finally, in the Forty-seventh Congress, it was referred to the Secretary of the Interior with authority to employ a special accountant to go over the accounts between this branch of the Cherokee people and the Government of the United States and ascertain what amount, if any, was due them. That special accountant examined the matter thoroughly and reported a large amount as due—something over $400,000, together with a certain rate of interest. The Commissioner of Indian Affairs at the time, Mr. Price, made a similar report and brought us in debt to these Indians in about the same amount. In the Forty-eighth Congress, the first Congress of which I had the honor to be a member, the question came before the Committee on Indian Affairs, through an executive document, and we were asked to appropriate the money. The chairman of the Committee on Indian Affairs, of which committee I was a member, referred the claim to me for investigation. I gave it the most thorough investigation I have ever given any claim since I have been in Congress. I found no disagreement between myself and the Department as to the facts, but there was a disagreement as to the law. Under my construction of the treaty and the acts of Congress relative thereto I believed, and I so reported, that we did not owe these Indians anything. In the mean time, however, the Court of Claims got jurisdiction of the matter by a reference from the Senate committee, and they made a report in the alternative. They said that upon one construction of the treaty, which was the construction I had adopted, there was about $4,000 due the Indians, but upon the other construction, the one adopted by the Department, there was a much larger sum, about $400,000.

Now there stands a disputed question as to the legal construction of the treaty out of which this claim grows, a question which can never be settled satisfactorily to the country and the claimants unless it be passed upon by the court of last resort. This bill then provides simply for referring this claim to the Court of Claims for adjudication, with the right of either party to appeal to the Supreme Court of the United States. The bill is peremptory in requiring the Attorney-General, if the decision should be against the Government, to appeal to the Supreme Court. Thus under this bill the rights of these individual Indians will be passed upon by a court of our own creation.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore* (Mr. STONE, of Kentucky). The hour for the consideration of bills reported from committees has expired.

Mr. KILGORE. I will not agree to the passage of that bill; I will call a quorum on it.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. PERRY, indefinitely, on account of important business.

To Mr. HEARD, indefinitely, on account of important business.

HOMESTEAD ENTRIES.

Mr. McRAE. I rise to present a privileged report, which I ask the Clerk to read.

The Clerk read as follows:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 3559) to amend section 2304 of the Revised Statutes of the United States to allow persons who have abandoned or relinquished their homestead entries to make another entry, having met, after full and free conference have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

Amendment numbered 1: That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House numbered 1, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In line 6 strike out the word "them" and insert the words "him or her upon the lands settled upon." In line 8 strike out the words "they have" and insert "he or she has;" and the House agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 2: That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House numbered 2, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

Strike out all of section 3 of said proposed amendment and insert in lieu thereof as follows:

"SEC. 3. That the price of all sections and parts of sections of the public lands within the limits of the portions of the several grants of lands to aid in the construction of railroads, which have been heretofore and which may hereafter be forfeited, which were by the act making such grants or have since been increased to the double minimum price, and also of all lands within the limits of any such railroad grant, and not embraced in the grant lying adjacent to and coterminous with the portions of the line of any such railroad which shall not be completed at the date of this act, is hereby fixed at $1.25 per acre."

And the House agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 3: That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House numbered 3, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: Strike out all after the word "acres" in line 5 and insert as follows: "without proof of residence upon and certification of the additional entry; and if final proof of settlement and certification has been made for the original entry, when the additional entry is made, then the patent shall issue without further proof." Add as an additional section as follows:

"SEC. 5. That every person entitled under the provisions of the homestead laws to enter a homestead, who has heretofore complied with or who shall hereafter comply with the conditions of said laws, and who shall have made his final proof thereunder for a quantity of land less than 160 acres, and received the receiver's final receipt therefor, shall be entitled under said laws to enter, by legal subdivisions of the public lands of the United States subject to homestead entry, so much additional land as added to the quantity previously so entered by him shall not exceed 160 acres: *Provided*, That in no case shall patent issue until the person making such additional homestead entry shall have actually and in conformity with the homestead laws resided upon and cultivated the land embraced therein, and otherwise complied with such laws."

Amend the title as follows: Strike out the following words: "Amend section 2304 of the Revised Statutes of the United States," and add, after the word "entry," the words "and for other purposes;" and the House agree to the same.

THO. C. McRAE,
BINGER HERMANN,
JOS. WHEELER,
Managers on the part of the House.

J. N. DOLPH,
J. H. BERRY,
Managers on the part of the Senate.

Mr. McRAE. I move the adoption of that report.

The report was adopted.

Mr. McRAE moved to reconsider the vote by which the report was adopted; and also moved that the motion to reconsider be laid on the table.

The latter motion was agreed to.

ELECTORAL COUNT.

Mr. PEEL. I ask unanimous consent that the House take up and put on its passage a Senate bill now on the Speaker's table, the necessity of which must be obvious, it being designed to correct an error in the statute in regard to the electoral count.

The title of the bill was read, as follows:

A bill (S. 3620) supplementary to the act approved February 3, 1887, entitled "An act to fix the day for the meeting of the electors of President and Vice-President, and to provide for and regulate the counting of the votes for President and Vice-President, and the decision of questions arising thereon."

Mr. PEEL. It will be obvious to the House, on the reading of this bill, that its passage is necessary. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. BRECKINRIDGE] to explain it if anybody desires an explanation.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE, of Kentucky. I think the measure is understood by the House. It is a bill passed by the Senate for the purpose of correcting a mistake in the act of 1887.

Mr. DINGLEY. The bill should be passed immediately.

Mr. EZRA B. TAYLOR. There is no doubt about that.

There being no objection, the bill was read a first and second time, and the House proceeded to its consideration.

The bill was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the certificates and lists of votes for President and Vice-President of the United States, mentioned in chapter 1 of Title III of the Revised Statutes of the United States, and in the act to which this is a supplement, shall be forwarded, in the manner therein provided, to the President of the Senate forthwith after the second Monday in January, on which the electors shall give their votes.

SEC. 2. That section 141 of the Revised Statutes of the United States is hereby so amended as to read as follows:

"SEC. 141. Whenever a certificate of votes from any State has not been received at the seat of Government on the fourth Monday of the month of January in which their meeting shall have been held, the Secretary of State shall send a special messenger to the district judge in whose custody one certificate of the votes from that State has been lodged, and such judge shall forthwith transmit that list to the seat of Government."

The bill was ordered to a third reading, and was read the third time; and the question being taken on its passage, the Speaker *pro tempore* announced the bill passed.

Mr. DOUGHERTY. I call for a division.

Several MEMBERS. Too late!

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The Chair thinks the call for a division comes too late.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE, of Kentucky. I presume the gentleman from Florida [Mr. DOUGHERTY] does not understand the effect of this measure. By the present law the Presidential electors are required to meet on the second Monday in January, and they are required to have their certificate here by a certain day in December.

Mr. DOUGHERTY. The explanation of the gentleman from Kentucky is entirely unnecessary. I think I understand the provisions of the bill. But certain gentlemen on this floor have stated that no legislation shall be passed except certain kinds of legislation. There are bills in which the people of my district are directly concerned, bills which are in the interest of economy on the part of the Government, and bills the passage of which would be of great assistance to the people I represent in their present strait on account of the yellow-fever epidemic.

If it be the purpose of any gentleman——

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The gentleman's demand for a division comes too late.

Mr. DOUGHERTY. As I understand it, the Chair put the question, and, if no other gentleman voted "no," I certainly voted "no," and then I called for a division.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE, of Kentucky. The demand for a division the Chair has declared came too late.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The vote was taken, the Chair announced the result deliberately, and the demand for a division therefore comes too late. The bill has been passed.

DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. BURNES. I submit the following privileged report.

The report was read.

The SPEAKER. Is the reading of the statement on the part of the House conferees demanded? [After a pause.] If not, its reading will be dispensed with.

The statement of the House conferees accompanying the conference report under the rules is as follows:

The managers on the part of the House of the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 10896) making appropriations to supply deficiencies in the appropriations for 1888 and prior years, and for other purposes, submit the following written statement in explanation of the accompanying conference report:

The action of the conference committee differs from that submitted in a report to the House on the Senate amendments, on the 3d instant, in the following particulars only:

On amendments numbered 39 and 41: Appropriates $2,500 to enable the commissioners of the District of Columbia to employ special counsel to represent the District in the case of Samuel Strong, authorized to be submitted to an arbitration board under a joint resolution of Congress approved July 10, 1888.

On amendment numbered 42: Strikes out a provision to extend the time within which the Washington aqueduct tunnel shall be completed, from November 1, 1888, to June 30, 1889, and appropriates $5,000 for the expenses of a joint select committee authorized under a concurrent resolution of Congress to investigate work on and other matters relating to said tunnel.

On amendment numbered 100: Strikes out proposed appropriation of $8,745 to pay to the widow of the late Chief-Justice Morrison R. Waite the balance of one year's salary.

On amendment numbered 107: Omits from the provision to pay certain accounts of district attorneys in 1887, the claim of Grosvenor Lowrey for $911.20, certified in Senate Executive Document No. 270.

On amendments numbered 112 and 113, relating to the Industrial Christian Home Association of Utah: Inserts in lieu of the matter proposed by said amendments the provisions which are set forth in full in the conference report.

On amendment numbered 114: Strikes out proposed appropriation to pay one year's salary to the widow of Lafayette Dancy, an employé of the Internal-Revenue Service, who died of yellow fever in Florida.

On amendment numbered 138: Appropriates $66 for payment of an additional clerk to the House Committee on Enrolled Bills for eleven days' services to October 7, 1888.

On amendment numbered 231: Strikes out the provision to extend the laws of the United States over the territory known as "No Man's Land," and authorizing the entry of public lands therein under the homestead laws.

The bill as agreed upon by the conferees appropriates $4,873,133.37, being a reduction under the amount as it passed the Senate of $291,915.28, and an increase over the amount as it passed the House of $1,645,615.05.

JAS. N. BURNES,
JOSEPH D. SAYERS,
THOS. RYAN,
Managers on the part of the House.

Mr. McKENNA. I rise to a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. McKENNA. Mr. Speaker, is there any way to get a separate vote on the item concerning the Chinese indemnity?

The SPEAKER. There is not. The conference report must be acted upon as an entirety. It must be agreed to or rejected as a whole.

Mr. McKENNA. A motion is in order to reject the report.

The SPEAKER. That is involved in the proposition to disagree to the report. If it be disagreed to, the whole subject will be open, and the House may insist on its amendments or recede from its disagreement.

Mr. McKENNA. I hope the House will disagree to the conference report. Mr. Speaker, there is no good reason whatever for appropriating $276,000, at this time at any rate, to indemnify the Chinese. It will be observed that the language of the item is somewhat changed. It is put by the committee on the ground of humane reasons. It was put by the President in his recommendation on the ground of a thing befitting the national honor.

Now, Mr. Speaker, if it could be put on either ground, the Calendars of this House are groaning with bills which should be passed for humane reasons, and which should be passed for reasons befitting the national honor. We seem to be in haste, sir, to appropriate $276,000 for claims that have not been audited by any committee of this House, and yet if a bona fide claim, which has passed the scrutiny of one of the committees of this body, be offered for consideration, some gentleman will be eager enough to call the regular order, or some one else swift to demand a quorum and defeat it.

Now, it seems to me that we should be as fair and just to our own citizens as we want to be extraordinarily generous to the citizens of some other nation. In the treaty which was negotiated with the Chinese Government there was a clause of indemnity amounting to $276,000, granted confessedly upon no legal ground whatever; granted then, I suppose, diplomatically. For diplomatic reasons the Chinese Government rejected the treaty. They will not give us the benefit of it. But we propose to give them all the benefit there is in it. Now why? Will some gentleman tell me why? I would like to have some member of this committee explain to me the reason why. Will any gentleman give the answer? There is no legal obligation to do it; there is no moral obligation resting upon us, and the diplomatic reason by the action of China itself has been destroyed. Why, then, grant it?

As I said before, in my former remarks on this subject, in the Forty-ninth Congress we granted $147,000 distinctly on the ground that it should not become a precedent. We grant the $276,000 distinctly that it is for humane reasons and possibly not to become a precedent. Are we never to be humane hereafter? Is this to be the limit of it?

Mr. Speaker, if we should entertain its consideration on the ground of humanity, and I confess it is a strong ground; if we should entertain its consideration on some ground befitting the national honor, and I confess it is strong, there is no haste to entertain either at this time. The Chinese matter is not yet concluded. I hope it is near a conclusion; and when it has reached a conclusion it is time enough to consider whether we shall make gifts to China or whether we shall consider them in the light that this bill desires we should consider them.

Now I am well aware that it looks like this is an invidious matter; it looks as if this great and powerful nation could well afford to grant this sum of money; but if you put it on that ground let us not go abroad to do justice or to grant favors before we do so at home. I

would like some sufficient reason to be given why this should become a law at all.

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. Speaker, I do not rise for the purpose of replying to the remarks of the gentleman from California, who has just taken his seat, or to discuss the pending report, but simply to occupy the attention of the House for a few moments relative to some of the statements made by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CANNON], not long since, in regard to the expenditures under this Administration. I do not propose to go into a general statement as to the appropriations or expenditures of the public money, but simply to refer to one statement in particular which was made by him—that in relation to the increase of public offices and of salaries. All of the other points made by him have been sufficiently and amply answered by other gentlemen on this floor.

Appended to the remarks of the gentleman from Illinois was a statement that there had been during the last three sessions of Congress, including this one, 799 new offices created, with salaries aggregating $762,236.50 per annum. The gentleman did not trouble himself to present the other side of this question and to show during that time what places had been dispensed with and what salaries had been abolished. I hold in my hand a statement of the offices that have been abolished, the appropriations for which have been discontinued during the same period of time, aggregating 467 offices, at an aggregate compensation of $515,665 per annum. I will not stop to read it, but with the consent of the House will incorporate it in the RECORD as a part of and at the close of my remarks.

This statement, Mr. Speaker, shows that 467 offices with salaries aggregating $515,655 per annum have been discontinued during the three sessions of Congress referred to, and which at least should be considered as a partial offset to the 799 new offices alleged by the gentleman from Illinois to have been created during the same period.

Now, as to the places enumerated as having been established, and which go to make up the total of 799, to which he alludes, I find upon an examination of the table presented by him that out of these places that are counted as offices established 62 are policemen of the District of Columbia, 12 are employés of the fire department, and 25 janitors of new school buildings erected in the District within the past three years, making a total of 99 places of this character which have been created during that time, or an increase of that many in the fire department, the police service, and for the public-school buildings of this city, and which the gentleman enumerates in his list as a part of the new offices created under this Administration.

Here is a great and growing city, a city which in 1880, I believe, contained about 180,000 inhabitants and now nearly 230,000. It is not a strange thing under such circumstances that for the protection of public property and for the preservation of peace and order, for the protection of property from fire, that there should have been this moderate increase; but I wish to call attention to the fact that this increased force is arrayed in the table of the gentleman from Illinois as a part of the increased officers of this Administration.

In the consular service there appears to have been an increase of twenty-three new consulates during the three sessions. They are in fact not new offices created, but they are offices formerly compensated from the fees which they earned. By providing for them specific salaries, as has been done, the fees revert to the Treasury, a better service is obtained for the Government, and the revenue derived from the fees more than balances the aggregate of specific salaries paid.

I find also that of this number one hundred are in the Patent Office. Gentlemen know very well how the Patent Office is run. It is not intended to be a source of revenue especially to the Government; but for the benefit of inventors and the country at large it is necessary that people having cases there should have them disposed of as rapidly and as efficiently as possible. As the country grows our progress has been faster; a large number of applications for patents have been filed there. It has been growing all the while, and, consequently, has necessitated this increase.

During this period of time the Department of Labor was established. In that Department sixty-two of this increased number are employed. That Department was established for the benefit of labor throughout the country. It was demanded by the laboring people and was made without an objection from either side of this House.

Of the number suggested by the gentleman from Illinois I find also eleven United States Senate employés. These are Republican employés provided for by the Republican Senate; and, as is well known here, of course it was consented to finally as a matter of necessity on the part of the House.

Now, as to the General Land Office. In that great office there has been an increase of thirty-five new employés. It is unnecessary for me to state here the reasons for this increase; they are many and obvious. The legislation which has occurred during this period, restoring to the public domain vast bodies of lands granted by Republican Congresses to railroad corporations, has opened the field to and increased the number of homestead settlers, thus multiplying the business of this overworked office.

Then the increase of the Navy has caused an increase of ninety of this number in that Department. That has been sufficiently answered here. We all know the number of vessels that are being built under the provisions for the increase of the Navy.

In that number of officers enumerated by the gentleman from Illinois I find forty-one employés connected with the new Library building. That was voted for by both sides of this House, and was a new enterprise not connected with the current business of the Government.

The interstate-commerce law was also passed during this period, the commission established and went into operation, and I find it has six employés.

In the State, War, and Navy building I find there was fifty-six additional places. These are mostly charwomen and watchmen. There was a great building, which cost about $10,000,000, and which was not completed until a very short time ago. It required additional watchmen and charwomen to care for and protect that vast structure.

I find also four additional employés in the service of the Civil Service Commission, where the business has been accumulating on account of the increased number of examinations and applications.

Now, as to the increase of salaries. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CANNON] states there have been 350 salaries increased at an annual cost of $52,000. In examining his statement I find included therein the salaries of 78 employés of the fire department of the District of Columbia which have been increased from $20 to $40 each per annum. I also find that the salaries of 7 Senate employés have been increased and are charged as a part of the 350 referred to, and 165 charwomen have had their salaries increased $60 per annum, making an aggregate of 250 salaries increased, which accounts for that number of the 350 submitted by him, leaving only 100 which I have not accounted for.

I wish to call attention to the fact that of the whole number of salaries increased 7 were for Senate employés (Republican Senate); 165 were for the poorly paid charwomen in the Departments, and 78 were for the fire department force of the District of Columbia.

I do not wish to detain the House at any length, but I will now submit a few suggestions in regard to the Post-Office Department. In 1882 there were 521 employés in that Department. In 1884—the last year of Republican administration—there were 568, and in 1888 there were 591. These figures show an increase of only 70 employés from 1882 down to 1888.

Mr. MASON. I wish the gentleman would state whether the slightness of the increase accounts for the condition of the service.

Mr. CLEMENTS. I will finish my statement and then will answer the gentleman's question. The increase in the Department from 1884 to 1888 was only 23, and in 1884 the letter rate of postage was reduced from 3 to 2 cents per half ounce. The increase of 70 employés between 1882 and 1888 is partly accounted for by the necessity of using additional buildings, requiring the employment of 7 additional laborers, 12 additional watchmen, 22 charwomen, 3 firemen, 1 engineer, and 2 elevator conductors. From these figures it will be seen that the increase included only 23 additional clerks. The percentage of increase in the clerical force was only a little over 4 per cent., while the increase in the number of post-offices was 23.8 per cent., and the increase in the postal business was 39 per cent. And, Mr. Speaker, this increase in the business has been effected notwithstanding the decrease of the letter postal rate from 3 to 2 cents per ounce, and the increase of the unit of weight from one-half to 1 ounce, and the reduction of newspaper postage from 2 cents to 1 cent per pound. Of the increase of 70 in the number of employés in the Department from 1882 to 1888, only 23 have occurred during the present Administration; and this, notwithstanding the large increase in the service, shown by the figures I have already given, and the necessity of using additional buildings.

Now as to the question suggested by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MASON] a moment ago, it is really unnecessary for me to answer it, because the business men of this whole country know how greatly the postal service has increased, and it is not true, as is alleged in a general way by partisans upon this floor, that the service has been inefficient under this Administration. Gentlemen can make that statement in general terms and in a partisan manner here, but they can not substantiate it. The business men of the country will not testify that the charge is true. The business of the Post-Office Department has been greatly enlarged along with the business of the country, and it has been managed efficiently and frugally. I have here a statement of the increased expenditures and the increased revenues of the Department. I will not take time to read it in full now, but will incorporate it in my remarks. I want to call attention to one very significant portion of it, which shows the cost of every dollar of revenue from this source during the different years from 1883 to 1888. In 1883 the cost was $1.04, in 1884 it was $1.08, in 1885 it was $1.17; in 1886, the first fiscal year of a Democratic administration, it was $1.16; in 1887 it was $1.08, in 1888 it was $1.03. It will be seen, therefore, that the last year makes the best showing of any year from 1883 down to the present time.

Mr. DINGLEY. What do I understand that statement to be?

Mr. CLEMENTS. It is a statement showing the cost of every dollar of revenue from the Post-Office Department, and it illustrates the industry, the honesty, and the rigid economy with which that Department has been conducted under this Administration. And as I have

already said the decrease in the cost of collecting the revenue from this source has not in any way impaired the efficiency of the service.

Statement showing offices abolished or salaries omitted to be appropriated for during the Forty-ninth Congress and the first session of the Fiftieth Congress.

FORTY-NINTH CONGRESS—FIRST SESSION.

Offices.	No.	Amount.
Executive Office.		
Clerk	1	$1,600
Clerk	1	1,400
Treasury Department.		
Second Comptroller's Office—		
Clerks at $1,600 each	5	8,000
Clerks at $1,400 each	2	2,800
Clerk	1	1,200
Clerk	1	1,000
Clerks at $900 each	3	2,700
Third Auditor's Office:		
Clerks at $1,400 each	6	8,400
Clerks at $1,200 each	14	16,800
Clerks at $900 each	2	1,800
Sixth Auditor's Office:		
Clerks at $1,600 each	3	4,800
Clerks at $1,400 each	10	14,000
Clerk	1	1,200
Clerks at $1,000 each	4	4,000
Trasurer's Office:		
Clerks at $1,200 each	3	3,600
Clerks at $900 each	19	17,100
Register's Office:		
Chief of division	2	2,000
Clerk	1	1,800
Clerk	1	1,600
Clerk	1	1,400
Clerks at $1,200 each	5	6,000
Copyists at $900 each	11	9,900
Engraving and Printing Bureau:		
Clerks at $1,200 each	2	2,400
Copyists at $900 each	3	2,700
Laborers at $660 each	3	1,980
Mint Bureau:		
Clerk	1	1,000
Internal Revenue Bureau:		
Clerks at $900 each	26	23,400
War Department.		
Quartermaster-General's Office:		
Clerk	1	1,600
Clerks at $1,400 each	4	5,600
Clerk	1	1,200
Clerks at $1,000 each	2	2,000
Copyists at $900 each	10	9,000
Watchmen	1	720
Agents at $1,400 each	15	21,000
Surgeon-General's Office:		
Clerks at $1,000 each	20	20,000
Paymaster-General's Office:		
Clerks at $1,400 each	2	2,800
Clerks at $1,200 each	2	2,400
Clerks at $1,000 each	2	2,000
Rebellion Records Office:		
Copyist	1	900
Compositors at $1,000 each	4	4,000
Interior Department.		
Indian Office:		
Employés	3	4,520
Pension Office:		
Clerks at $1,600 each	5	8,000
Clerks at $1,400 each	28	39,200
Clerks at $1,200 each	39	46,800
Clerks at $1,000 each	20	20,000
Copyists at $900 each	45	40,500
Post-Office Department.		
Topographer's Office:		
Draughtsman	1	1,800
Draughtsman	1	1,400
Map mounter	1	720

FORTY-NINTH CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION.

Treasury Department.		
Supervising Architect's Office:		
Clerk	1	$1,600
Clerk	1	1,200
Second Comptroller's Office:		
Clerks	8	10,800
Secret-service division:		
Clerk	1	1,400
War Department.		
Quartermaster-General's Office:		
Clerks and employés	13	14,600
Post-Office Department.		
Office First Assistant Postmaster-General:		
Clerk	1	1,400
Clerks, at $1,200 each	2	2,400
Clerks, at $1,000 each	6	6,000

Statement showing offices abolished or salaries omitted, etc.—Continued.

FIFTIETH CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION.

Offices.	No.	Amount.
Treasury Department.		
Secretary's Office:		
Assistant chief of division	1	$2,100
Clerk	1	1,800
Clerk	1	1,200
Clerks reduced by consolidation of divisions	8	12,360
Supervising Architect's Office:		
Photographer	1	2,000
Second Auditor's Office:		
Clerks at $1,000 each	5	5,000
Third Auditor's Office:		
Clerks at $1,400 each	3	4,200
Clerks at $1,200 each	4	4,800
Clerk	1	1,000
Treasurer's Office:		
Clerks at $300 each	5	4,500
Pressman	1	1,200
Separators at $660 each	2	1,320
Feeders at $660 each	2	1,320
War Department.		
Adjutant-General's Office:		
Assistant messengers at $720 each	6	4,320
Watchmen at $720 each	17	12,240
Quartermaster-General's Office:		
Clerks and employés	23	18,915
Paymaster-General's Office:		
Watchmen at $720 each	7	5,040
Interior Department.		
Members Board of Pension Appeals, at $2,000 each	6	12,000
Total	467	515,655

Comparative statement showing the receipts and expenditures of the Post-Office Department for several years past.

Fiscal year ending June 30—	Gross postal receipts.			Expenditures made on account of the year.			Cost for every dollar of receipts.
	Total for the year.	Increase over the previous year.	Per cent. of increase.	Total for the year.	Increase over the previous year.	Per cent. of increase.	
1883	$45,508,692.61	$3,632,282.46	8.6+	$43,519,187.96	$3,077,995.90	7.5+	$1.04
1884	43,325,958.81	*2,182,733.80	*4.7+	47,062,623.56	3,543,435.60	8.1+	1.08
1885	42,560,843.83	*765,114.98	*1.7+	49,782,619.09	2,719,995.53	5.7+	1.17
1886	43,948,422.95	1,387,579.12	3.2+	51,093,036.48	1,310,417.39	2.6+	1.16
1887	48,837,609.39	4,889,186.44	11.1+	53,133,252.00	2,040,215.52	3.9+	1.08
1888	53,233,579.13	4,395,969.74	9.0+	55,250,000.00	2,116,748.00	4.0+	1.03

*Decrease.

Mr. VANDEVER. Mr. Speaker, I understand the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. CLEMENTS] to have stated emphatically that the efficiency of the postal service has been materially increased of late and under the present Administration. Now, I can speak with confidence on this question in regard to the part of the country which I represent. At the commencement of this session of Congress I called the attention of this House to the suffering condition of the postal service in Southern California; and I stated then a fact which has never been contradicted—that on account of the inefficiency of the service or inadequate provision for it the mails had piled up in certain offices in Southern California, and especially in San Diego, to such an extent that when there was a change made in the office of postmaster at that place the new incumbent found the office encumbered with a lot of mails which had never been handled or distributed, and in order to get rid of them he was obliged to load them up on wagons and have them hauled down and dumped into San Diego Harbor.

That is a fact which can not be controverted or denied; and although there may have been an increase of appropriation for the postal service, and may have been something like a general increase in its efficiency, I can say that the beneficial effects of such increase have never reached our part of the country; and I assert that if we had here the evidence of the Post-Office Department it would show clearly and unequivocally that petitions are being received and piled up in the Department claiming relief that is but tardily afforded, if at all.

There may be no intention on the part of the Post-Office Department to withhold proper facilities from our part of the country; but I affirm that with reference to us the credit for economy which the Department claims is at the expense of the public convenience. Let me refer to one county of my district to show the growth of population and the increased necessity for postal facilities. In Los Angeles County two years ago the registered vote was a little over 17,000; the registration for this year has already reached 28,000. The increase is in about the same proportion in other counties of Southern California. Not a city or town of any pretensions in that section but is suffering for greater mail and postal service.

Now, that is a fair sample (though it may appear a little exaggerated)

of the general growth of population, the development of business, and the increase of resources in that part of the country. The service of the Post-Office Department has not kept pace with this increase and growth. We have not been able to impress upon the Post-Office Department the necessity for increased postal facilities, and the public there are suffering in this respect. They are crying aloud continually, and crying in vain, to the Post-Office Department for a service which shall be adequate to the public wants.

Mr. Speaker, the pertinency of the observations of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. CLEMENTS] to the remarks of my colleague [Mr. MCKENNA] on this Chinese clause of the deficiency bill is not very apparent.

Mr. CLEMENTS. I did not rise for the purpose of replying to that gentleman. I so stated at the beginning of my remarks.

Mr. VANDEVER. Well, as I am on the floor and have some ideas in regard to the Chinese question, I propose to say a few words on that topic. The message of the President of the United States to this House approving the Chinese restriction act seemed to me in the nature of an apology for that act of approval on his part—not an apology to this House, but evidently an apology to China; and in order to make the act which he approved acceptable in some degree to the Chinese Government, the President recommended in his apology that there be an appropriation of $276,000 from the public Treasury as a sort of sop to the Chinese Government in order to make the bill go down. And we are now asked in the report of the conference committee on this deficiency bill to approve that apology of the President to the Chinese Government for signing a bill passed by the Congress of the United States; and that, too, after China had rejected a treaty with this Government that proffered indemnity for alleged depredations committed upon Chinese subjects residing in this country.

Mr. RYAN. A plaster for the bruise.

Mr. VANDEVER. Yes, sir. Now, I can not see that this House is called upon to approve that clause of the deficiency bill; and I agree entirely with every expression which has been made by my colleague. I think this proposed appropriation ought to be rejected. We owe it to ourselves, we owe it to the people we represent and to the country at large, that the official acts of the President of the United States should not be accompanied with apologies to foreign governments, and that a money consideration should not be tendered to such a government to make our Congressional action acceptable.

Mr. BURNES. Mr. Speaker, our relations with China, as is known to the public, are somewhat delicate, if not strained. It has been stated in certain quarters that there were outside influences operating to prevent the maintenance of such relations as, I trust, we seek to preserve with every nation on the face of the earth. Be that as it may, the State Department seems to have been firmly of the opinion that this money ought to be appropriated, not only for the reason suggested by the distinguished gentleman from California [Mr. MCKENNA], but as evidence of our willingness to pay for damages perpetrated upon citizens of a foreign country. Of course we want to pay our own citizens whatever is due them, but we can not do so in a moment nor in this bill. Let each claim stand on its own merits and bide its own time. That we can not now consider their claims seems not a sufficient reason why we should withhold payment to some one else of what seems to be a fair and reasonable obligation on the part of the Government toward citizens of a foreign government for injuries suffered at the hands of certain parties in some of the Territories of the United States. The amount of damage has been estimated at the sum proposed to be appropriated in this Senate amendment; and it is but reasonable and fair that the damage thus perpetrated should be recognized and paid for, even if not strictly required by the law of nations. We feel that there is some sort of law at least to justify this payment, and if nowhere else, it is recognized in the hearts of mankind.

All I desire to say in justice to the House committee is that the communication with regard to this matter was with the conferees on the part of the Senate, or with the Senate, and the amendment was urged on the conferees of the House by our brethren of the Senate. It was an amendment which met the approbation of the Senate. It was not only urged by members of the Senate conference, but by others distinguished in the councils of the nation at the other end of the Capitol.

I will say to my friend from California it was agreed upon and perhaps put upon the bill by the Senate before the reception of the message of the President of the United States. We were in conference for a number of days.

Mr. MCKENNA. Is not that a reason for not continuing it, that it was put on the bill upon the supposition the Chinese treaty would be ratified?

Mr. BURNES. I beg your pardon, it was put on after the treaty was known not to have been ratified. If I am wrong in that, I will say we had a conference after it was known the Chinese Government had refused to ratify the treaty, and the Senate conferees insisted on it before the reception of the President's message. The House conferees were indisposed to yield—I was, for one. When the message came it was urged as a reason why the action supported by the Senate conferees should be yielded to on the part of the House conferees. Under the circumstances, as no one mind can see the whole of this proposition, and looking at it as a whole, a compromise seems wise, for our relations with foreign countries—possibly peaceable relations—may be in some sense involved. We will do well to look at it from every point of view.

My friend has viewed it from a legislative standpoint, which may be satisfactory to him, but when we view it as a whole there are other considerations which should influence our action. It has met the approval of a co-ordinate branch of the legislative department of this Government, and the one that has to do with ratification of treaties, and the approbation of the executive department also. Because some of us can not see the wisdom of the tender of this payment now, is scarcely a sufficient reason for rejecting this conference report. Something is due to the judgment of others who have had to do, closely, with the whole subject. It is not necessary to argue in favor of a blind submission to the judgment of others, and I would not do so in ordinary matters, but this involves matters and considerations with which we have not had official connection, and concerning which the President and the Secretary of State, from other than a legislative standpoint, and the Senate, which has given it careful consideration, unite in warmly commending this amendment to us. It can do no harm, at least, to agree to the amendment. The money will not be paid to the Chinese Government until after the State Department has fully reconsidered the matter with reference to some further negotiation and arrangement which may be beneficial to the country.

Mr. VANDEVER. What specific claims of the Chinese Government were made the basis of your action in fixing that amount?

Mr. BURNES. It is intended to discharge the obligations of this Government to China on account of damages or injuries inflicted by our citizens on citizens of that country.

Mr. MCKENNA. Were they ascertained damages?

Mr. BURNES. I understand they were ascertained. They were sufficiently ascertained at least to enable the Secretary of State to incorporate this amount in the treaty with China which was rejected.

Mr. VANDEVER. It should be investigated by a committee of the House and not given directly without some such action on our part.

Mr. BURNES. We can not possibly investigate every item by the action of a committee of this House, but this having been investigated already by the Secretary of State to the extent of enabling him to fix this amount in the recent treaty, I do not see that Congressional investigation by a committee could do any good. No man can fix exactly what would be adequate compensation to the survivors of a family whose head, or other member was slain, maimed, or injured. The mind is incapable of grasping such elements of estimation or figures. But as this amount has been ascertained by the Department of State, and so far recognized as to have been put into the treaty, and be urged by the President and the Senate, I think we had better accept it.

Mr. DINGLEY. Mr. Speaker, in reply to some statements recently made in this House by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CANNON], it seems to me that my friend from Georgia [Mr. CLEMENTS] as well as the gentleman from Texas [Mr. SAYERS], who spoke the other day on the same subject, and the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BURNES], have entirely lost sight of the real point which was made by him in his argument. If I understood the gentleman from Illinois aright in the statement made in this House a few weeks ago, in which he alleged that the appropriations had been largely increased under the present Administration, that the number of officials had been enlarged, and that the amounts paid in salaries had been increased over what they had been under a Republican administration, the gentleman from Illinois did not intend to make the allegation that these increases had been unnecessarily and extravagantly made, but he intended in calling attention to them simply to remind gentlemen on the other side of the House that in 1884, pending the Presidential election, they had charged throughout this country and in this House, as gentlemen will well remember, that the Republican party and the Republican administration had largely, unnecessarily, and extravagantly increased the appropriations and the number of officials, as well as their salaries, and that if the country would only give to them (the Democratic party) the control of the reins of Government, then they would show to the people of the country a large reduction of the appropriations and a large reduction of the number of officials and the amount of the salaries. The gentleman from Illinois simply called attention to the fact that these promises under which our friends on the other side came into possession of the Government in 1884, entering upon the actual control of it in 1885, had not been redeemed in any respect.

I take it that that was the only point the gentleman from Illinois had in mind in presenting the statistics which he did; and the very fact that it required the gentleman from Texas, the gentleman from Missouri, and the gentleman from Georgia to undertake to explain why all of these additions to the appropriations had been made, how the number of officials had been increased and how the salaries had been multiplied; I say, the fact that it was necessary to show that the business of the country had increased and had rendered necessary a large increase in official force and emoluments, is sufficient also as an explanation of all increases of appropriations under prior administrations. I take it for granted that not only under prior administrations, but under this present Administration the expenditures of the Government on the

whole have been brought within the proper necessities of the Government, having regard in their increases to the increased business of the country.

But I wish my friends on the other side of the House to bear in mind that when in 1884 in this House and throughout the country they were endeavoring to arouse the indignation of the people of this land against the Republican party and against Republican administrations simply because there had been slight increases, and when they promised to the people that if they should be put into power there would be reductions on appropriations, reductions of officials, and reductions of salary, that really they came into power under false pretenses.

Now, it seems to me that in all matters of this kind it is the desire of whatever party may be in power in this country to endeavor to carry on the administration of the Government within the limits of appropriate economy, and if this example which has been set before us of unredeemed promises of our friends in 1884 shall simply show them in the future that all such promises that may be made during political campaigns, like the promises they made themselves in 1884, are simply for political effect, and that they really had no intention at the time to redeem them, it will have a good influence upon the country. But it ought to be an indication to the masses of the people that their promises were all made for political effect.

I remember, sir, in 1884 one of the constant charges which was being made throughout the country was that the Republican administration had gathered into the Treasury a large and unnecessary surplus. I remember a gentleman, whom I heard upon the stump, declare that this surplus was some $300,000,000 of idle money, and thousands of voters were led to believe that there was truth in the statement, while the promise was held out to them that if there should be a change of administration then the idle surplus would be immediately used in the redemption of the interest-bearing debt of the country paying it off. What was the fact? When the present Administration came into power on the 4th day of March, 1885, it found that there was only $8,000,000 of surplus in the Treasury coming over from the preceding administration of Mr. Arthur, without taking into account the hundred millions of greenback redemption fund, or taking into account the money which had been provided to meet the obligation of the public debt at maturity.

Excluding these there was only eight millions of surplus, as shown by the subsequent accounts of the Treasury, at a time when it was stated that this immense sum of $300,000,000 was locked up in the vaults of the Treasury and while that statement was being used for campaign purposes. And yet, Mr. Speaker, there has not been a single hour since the 4th day of March, 1885, up to the present moment, when the surplus in the Treasury has not been far more than when the Republican administration gave up the control of the Government. The accounts and statements which have been rendered by the Secretary of the Treasury since the 4th day of March, 1885, show that all of the charges made in the campaign and preceding the Presidential election of 1884 were absolutely without foundation.

Mr. TURNER, of Georgia. But the gentleman from Maine ignores the fact that the condition of our finances was very different during this Administration from what it was before.

Mr. DINGLEY. I was replying——

Mr. TURNER, of Georgia. Because under the administration of the gentleman's party all the bonds outstanding and redeemable had not been paid, and for some months past we have been unable to redeem any bonds except at a premium; and it was on account of that condition that this surplus accumulated.

Mr. DINGLEY. But my friend forgets that on the 4th of March, 1885, when this Administration came into power, there were one hundred and forty-six millions of 3 percents subject to call at the option of the Government, and instead of calling in, canceling, and paying off these 3 percents, the present Administration proceeded to increase the surplus in the Treasury. The actual condition, the gentleman will ascertain on examination of the facts, shows that they increased that surplus of only $8,000,000 on the 4th of March, 1885, until, in October, it was over $66,000,000, without buying a single 3 per cent. bond.

Mr. SOWDEN. Did not the present Administration call in every one of the 3 per cent. bonds as rapidly as it could?

Mr. DINGLEY. Not at all. On the 4th of March, 1885——

Mr. SOWDEN. When were the last 3 percents redeemed or called in?

Mr. DINGLEY. Not until the subsequent January. On the 4th of March, 1885, there were one hundred and forty-six million in 3 per cent. bonds subject to call, and yet it was not until October in that year that a single one of these 3 per cent. bonds were called in, and they could have been called in through the summer and so much interest saved. I am not at this time complaining of this. But I complain that everywhere it was proclaimed on the stump in 1884 by the gentlemen who represent his party, and perhaps by the gentleman himself, that the Republican party was keeping in the Treasury hundreds of millions—$300,000,000—idle.

Mr. McKENNA. Four hundred million dollars.

Mr. DINGLEY. And yet, as a matter of fact, from the 4th of March, 1885, until October, 1885, there was nothing even approximating the idle money in the Treasury that was charged.

Mr. McMILLIN. Will my friend yield to me for a moment?

Mr. DINGLEY. Certainly.

Mr. McMILLIN. Does he not know that when this Administration came in, as a partial explanation of this state of affairs, that the outgoing Secretary of the Treasury had said that gold and silver could not be kept together, and that a financial panic would come in spite of everything that could be done, and there would be a money stringency in less than ten months after the Administration came into power?

Mr. DINGLEY. I am aware that ex-Secretary McCulloch made a statement of that kind, and that statement was derided all over the country, and that gentlemen said there was no sufficient ground for this condition of affairs.

Mr. McMILLIN. The gentleman knows that there was a very general apprehension all over the country, and in the campaign at which the present President was elected it was predicted that panic and ruin would follow his administration.

Mr. DINGLEY. Mr. Speaker, I want to say in reference to that matter that there was nothing to have prevented the present Administration from paying at least $10,000,000 from the 4th of March, 1885, until October, 1885; but this money was allowed to accumulate unnecessarily in the Treasury until October.

Mr. McMILLIN. But the gentleman knows that the last one of these 3 percents have been redeemed—every one.

Mr. PETERS. Not until the President was forced to do it.

Mr. SOWDEN. I would like to ask the gentleman from Maine a question.

Mr. DINGLEY. I am ready to hear you.

Mr. SOWDEN. As I understand the gentleman, he stated to the House that when the present Administration came into power, on the 4th of March, 1885, it found a surplus of but $8,000,000 on hand and in the Treasury.

Mr. DINGLEY. A surplus of $8,000,000 over and above the matured obligations of the Government, and $100,000,000 for the redemption of the currency.

Mr. SOWDEN. This fund could not be applied to the redemption of the $146,000,000 3 per cent. bonds.

Mr. DINGLEY. But the amount was constantly accumulating from that time when the Republicans went out of power; and I was saying that the surplus had been constantly used by the Republican administration for the purpose of calling in the 3 per cent. bonds until that party did go out of power. But when another administration came in, notwithstanding they came in under the charge that this amount had been needlessly accumulating in the Treasury under the Republican party, yet they proceeded to accumulate more, when their Republican predecessors had been paying the 3 per cent. bonds off as rapidly as they could.

Mr. McMILLIN. Oh, not at all.

Mr. PETERS. And they had to get the Morrison resolution passed through the House to compel the Secretary of the Treasury to go on with the payment.

Mr. SOWDEN. But you contend that when the present Administration came into power there was only $8,000,000 surplus in the Treasury.

Mr. DINGLEY. That was eight millions that was left after the outgoing administration had been using about ten millions per month in paying off the 3 per cent. bonds. But the revenue was accumulating at the rate of nearly ten millions per month from that time on, and instead of using that ten millions month by month to call in the 3 per cent. bonds, the present Administration allowed the surplus to accumulate at the rate of about ten millions a month, until in October, 1885, it had reached the amount of sixty-six millions.

Mr. TURNER, of Georgia. Does not the gentleman know that the Morrison resolution did not relate to the 3 per cent. bonds?

Mr. PETERS. It related to the surplus, though.

Mr. TURNER, of Georgia. Now, I want to call the attention of the gentleman from Maine [Mr. DINGLEY] (who is always courteous and whose courtesy I do not wish to trespass upon unwarrantably) to the fact that when the present Administration came into power the outstanding bonds of the Government redeemable at the option of the Administration amounted to $196,000,000, and to the further fact that every dollar of those bonds was redeemed by the Administration up to the 1st of August of last year, so that when Congress met there were no bonds at all outstanding subject to the call of the Government, and the only way in which the surplus accumulating in the Treasury could be disposed of was by going into the market and buying those bonds at the enormous premium of which the gentleman is aware.

Mr. DINGLEY. Let me repeat what I have already said. On the 4th of March, 1885, when the present Administration came into power, the surplus revenue had been used by the Republican administration, which went out at that date, in calling in and paying off the 3 per cent. bonds, so that there were but eight millions of surplus revenue—idle money, so called—in the Treasury. Now, I say that instead of using the surplus revenue, as it had been previously used by the Republican

administration, to call in and pay off the 3 per cent. bonds, this present Administration permitted the revenue to accumulate at the rate of about ten millions per month in the time between the 4th of March, 1885, and October, 1885, so that in the latter month the amount of idle money in the Treasury had reached some $66,000,000.

Now, observe my point. I say there was no sufficient reason for refusing to use that idle money to call in and pay off the 3 per cent. bonds during that period, and especially no reason for such action by a Democratic administration, in view of the fact that the Democratic leaders had appeared upon the platform and had risen in this House during the pendency of the Presidential election of 1884 and had charged upon the Republicans that they had not used the surplus in paying off the debt as rapidly as they ought to have done, but had permitted an accumulation of at least three hundred millions of idle money in the Treasury, although as a matter of fact, on the 4th of March, 1885, the amount was only $8,000,000.

Mr. MILLIKEN. Mr. Hendricks in his campaign speeches put the "surplus" at four hundred millions.

Mr. DINGLEY. And, gentlemen, in order to make a show of justification for your statements as to the enormous accumulation in the Treasury you had to include the one hundred millions of greenback redemption, you had to include gold and silver against which there were outstanding certificates, you had to include money which had been set aside to meet bonds and to pay interest which had matured, money which was necessary to meet the constantly maturing obligations of the Government. Now, I am not so much complaining of what was done during the period I have mentioned, as I am calling attention to the fact that the very gentlemen who, during the campaign of 1884, had charged upon the Republicans that they were holding in the Treasury a vast amount of idle money, and who were promising that if they should come into power they would use that idle money in paying off the debt, when they did come into power not only did not increase the payments upon the debt but stopped them entirely for six months and allowed an extra accumulation of $58,000,000 of idle money between the 4th of March, 1885, and October of the same year. I am calling attention to this, and also to the fact that by their own admission, appropriations have been increased under the present Administration, officials have been increased under the present Administration, and salaries have been increased under the present Administration.

I do not say unnecessarily increased, and neither did the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CANNON]. But, nevertheless, gentlemen, you admit that they have been increased; increased, as you say, no doubt properly, because the business of the country has increased; but I am calling attention to the fact that what you said in 1884 that you would do if you should come into power you have not done, and that you are confessing, by the position which you take now, that your charges against the Republicans in 1884 had no sort of foundation. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. MCMILLIN. Will the gentleman permit a question?

Mr. DINGLEY. Yes, sir.

Mr. MCMILLIN. You have contrasted Democratic action with Republican action as to the public debt. Now, is it not a fact that a Democratic House passed a bill for the refunding of that debt, reducing the interest to 3 per cent., a reduction which would have saved on the amount of outstanding bonds about $16,000,000, and did not President Hayes veto that bill, and, on account of that veto, did not the people have to pay millions of money in interest before the bonds were refunded?

Mr. DINGLEY. The gentleman now is going back many years.

Mr. MCMILLIN. I go back to show what was done with reference to this same debt. You have been talking about the action of the two parties with regard to the debt, and I want the whole of the facts to go before the country, and I say that the people had to pay from ten to sixteen million dollars additional, in interest, on account of that veto by a Republican President.

Mr. DINGLEY. The gentleman has gone back to 1877 or 1878 for the purpose of finding an excuse for what occurred in 1885. Now, I wish to call the gentleman's attention to the fact that under the bill introduced by Senator Windom the very bonds of which he has spoken were subsequently refunded at 3 per cent. interest, under conditions far more favorable to the Government than those which were proposed in the bill vetoed by President Hayes.

Mr. MCMILLIN. No, sir. President Garfield's administration saw that the action of the Hayes administration would be their ruin, and they got remission down to 3½ per cent., and the Democratic House forced the rate down to 3 per cent.

Mr. DINGLEY. Not at all; but——

Mr. MCMILLIN. But millions of interest had been paid out in the mean time.

Mr. DINGLEY. Having the floor, Mr. Speaker, I think I shall endeavor to occupy half the time myself.

Mr. MCMILLIN. I beg the gentleman's pardon. I interrupted him with his permission.

Mr. DINGLEY. I was entirely willing to yield for a question, but I am not willing to yield for a speech.

Mr. SOWDEN. Will the gentleman allow me to ask him another question?

Mr. DINGLEY. Yes, sir.

Mr. SOWDEN. I would like to know whether the gentleman's lamentations about the charges which he alleges were made against his party prior to the last Presidential election is not the result of the impression which those charges made upon the public mind and the success with which they met before the people in contributing to the election of the present President of the United States?

Mr. MILLIKEN. The gentleman acknowledges, then, that he elected his President under false pretenses?

Mr. SOWDEN. Not at all.

Mr. DINGLEY. What I am calling attention to is that by what has been said here to-day it is confessed that all of the charges that were made against the Republican party and the Republican administration in the campaign of 1884, by means of which, as the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SOWDEN] well says, the people were deceived into the election of the Democratic candidate, were without foundation. That is what I am calling the attention of the House and of the country to at this time. You admit, I say, that there was no foundation for your charges, because, instead of reducing the appropriations, as you said you would if you should get into power, alleging as you did that the Republicans had been extravagant and profligate in their expenditures, instead of reducing the appropriations as you promised, you have increased them. You say, very properly, I think, that you have increased them because the country has grown; but did not the country grow during the period of the Republican administrations as well as since? Why could you not have been honest enough in the campaign of 1884 to have owned up that there had been no profligate expenditures, and that the increase of appropriations which had been made had resulted simply from the increased business of the country. Why did you not admit that explanation of the increase under the Republican administrations, just as you offer it now in explanation of the increases which you have made yourselves?

Now, your Administration has come into power on the charge that the Republicans had been maintaining unnecessary officials. I heard the charge made on dozens of stumps that there were twice as many officials as ought to be maintained, and that our party had been using them for political work; and it was promised that if you should come into power you would reduce these officials and these salaries. And now, by your confession here to-day you have not only not reduced the number of officials, but have increased them and have increased salaries. And you give the very appropriate excuse that the business of the country has increased; that it was necessary to have the utmost efficiency possible. I accept the excuse, but call attention to the fact that in giving this excuse you convict yourselves of having deluded and deceived the people in 1884, and induced them to elect your candidate for the Presidency in the belief that he would do something which now you confess he has not done, ought not to have done, and could not have done.

Mr. SOWDEN. One word more. Does not the gentleman from Maine know that his party to-day through their newspapers and public speakers are parading before the country these very facts, and are claiming for electioneering purposes that under this Administration the appropriations have been increased some $90,000,000; and is not this done for the purpose of imposing upon the people——

Mr. DINGLEY. In other words, the gentleman means to say that we are trying to do what his party did.

Mr. SOWDEN. Is not this done for the purpose of inducing the people to vote for the Republican Presidential ticket upon these allegations that the present Administration has been more profligate in the expenditure of public moneys than even its predecessor? Does not the gentleman know further that in reply to the statements of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CANNON] the gentleman from Texas [Mr. SAYERS] has put forth a full and unanswerable explanation of every charge, accounting satisfactorily for every item of increase, and which increase included some $30,000,000 for additional pensions in excess of the amount granted by the administration immediately preceding the present?

Mr. DINGLEY. The amount is stated a large number of millions too high.

Mr. SOWDEN. Does not the gentleman know——

Mr. DINGLEY. When the gentleman gets through his speech I will go on.

Mr. SOWDEN. Has not the gentleman himself used this very argument in a recent speech in the State of Pennsylvania—the argument that this Administration has been far more extravagant than the preceding one——

Mr. DINGLEY. I have not used that argument at all in that form.

Mr. SOWDEN. And has the gentleman been frank enough to give, in explanation of the increased appropriations, the real reasons for it, namely, the increased allowance for pensions, the natural growth of the country, and the enlargement of the public business?

Mr. DINGLEY. I wish to say to the gentleman from Pennsylvania that the only use I have made personally in my arguments of this increase of appropriations and officials and salaries has been in precisely

the line I have already indicated, simply showing that the pretense under which the Democratic party came into power in 1884 is now confessed to have been without foundation; that officials and appropriations and salaries have been increased as rapidly under the present Administration, not to say more rapidly, than under previous administrations.

Representatives of the Democratic party have claimed—and it was not for me to say the claim was not just—that this increase was because of the increase in the business of the country. But I have called attention to the fact that by this confession they admit that when, in 1884, they charged that Republican administrations had needlessly increased appropriations, had been making profligate expenditures, and that if the Democrats should come into power appropriations and officials and salaries should be reduced, they obtained power under a pretense which their own official conduct has not verified; for instead of reducing these expenditures they have increased them in various directions. I ask the gentleman from Pennsylvania whether that argument is not legitimate and sound?

Mr. SOWDEN. The gentleman's party makes the same charge against us to-day which he says representatives of the Democratic party made against the Republican administration in 1884.

Mr. MILLIKEN. But the difference between your statements and ours is that yours are now shown to have been untrue, while you do not deny that the statements we make are true. That is quite a wide difference.

Mr. DINGLEY. A single word further. The three responses which we have had to the statements made a few weeks ago by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CANNON] show that the people, in accepting as true the charges in 1884 that the Republican party had been profligate in expenditures, had increased officers and salaries unnecessarily, were deluded. You did make the people believe those charges, but now you confess that they were without foundation. In reference to all such charges which we hear from time to time on either side of the House I think it may be said, with the experience we have had, that we undervalue somewhat the intelligence of the people on matters of this kind. There was no ground in 1884 for your charges. I do not believe there is ground now to any great extent for any charges of extravagant and unnecessary appropriations and the creation of unnecessary officials; but I believe we have now the same reason and stronger reason to make such charges than you had in 1884. But I believe, as a matter of fact, such things are hardly being alluded to now by speakers on our side except for the purpose of calling attention to the fact that you deceived the people in 1884.

I believe the people of this country, without respect to party, intend to carry on the affairs of the nation as economically and as efficiently as may be under the circumstances; and although there are occasional instances of falling away from duty, and occasional instances of unwise and improper expenditure, yet I do not want the people of the country to be led into the belief each party coming into power is doing all it can to spend profligately the money of the people and to appoint officers unnecessary, and, in other words, is not to be trusted for fidelity or for common honesty in the management of the affairs of the nation.

I regretted in 1884 when you recklessly made these charges against the Republican party and made so many people believe there was some foundation for them. I regretted to see it, for to some extent it undermined the confidence of the people in the integrity of the public service, and I think there is no necessity for anything of that kind.

The two great parties of the country are divided on great lines of public policy. Let us hold the discussion in reference to the line of division, disagreeing honestly with reference to our views on this matter, discussing them candidly, and not on every occasion which may come up charging upon the other side dishonesty, want of integrity, want of fidelity. But I do not allude to any of these facts I have brought forward, to this increase of expenditure, to this increase of officials under the present Administration, or to the increase of salaries for the purpose of making any charges with respect to its efficiency and fidelity, but simply to hold a mirror up to you in order that you may see the charges you made in 1884, and upon which I believe you came into power, were without foundation and deceived the people of this country.

Mr. BURNES. I have no disposition to engage in this discussion, but I wish to express a word or two——

Mr. DINGLEY. I reserve my time.

Mr. BURNES. I wish to express a word or two of admiration for much the gentleman from Maine has said in regard to the subject under discussion, and perhaps I would be permitted to express the feeling I have that he has been exceedingly adroit. If he had alluded exclusively to the surplus and money question, to the purchase of bonds, subjects which belong to another committee of this House, and not to the subject of appropriations, I should have been entirely content to say nothing.

The gentleman from Maine [Mr. DINGLEY] has studiously avoided alluding to the real proposition on which, in my judgment, the Democratic party succeeded in the election of 1884. The Democratic party have been in power in this House, with one exception, from 1875 to this time, and it was in some sense responsible for appropriations during that period. No gentleman so far as I know has ever urged with any very great degree of prominence that the appropriations made during the Republican administrations of the Government were extraordinarily excessive or extravagant. And I submit it could scarcely do so without some degree of self-stultification. It was not, then, because of the appropriations during Republican administrations so much, if at all, but it was as to the character of the expenditures and the faithful manner in which they ought to have been disbursed, and in many instances were not.

To that subject the gentleman has made no allusion and I seek to make none. I call the attention of the House and the country to the fact, however, that in the discussion of this question we can not avoid, in justice and in fairness, contrasting the integrity of the expenditures under this Administration as against the want of it in the expenditures under the former administrations. [Applause on the Democratic side of the House.]

In saying this, sir, I only state a fact, without any partisan feeling or design. I simply call the attention of my friends on the other side, and the country, to the fact that for the last four years the money that has been expended has been expended without causing a single blush on any American cheek. Can you say as much for preceding administrations?

Whatever we can or can not say, I simply rose for the purpose of emphasizing the assertion that the people of this country turned the Republican party out of power, in my judgment, not because of the amount of money that was appropriated through Congress, but because of the waste and extravagance and want of integrity, as they believed, that existed in some departments of the administrations that preceded the present one at least. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. MILLIKEN. Mr. Speaker, it is a very easy thing for the gentleman from Missouri and for other gentlemen on that side to talk about the "waste and extravagance" under a Republican administration of this Government. But it will be a very much more difficult thing for him or for them to substantiate any such statements. It makes some material difference with political parties who the critics are. There is just this difference between your party and ours in the treatment of each other. We have treated you decently and with charity, a charity you have sorely needed. You have slandered us for political capital. It had become an old story with you. You had been crying about "corruption" against the Republican party ever since, and even before the close of the war. It was the only stock in trade your party had.

Mr. Tilden, when he came to run as a candidate for governor of the great State of New York, saw with his political sagacity that it was no use for him to attempt to accomplish a Democratic victory in that State and a Democratic victory in this country upon the old lines upon which you had been working for so many years. He saw you had gone behind in that. He saw that the people of this country would not intrust you with the reins of Government simply on the claims that you had been setting up, and that there was but one way for the Democratic party to succeed in that campaign, which was to commence an attack upon the integrity of the party in power, and to inaugurate your talk about wise reforms in Governmental administration. Well, you then took up the cry, and have been crying it ever since. You have been a good deal like the old lady who made up a story and told it and told it again, and told it so often that she began to believe it herself, and who finally was ready to swear to the truth of it anywhere, when as a matter of fact in the first beginning she did not believe a word of it herself and knew that it was false.

You know how it was in the last campaign. I happened to have a little something to do with that myself, and I have a distinct recollection of a certain distinguished member of the Democratic party who went all through the State of New York—and I know that because I followed him myself—who stated everywhere, and used it and urged it in argument against the Republican party, that there was horded up in the Treasury of the United States as a surplus $300,000,000, which was held there for corrupt purposes.

Mr. Hendricks, your candidate for Vice-President, who was perhaps a little more intense, or a better Democrat than the person to whom I refer, made the statement still more extravagant. He said that there was four hundred millions. And yet, Mr. Speaker, to show how much reliance was to be placed upon such statements as that, when your party came into power in this Government and the party of which I am a member had gone out, and the whole question of surplus was discussed, as it was discussed in this House, there was a statement made that we had left but about eight millions of surplus in the Treasury, a statement on the floor of this House to which there was no denial. It could not be denied because it was the truth. And when one gentleman who had gone through that campaign and had stated that three hundred millions of surplus was in the Treasury, kept there by the Republican party for corrupt purposes, was asked why he made the statement when, as a matter of fact, there was only eight millions, he had nothing to say.

But, sir, you went further than that. You stated that the Republican administration of the Government was rotten with corruption; and one distinguished Democrat, when it was proposed to appoint Carl

Schurz as Secretary of the Interior, said that would not do, that it was all rotten with corruption; that your party was going to put in the breaking-up plow and turn it all out to the light, and that Carl Schurz, having once been Secretary of the Interior, might be very much embarrassed to be in that position under such circumstances. But what did you do? One of your party was appointed as Secretary of the Interior, and he was a man who was honest enough to admit, as I have been credibly informed, that he never found so systematic a method as had been pursued in conducting the administration of that Department, and that everything was correct and straight. You had the vaults of the Treasury overhauled; you had the moneys counted; you found the books all right; you found the money all there; you found everything, down to a defalcation of 2 cents, but I understand that even that was afterwards discovered where some not very careful Democratic counter had dropped the money upon the floor, where it was afterwards discovered.

Now, I say this but to emphasize the statement of my colleague [Mr. DINGLEY]. I do not charge upon the Democratic party, as he does not charge upon it, that these increases in expenses which you have made have been unnecessary; and I say further that I believe it is demoralizing to the people of the country—I believe it is a public injury that in the political campaigns or at any other time these reckless statements should be made regarding any administration, for when the people of the country are brought to believe that their public servants and those standing as high as the President of the United States and his Cabinet are corrupt and dishonest they will find that the strongest possible excuse and inducement to be so themselves. And I would be glad if this should be the last of these indiscriminate attacks on the characters of administrations.

My friend from Missouri may iterate and reiterate his statement in regard to the corruption of Republican administrations before his party came into power; but I say again it is the old story. It not only has never been verified, but the last three and a half years of Democratic rule have proved its falsehood. All this time you have had ample opportunity for investigation, and have shown nothing crooked or wrong. The silence of your officials is the fullest and most conclusive proof that Republican rule was as clean as it was patriotic. Gentlemen will please remember in what condition the country was when you relinquished the Government. You handed it over to us in the flames of civil war. If you will remember this, and what a great crisis we had to go through, if you will also remember the demoralizing influences of a great civil war, all of which fell upon our hands, while we handed back the Government to you with the nation peaceful and prosperous—I think if you will recall these facts, and look through the history of our country during that period, you will say that we came out of a great contest and down to the present time with as clean hands and pure administration of the trust confided to us as can be found in the records of the affairs of men. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. PETERS. I want to call the attention of the House to one single fact; and I do it for the purpose, if possible, of riveting the attention of the Committee on Appropriations to that fact, so that it may be taken into consideration. I do not make any complaint against the increase of the official force in any Department. I believe that the increase in some of the Departments, at least, should be greater than it is. I simply want to call attention to one Department, and that is the Department of the Commissioner of the General Land Office. There has been, as stated by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. CLEMENTS], an increase in the clerical force of that Department; and yet what do we find?

Notwithstanding there has been an increase in the clerical force there as compared with that under the Republican administration, yet the work is getting further and further behind during the present Administration. Let me give an illustration: When a man enters a piece of land and lives upon it for a period of six months and applies to have his title completed he pays $200 to the Government, and yet he is unable to obtain evidence of his title for three years after he has paid the last dollar into the Treasury. Now, the gentleman from Georgia says that the Patent-Office is run in the interest of the inventors, and that the inventors pay the money for carrying on that office.

So is it with the Land Office. The man who enters these public lands pays the Government for them. If he enters under the homestead laws he pays the officers the fees, and yet it is years and years before he can get evidence of his title. If he takes land under the preemption or timber-culture laws, he pays to the Government $200 for 160 acres of land, and the homesteader or pre-emptor pays all these expenses, so that the Government is not out one dollar. Yet he is compelled, in the absence of any contest, in the absence of any suspicion that may be cast upon his title, to wait three years, as it is at present, before he can obtain from the Government evidence of his title. Under Republican administration I admit that the title could not issue immediately, but it could issue in a shorter time than three years.

What I want to impress on the Committee on Appropriations when the appropriations bills are considered and brought in during the short session of the Fiftieth Congress is, that the force of the Land Office should be so increased that these men who have paid their money should have evidence of their title from the Government within a reasonable time. It might at least be shown that they had paid their money into the Treasury of the Government.

[Cries of "Vote!"]

Mr. SOWDEN. I would like to ask the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BURNES] if amendment 107, as modified by the conference report presented by him, excludes the $911.20 balance claimed by Grosvenor Lowrey, one of the special counsel in the Bell telephone cases?

Mr. BURNES. It does.

Mr. Speaker, the Senate amendment relating to the extension of certain laws over the Public Land Strip has been disagreed to, and is not in this conference report. The proposition to pay a year's salary to the widow of a gentleman who died of yellow fever is not in the report. The proposition to pay the widow of the late Chief-Justice Waite the balance of a year's salary is not in the report.

Mr. RYAN. I suppose my friend means that the Senate has receded from those amendments.

Mr. BURNES. The Senate has receded from those amendments.

In regard to the proposition concerning the establishment of an institution for the purpose of assisting in the eradication of polygamy in Utah Territory I desire to make a brief statement, more for the purpose of calling the attention of the Treasury Department to the facts than anything else. We found that matter—I may call it that appropriately—in this condition. Some $40,000 had gotten into the hands of Governor West to be expended by him at the will or wish or on the order of a corporation organized in the Territory of Utah by some good women, doubtless, who had interested themselves in the work of extinguishing polygamy. That money was there in the hands of no bonded officer, subject to be expended by private persons. It was held and liable to be expended by parties who were not under any bond to the Government of the United States. By the amendment as now agreed upon the first thing we accomplish is to get that money, the unexpended balance of the two preceding appropriations, into the hands of a bonded officer of the United States to be appointed by the Secretary of the Treasury.

On investigation it will be found that there are marked discrepancies in several financial statements that have been made to the members of the committee and possibly to the House. That is to say, in one financial statement I found the total amount received—apparently stated at $40,000; expended in temporary home, $13,500; paid for some lots in Salt Lake on which the building is to be erected, $10,500; leaving a balance of $16,000 out of $40,000. But it appears that there were $48,800 drawn out of the Treasury; and the account, instead of starting with $40,000, as it does in this financial statement of the corporation alluded to, should start with $48,800. And then the $13,500 alleged to have been expended under the direction of the corporation should be carefully considered, for the reason that the $40,000 drawn out of the Treasury were drawn as stated in this financial estimate in the month of August last, two months ago, and that $13,500 is deducted from the $40,000 instead of the $48,800, when it could not in the nature of the transaction have been expended after the date it was received.

Now, it is simply impossible for them to have spent $13,500 since August last, and there is no pretense that there has been any such amount expended. I think it will be found upon investigation that the expenditures for the first year, as reported by Governor West in his annual report to the President, were included in the $13,500, without raising the debt entry from $40,000 to $48,800. At all events it will furnish some little work for the Treasury Department, which I trust and know it will carefully perform.

The amount of appropriation asked for in the Senate amendment was $80,000. We give only $32,000.

Mr. EZRA B. TAYLOR. Mr. Speaker——

Mr. BURNES. Does the gentleman from Ohio desire to ask a question?

Mr. EZRA B. TAYLOR. I simply want to ask whether the gentleman desires to have this bill passed? If he does, I ask him to let it be passed without any more talk. [Laughter.]

Mr. BURNES. I move the previous question. [Renewed laughter.]

The question was taken on ordering the previous question, and the Speaker declared that the ayes seemed to have it.

Mr. DOUGHERTY. I ask for a division.

The House divided; and there were—ayes 34, noes 3.

Mr. DOUGHERTY. No quorum.

The SPEAKER. The point being made that no quorum has voted, the Chair will appoint to act as tellers the gentleman from Florida [Mr. DOUGHERTY] and the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BURNES].

The House again divided; and the tellers reported—ayes 45, noes 3.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Florida insist upon the point of no quorum?

Mr. DOUGHERTY. Yes, sir.

Mr. EZRA B. TAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, if it is in order I move that the House do now adjourn.

Mr. BURNES. I hope the House will not adjourn.

The question was taken on the motion to adjourn, and it was not agreed to—ayes 7, noes 30.

Mr. HOOKER. I hope my friend from Florida [Mr. DOUGHERTY],

who I know has been very much irritated by the failure to get up for consideration certain matters pertaining to his own greatly afflicted portion of the country, will reconsider his opposition to this measure and will not call a quorum. I am sure that when he considers that this is a bill the passage of which is necessary for the public interests he will feel that opposition to it ought not to be manifested in this way. It is a bill which I believe meets the almost unanimous approbation of both sides of the House, and I hope that the gentleman, in the generosity of his nature (for I know him to be a generous man), will withdraw his opposition.

The tellers resumed their places.

Mr. BURNES (before the announcement of the final vote). Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

Mr. HOOKER. Pending that motion, Mr. Speaker, I rise to a question of privilege. I desire to make a motion to reconsider a vote which was taken on yesterday in the House. During my absence a bill was called up by the chairman of the Committee on Public Lands for the creation of a new land district in the southern part of Mississippi. It was a bill which had been introduced by my colleague, Colonel STOCKDALE, who represents that portion of the State. The existing land district is located in my own city of Jackson, in the county in which I live. Some time ago, when the bill was first reported from the Committee on Public Lands, my colleague, Colonel STOCKDALE, came to me——

Mr. EZRA B. TAYLOR. Mr. Speaker——

The SPEAKER. The Chair will state to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. HOOKER] that a motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was made yesterday and was laid on the table; so that unanimous consent will be required to reopen the question.

Mr. HOOKER. I am going to ask unanimous consent to set aside the vote laying the motion to reconsider on the table, and I am offering my reasons for making that request.

The SPEAKER. But the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. EZRA B. TAYLOR] objects.

Mr. HOOKER. I hope the gentleman will not object to my making a statement.

Mr. EZRA B. TAYLOR. I do not object to the gentleman making his statement, but I object to the result.

Mr. HOOKER. Then I will make the statement, and the gentleman can object to the request if he pleases. When that bill was brought into the House with a favorable report from the Committee on Public Lands my colleague, Colonel STOCKDALE, sought me at my seat and said that he had had several opportunities to call up the bill and have it passed, but that, in deference to my known opposition to it, he would not call it up in my absence, and therefore had not availed himself of these opportunities. On yesterday I was in the city and in the House during the greater part of the day, but at the time this bill was called up I was not in the House. I had been called out on a matter of business which detained me thirty or forty minutes, and relying upon the statement previously made to me by my colleague I did not suppose it was necessary for me to be here to watch the bill; on the contrary, I expected that I would be notified when it was to be called up in order that I might have an opportunity to state my objections to it. My colleague did not say to me directly that he would not call up the bill at any other time in my absence, but the implication in what he said was very strong that he would not call it up without giving me notice.

I think it important to me that I should make this statement. I therefore ask unanimous consent that the order by which the motion to reconsider was laid on the table be set aside. In this way the bill presented by the committee will stand as passed by the House, with the motion to reconsider pending. This is all I ask; and I appeal to the usual fair-mindedness and justice of my colleague not to interpose any objection to this request, which I suppose will meet no objection from any other quarter.

The SPEAKER. The Chair understands the gentleman from Ohio to object.

Mr. HOOKER. I understand him now to withdraw the objection.

Mr. EZRA B. TAYLOR. I withdraw my objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

Mr. STOCKDALE. I desire to say, in justice to myself, that if I used any expression which led my colleague to think that I would not call this bill up in the House, such a thing was entirely foreign to my intention. I was about to call the bill up by unanimous consent, and asked recognition for that purpose; but in conversation with my colleague he told me that he would object. I did not call it up and lost for the time my privilege of recognition. Afterward, when I again had opportunity to be recognized, and the Speaker told me I was at the head of the list, I did not ask unanimous consent to bring the bill up, because my colleague was not in the House.

But I never intended to say—and I do not know how my colleague could have so understood me—that I would not try to have the bill passed in the House regularly under the rules. I knew that my colleague was in the House when the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. MCRAE] commenced to call up bills on the Calendar of the Public Lands Committee—a fact which certainly was ample public notice that any bill on the Calendar of that committee might be called up. I was asked by the gentleman from Arkansas whether I desired the bill called up, and I said yes.

Now, there can be no object in setting aside what has been done except simply to raise objection on the ground of "no quorum." The land office in question is located in the only part of our State that has any public lands. To transact business in reference to those lands the people there have now to go a long distance to the land office in the city of Jackson. This bill does not interfere with that land office, and there can be no object in opposing it except to compel my people to journey to the city of Jackson for the benefit of a couple of officials there.

Mr. HOOKER. I wish to say only one word more. Whatever may have been the intention of my colleague, he certainly said he had not called the bill up because he knew I would object to it if called up.

Mr. STOCKDALE. By unanimous consent, yes.

Mr. HOOKER. The fair inference therefore was that I should have notice when the bill was brought up for passage. While I was in the city yesterday, and may have been in the House in the early part of the day, I was not present at the time this bill was under consideration. All I ask now is that the order of the House laying on the table the motion to reconsider shall be set aside, and that the bill shall be regarded simply as passed. Then, if I can not give any good reason in favor of the reconsideration of that vote, the order of the House passing the bill will stand.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. STOCKDALE] objects to the request of his colleague.

Mr. HOOKER. Do I understand my colleague to object?

Mr. STOCKDALE. Yes, sir.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion to adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; and accordingly (at 3 o'clock and 55 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned.

PRIVATE BILLS INTRODUCED AND REFERRED.

Under the rule private bills of the following titles were introduced and referred as indicated below:

By Mr. BACON: A bill (H. R. 11582) granting a pension to Patrick Callahan—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. E. B. TAYLOR: A bill (H. R. 11583) for the relief of George Farnwalt—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

SENATE.

WEDNESDAY, *October* 10, 1888.

Prayer by Rev. WILLIAM E. PARSON, of the city of Washington.

The Journal of yesterday's proceedings was read and approved.

MISSOURI RIVER BRIDGE AT OMAHA.

Mr. ALLISON. I present the memorial of T. J. Power, of Helena, Mont., alleging an obstruction to the navigation of the Missouri River caused by the construction of the piers of the Union Pacific Railway Company between Council Bluffs and Omaha. I ask that the memorial be referred to the Committee on the Improvement of the Mississippi River, and in connection with it I desire to offer a resolution for present consideration.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The memorial will be referred to the Committee on the Improvement of the Mississippi River and Tributaries. The resolution will be read.

The resolution was considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on the Improvement of the Mississippi River and Tributaries be, and it is hereby, directed to inquire whether the construction of the Union Pacific Railroad Company bridge over the Missouri River between Council Bluffs, Iowa, and Omaha, Nebr., authorized by Congress, is in conformity with law, or if the piers of the present bridge or the piers of an old bridge constructed by the said company, are an obstruction to the free navigation of the river, and if so, to report a bill for the remedy of the same.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES.

Mr. WILSON, of Maryland, from the Committee on Claims, to whom was referred the bill (S. 1712) for the relief of G. M. Woodruff, reported it without amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

Mr. CHACE, from the Committee on the District of Columbia, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 9418) to incorporate the Washington and Western Maryland Railroad Company, reported it with amendments.

Mr. HAWLEY, from the Committee on Printing, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 1860) to amend section 683 of the Revised Statutes, reported it with an amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

Mr. FAULKNER, from the Committee on Pensions, to whom were referred the following bills, reported them severally without amendment, and submitted reports thereon:

A bill (H. R. 10032) granting a pension to Milton Wallen;

A bill (H. R. 10253) granting a pension to Emmanuel P. Steed;

A bill (H. R. 3681) granting a pension to Carter W. Tiller; and

A bill (H. R. 9176) granting a pension to Charlotte Taylor.

Mr. JONES, of Arkansas, from the Committee on Claims, to whom was referred the bill (S. 3619) for the relief of Alice E. Robertson, reported it without amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

Mr. SPOONER, from the Committee on Claims, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 9464) for the relief of Hudson G. Lamkin, reported it without amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

CONDITION OF THE CIVIL SERVICE.

Mr. HALE. By direction of the Select Committee to Examine into the Condition of the Civil Service I present the report of the committee, together with the testimony taken by it.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. What disposition does the Senator desire to have made of the report?

Mr. HALE. I should like an order to have the usual number of copies printed of the report and the testimony.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. It will be so ordered if there be no objection.

Mr. HALE. I wish to say, as the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. BLODGETT] is not present, that he desired me, if he was not present, to ask in behalf of the minority that leave might be given to file any report they may desire to make upon the subject at any time during the session. I ask that that leave may be granted.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The Chair hears no objection, and the leave is granted. The report is not accompanied by a bill or resolution?

Mr. HALE. The report is not yet accompanied by a bill. The committee will further sit and further investigate.

REVENUE-BILL TESTIMONY.

Mr. MANDERSON. I am directed by the Committee on Printing to report favorably a Senate resolution, and I ask for its present consideration.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The resolution will be read.

The Secretary read the resolution submitted by Mr. ALDRICH October 9, 1888, as follows:

Resolved, That in addition to the usual number there be printed 750 copies of the testimony accompanying Senate report No. 2332 for the use of the Senate.

Mr. DAWES. What report is that?

Mr. MANDERSON. The testimony taken by the Finance Committee on the revenue bill.

The resolution was considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. CLARK, its Clerk, announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 3559) to amend section 2304 of the Revised Statutes of the United States to allow persons who have abandoned or relinquished their homestead entries to make another entry.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED.

The message also announced that the Speaker of the House had signed the following enrolled bills; and they were thereupon signed by the President *pro tempore:*

A bill (S. 70) to provide for warehousing fruit brandy;

A bill (S. 619) granting an increase of pension to Leopold Mayer;

A bill (S. 664) for the relief of William R. Wheaton and Charles H. Chamberlain, of California;

A bill (S. 741) for the relief of William Tabb;

A bill (S. 889) granting a pension to Mary O. Hall;

A bill (S. 1089) for the relief of Henrietta M. Sands, widow of the late Rear-Admiral Benjamin F. Sands, United States Navy;

A bill (S. 1219) granting a pension to David Heinbach;

A bill (S. 1614) granting a pension to Phillipe Ray;

A bill (S. 1671) for the relief of the heirs of Martin Kenofsky;

A bill (S. 1926) granting a pension to William Smith;

A bill (S. 2567) granting a pension to Nancy Polock;

A bill (S. 2593) granting a pension to Sarah E. McNamara;

A bill (S. 2742) to incorporate the Brightwood Railway Company of the District of Columbia;

A bill (S. 3018) granting an increase of pension to John N. Bovee;

A bill (S. 3030) granting a pension to Mary J. Foster;

A bill (S. 3083) restoring to the pension-roll the name of Florian Lischewsky;

A bill (S. 3175) granting a pension to Mrs. Caroline Taylor;

A bill (S. 3197) granting a pension to Abbie L. Ham;

A bill (S. 3230) granting a pension to Martha J. Cole;

A bill (S. 3241) granting a pension to Easter A. Jackson;

A bill (S. 3427) to amend section 4474 of the Revised Statutes of the United States;

A bill (H. R. 4765) for the relief of G. W. McAdam; and

A bill (H. R. 8962) for the relief of Anthony L. Woodson.

BILLS INTRODUCED.

Mr. FARWELL introduced a bill (S. 3624) for the relief of Charles D. French; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

He also introduced a bill (S. 3625) for the relief of Michael Herr; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

He also introduced a bill (S. 3626) for the relief of D. H. Ming; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

WITHDRAWAL OF PAPERS.

On motion of Mr. HARRIS (for Mr. DANIEL), it was

Ordered, That Arthur Connell be allowed to withdraw his petition and papers from the files of the Senate on leaving copies of the same, there having been an adverse report.

EXPORTATION OF CATTLE THROUGH CANADA.

Mr. WILSON, of Iowa. I offer the following resolution, and ask for its present consideration:

Resolved, That the Committee on Foreign Relations be directed to inquire and report at as early a day as practicable what action can be taken to effect an arrangement with the Dominion of Canada whereby American cattle for export to England and other European countries may be transported through said Dominion of Canada, or any port or ports thereof, without being subjected to the delay imposed by the quarantine regulations now in force.

Mr. CULLOM. To what committee is the direction given?

Mr. WILSON, of Iowa. The Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. CULLOM. I do not know whether it belongs to that committee or not.

Mr. WILSON, of Iowa. Yes, it relates to our relations with foreign countries.

Mr. CULLOM. It relates to transportation as well. However, I do not object to the resolution.

The resolution was considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to.

Mr. WILSON, of Iowa. Inasmuch as the subject to which the resolution refers is one of growing interest, especially to the Western portion of the country, I ask that some papers which have been sent to me relating to the subject may also be referred with the resolution to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The papers will be received and referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, if there be no objection.

GEORGE K. OTIS.

Mr. CALL. If the morning business is over, I desire to move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Senate bill 682.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. If there is no further morning business, the Calendar under Rule VIII is in order, and——

Mr. HOAR. I move to proceed to the consideration of the bill reported from the Committee on the Judiciary yesterday.

Mr. CALL. I believe I have the floor.

Mr. HOAR. I beg pardon; I did not know that the Senator held the floor.

Mr. CALL. I was about to make a motion to proceed to the consideration of a bill.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The Chair had recognized the Senator from Florida. The Calendar under Rule VIII being in order, the title of the first bill on the Calendar will be stated.

The SECRETARY. Order of Business 1995, a bill (S. 3348) for the relief of George K. Otis.

Mr. MITCHELL. Will the Senator from Florida allow the first case on the Calendar to be passed? It is a case on which there will be no discussion, and it has been called up very frequently as the first case on the Calendar. It will only take a moment. I think there will be no objection to it.

Mr. CALL. I yield for that purpose, if the Senator desires it.

Mr. MITCHELL. I shall not insist upon it if it takes more than a moment's time.

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 3348) for the relief of George K. Otis. It directs the Postmaster-General to allow George K. Otis, late contractor on route 6771, New York, for the contract term from July 1, 1881, to June 30, 1885, pro rata increase of pay for any increase of service which the Postmaster-General may have required him to perform during that period, the same to be based on the number of trips actually run and distance traveled in excess of what he was required to perform on the date of the execution of his contract.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ALFRED PLEASONTON.

Mr. CALL. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the bill (S. 682) authorizing the President to appoint and retire Alfred Pleasonton a major of cavalry in the Army of the United States.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The Chair is informed that a bill of the House of Representatives, identical with the Senate bill, has passed both Houses and is now in conference. Therefore it would be superfluous to pass the Senate bill.

Mr. CALL. I understand that there is some difficulty in getting the House bill which has passed the Senate considered by the conference and reported to the two Houses. I have no particular interest in the bill, but I am informed that General Pleasonton is in a condition of extreme want and suffering. He has appealed to me through his friends repeatedly, and said he had appealed to other Senators to allow the bill to be considered. It seems to be impossible to obtain a conference re-

port upon the House bill. It is for that reason, this bill standing upon the Calendar, that I have asked that it be considered by the Senate. I do not know what action the Senate can take in regard to the House bill unless it should instruct its conferees to report to the Senate.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CAMERON] is chairman of the managers at the conference on the part of the Senate.

Mr. CAMERON. I will state that I have been endeavoring for some time to get a meeting of the Senate conferees with the conferees on the part of the House, but up to this time I have been unable to do so. As the Senate passed the bill, it retired General Pleasonton as major, while the House retired him as colonel. The Senate in all cases in putting officers upon the retired-list has declared that they should be retired with the rank which they held at the time of their resignation. General Pleasonton's friends insist upon it that he shall be retired with a higher rank. That is the difference between the two Houses. As soon as a meeting of the conferees can be brought about, I have no doubt the matter will be adjusted. Up to this time we have been unable to agree.

Mr. CALL. I suppose nothing further can be done now; but I desire to bring the matter to the attention of the chairman of the Senate conferees with the hope that there may be a report made. The bill should receive final consideration at the hands of Congress.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The Senate bill will be restored to its place on the Calendar.

ANDREW J. SMITH.

Mr. CULLOM. The Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. HOAR] yields to me to call up the bill (H. R. 2579) authorizing the President to appoint and retire Andrew J. Smith, late colonel of the Seventh United States Cavalry and a major-general of volunteers.

By unanimous consent, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill.

The bill was reported from the Committee on Military Affairs with an amendment, in line 9, before the words "in the Army of the United States," to strike out "brigadier-general" and insert "colonel of cavalry;" so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the laws regulating appointments in the Army be, and they are hereby, suspended, and suspended only for the purposes of this act; and the President is hereby authorized to nominate and, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, appoint Andrew J. Smith, late colonel of the Seventh United States Cavalry and a major-general of volunteers, a colonel of cavalry in the Army of the United States, and thereupon to place him, the said Andrew J. Smith, upon the retired-list of the Army, with the rank and grade of colonel, without regard and in addition to the number now authorized by law of said retired-list.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HAMPTON. I wanted to have the House bill substituted for the Senate bill.

Mr. CULLOM. It is.

Mr. HAMPTON. I see the Senator from Illinois called up the House bill. It is all right.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendment was concurred in.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time, and passed.

S. T. MARSHALL.

Mr. ALLISON. The Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. HOAR] kindly yields to me that I may ask the Senate to take up the bill (H. R. 2196) for the relief of S. T. Marshall. It is a bill relating to a constituent of mine, and I believe there will be no objection to it.

By unanimous consent, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill. It proposes to pay $6,598.49 to S. T. Marshall, of Keokuk, Iowa, in full of all claim or demand as assignee of G. M. Marshall, in a contract made in 1850, to supply and furnish beef cattle to General Estill, purchasing and disbursing agent of the United States for the commission sent to California, in 1850, to make treaties with the Indians.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

CONDEMNED CANNON AND SMALL-ARMS.

Mr. CAMERON. I ask the Senate to consider at this time the bill (S. 3612) donating condemned cannon and small-arms to Naval Post No. 400, Grand Army of the Republic, Department of Pennsylvania. I will state that this bill was read on a former occasion, but was objected to by the Senator from Illinois [Mr. CULLOM], who I understand now withdraws his objection.

Mr. CULLOM. I wish to state that I was under a misapprehension when the bill was formerly read. I desire to withdraw any objection to its passage.

By unanimous consent, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

PREVENTION OF YELLOW FEVER.

Mr. HARRIS. I ask the Senate to proceed at this time to the consideration of the joint resolution 113, reported by me yesterday from the Committee on Epidemic Diseases. It is important, if the joint resolution is to pass at all, that it should be passed at once.

By unanimous consent, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the joint resolution (S. R. 113) concerning the conference to be held in Washington, December next, to consider the best means of preventing the introduction of yellow fever and other epidemic diseases into this country.

Mr. CALL. I offer as an amendment to that joint resolution the joint resolution which was adversely reported by the Committee on Epidemic Diseases; and I ask that it be read.

Mr. HARRIS. The joint resolution is on the Calendar of itself. I think it is subject to a question of order, and I make it. It is a pending measure upon the Calendar.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The Chair understood the Senator from Florida to desire to offer as an amendment the joint resolution adversely reported.

Mr. HARRIS. So I understand, but it is offering a measure pending on the Calendar as an amendment to another measure.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The Chair did not so understand the Senator from Florida. The Chair understands the Senator from Florida to offer as an amendment the substance of the joint resolution adversely reported. It will be read as an amendment to the pending joint resolution. The Chair understands the Senator from Florida to move to strike out and insert?

Mr. CALL. I do.

Mr. HOAR. I should like to inquire of the Senator from Tennessee if the consideration of the joint resolution is likely to lead to discussion?

Mr. HARRIS. That depends altogether on the Senator from Florida, I must answer the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. HOAR. I was assigned the floor by the President of the Senate, and yielded for matters which I understood would require no discussion and about which there was no difference of opinion. I wish to have a bill taken up for discussion.

Mr. HARRIS. I was not aware of the fact that the Senator from Massachusetts had the floor in respect to some measure of his or I should have asked his courtesy to allow me to call up the joint resolution. If the joint resolution is to pass at all, in my opinion it is a matter of some importance that it should be passed at once so as to go to the other House. I have no desire to say a word except to have the joint resolution read, but if the Senator from Florida by proposing to debate it shall defeat its passage, I shall have done my duty in asking the Senate to consider it. Of course, I shall not trespass upon the courtesy of the Senator from Massachusetts beyond the time that his patience will allow me to do so, but will abandon my request at any moment the Senator may suggest.

Mr. HOAR. Very well.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The amendment proposed by the Senator from Florida [Mr. CALL] will be read.

The SECRETARY. It is moved to strike out all after the resolving clause and insert:

That the President of the United States call upon the Academy of Sciences to convene in the city of Washington at as early a day as practicable, and that the President shall select and request the attendance of such persons of the different schools of medicine and of such others of attainments in science and natural research who shall be distinguished for learning and eminent attainments to take evidence, examine into, and report upon all methods that shall be submitted to them for the cure, prevention, and suppression of yellow fever and other contagious or infectious disease.

SEC. 2. That the President is authorized to invite the attendance of men eminent for learning and attainments in science and natural research from foreign countries and to order a reasonable per diem compensation to them and mileage from and to the homes of all persons who shall be requested to attend and shall attend such convention, including the members of the Academy of Sciences, and the sum of $100,000, or so much thereof as shall be necessary, is hereby appropriated to pay the expenses of such convention.

SEC. 3. That the President shall appoint the time of the meeting of such convention and the length of time which it shall continue, and may adjourn it or extend the time of its continuance.

SEC. 4. That the money herein appropriated shall be paid upon the order of the President of the United States or as shall be directed by him.

Mr. CALL. Mr. President, I do not wish to interfere with the Senator from Massachusetts in the bill he wishes to bring up for consideration, but it is I think quite obvious that this is a subject of considerable importance. I am of the opinion that the joint resolution which was adversely reported contains all that is meritorious in the measure of the committee and much that is not contained in that measure, but is important for the protection of the people against this plague. The joint resolution of the committee is impotent of good and is virtually a suppression of all scientific and practical inquiry by experimental methods. It proposes that a number of persons of greater or less sanitary knowledge and opinions shall convene at their own expense and make public their several preconceived opinions already made public in the newspapers and public journals, and like the former commission adjourn.

Why the Committee on Epidemic Diseases should desire to exclude from the consideration of this subject the ablest intellect that can be found in the country, whether it is or is not upon the boards of health of the different States, or whether it is or is not in the military or naval

service, is a proposition that I think they can not vindicate. In the presence of a plague of such very great danger to the whole country as is threatened by this disease, certainly there can be no excuse with intelligent men for ignoring the best capacity that may be found to investigate and consider the subject, nor for confining the selection of this capacity for investigation to the boards of health of the several States.

That is the whole distinction. The amendment that I offer authorizes the President to convene any persons in the United States, whether they are upon boards of health or not upon boards of health, whether they are in the military or naval service or not in the military or naval service, whether in the United States or out of the United States, whose researches and reputation entitle them to consideration, to consider this subject. It provides the only method by which it can be done, the means for compensating them for their service, and providing for their coming to and their going from the place of deliberation.

That is the whole question, and upon that question I wish to have a vote of the Senate. The Committee on Epidemic Diseases say let us take the men not selected for this purpose but who chance to be members of the State boards of health, conspicuous, some of them for eminent ability, others for executive ability, and others perhaps without any special fitness for the investigation. They are not to be selected by the medical profession nor by any scientific body for this most important of all purposes, the consideration and suggestion of plans and methods of investigation and research of the nature and the remedies which have been or may be developed for the prevention and cure of this terrible plague. The committee propose to take whoever may chance to be put upon those boards. It does not provide them with transportation or compensation, but leaves them to their own private resources altogether. It makes no compensation to them for their expenses or for the time occupied in considering a subject which is of importance, and of the greatest importance, not only to the lives and happiness of our people, but also of very great pecuniary importance to the whole country.

That is the whole difference, and therefore I desire a vote upon the two propositions.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. President, I propose to consume but a single moment. The Committee on Epidemic Diseases carefully considered the joint resolution offered as an amendment by the Senator from Florida, and with absolute unanimity, without a dissenting voice or a dissenting opinion, directed me to report as an original measure the joint resolution now before the Senate for consideration, and to report the joint resolution of the Senator from Florida adversely.

I do not know where the Senator from Florida would look for information upon this subject other than the members of those organizations who deal exclusively with sanitary work, and the study of whose lives has been devoted to sanitation. The various boards of health of all the States propose to select from their respective bodies the best sanitarians and send them here for the purpose of conferring and considering the causes and the best methods of prevention of the epidemics referred to in the joint resolution.

The absolute unanimity of the committee in favor of the joint resolution reported by me and against the joint resolution offered as an amendment by the Senator from Florida, fully justifies me, and as I think justifies the Senate, in voting down the amendment and passing the joint resolution as reported by the committee.

Mr. CALL. Mr. President, I expected that would be about the kind of argument which would be used—that is, the unanimity of the committee, not the reasons for that unanimity. Now, what is the proposition the Senator from Tennessee makes? That you can look nowhere for knowledge upon these subjects except to the boards of health of the respective States, the lives of whose members have been devoted to sanitary knowledge. What authority has he for that statement? How does he know that the members of the boards of health who will be selected will be persons who have devoted their lives to that purpose? There is no reasonable probability that this is true. There may be eminent men here and eminent men there, but the fact that they are selected as a board of health will be no evidence upon that point.

Then there are no means provided for these people to pay their expenses while considering this subject, and the time they can give to this work will be limited by their personal means. There are no means provided for their coming or going, and no means for pursuing any investigations or experiments. Why shall we assume that outside of the boards of health, who doubtless contain many men of much merit, there is not the most conspicuous ability all through the country which could be made available to consider this subject? Why should we not consider that the eminent scientific men of foreign countries who have been appointed upon commissions by their respective governments and sent where this disease is to be found, as well as other diseases, to investigate the processes of cure and prevention—why shall we say here that they would not be important factors in the consideration of this subject? The joint resolution of the committee will prevent investigations and scientific experiments. It loses the opportunity of using the favorable moment when public attention is awakened to the importance of the subject, and postpones and ignores the processes of intelligent thought, examination, and experiment, which alone can possibly lead to discovery of the secrets of nature, until a new holocaust of human life shall be caused by our own ignorance and neglect.

Mr. President, that is the whole subject. I know the Senate will follow the committee, as usual; but I wished to present the two propositions in contrast, the unanimity of the committee without reason, without a single fact upon which they can base a reasonable conclusion, really suppressing inquiry and refusing to recognize eminent medical and scientific knowledge, and the proposition embracing the whole scientific and medical knowledge of the country and of the world, to be convened in a representative form and in limited numbers here for the consideration of this subject and the formulation of plans of inquiry, observation, and experiment. First, the Academy of Sciences, which comprises men not only devoted to one science, but to all methods of scientific natural result; then the members of the boards of health, represented and selected by the different committees or boards of health, or the President, and then men conspicuous throughout the world for the consideration of the cure or prevention of a plague that for one hundred years has desolated the countries of Central America, the United States, and the West Indies, and which threatens now to prevail throughout the whole country in all of its great cities.

It is a subject of the greatest importance, and it is worth the expenditure of a hundred thousand dollars to dignify the investigation and make it effective and useful. It is a narrow-minded idea on our part that refuses to avail ourselves of the conspicuous ability which is to be found in other countries as well as our own for the investigation of this subject.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The question is on agreeing to the amendment proposed by the Senator from Florida [Mr. CALL].

The amendment was rejected.

The joint resolution was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The preamble was agreed to.

WIDOW OF CHIEF-JUSTICE WAITE.

Mr. HOAR. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the bill (S. 3621) for the payment to the widow of the late Chief-Justice Morrison R. Waite the balance of a year's salary, which was reported yesterday by the Judiciary Committee.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. BERRY. Mr. President——

Mr. HOAR. I thought perhaps the Senator from Arkansas would permit me, as I have charge of the bill, according to what I suppose is the usual custom, to make a remark in its favor, if there is no objection.

Mr. BERRY. Certainly; I give way to the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. HOAR. I wish merely to repeat what has been said before, that the needs of the family of the late Chief-Justice are well known. He had, like Professor Agassiz, never found time to make money when he was engaged in a higher public service.

It has been said that there is no precedent for this legislation. I understand that the case of every member of the House of Representatives and every member of the Senate who has died in office, for a great while, is a precedent for this legislation. It is the universal practice to give to the family of a deceased Senator or Representative his salary for the current year.

It is true that there are some distinctions between the office of Chief-Justice of the United States and that of a Senator or Member of Congress, but all the distinctions are such as make the argument much stronger, in my judgment, in the case of the jurist than in the case of the legislator, because the life of the judge the whole year, whether his court is in session or not, is necessarily devoted to the public service to the exclusion of all other methods of making money, and his calculations must have been made, provision for the support of his family must have been anticipated, planned for, with reference to the receipt of his salary and to the receipt of nothing else from any money-making employment.

It is notorious that Senators and Members of Congress are not only permitted by law, but conceive themselves permitted by practice and by public sentiment, to devote large portions of the year to the practice of their profession or business, whatever it may be. If Chief-Justice Waite himself had died in the Senate his family would have received this appropriation without question, although it would undoubtedly have been true of that eminent jurist and magistrate that he would have been in the receipt of large sums for professional services rendered during the year when Congress was not actually in session; or, as in the case of many eminent lawyers of both Houses of Congress, it would have been true that he would have been rendering service in the Supreme Court of the United States for compensation even while the legislative body of which he was a member was in session.

I therefore confidently affirm that the precedent which we are in the habit of applying to our own associates applies with double force to the case of a Chief-Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States.

Mr. HAWLEY. May I add a single word to that? It seems to me

also that the established pension to the widows of the Presidents may be considered as in some degree a precedent.

Mr. BERRY. Mr. President, under the law the Chief-Justice of the United States was entitled to receive and did receive $10,500 per annum. Every dollar that was due the late Chief-Justice at the time of his death was either paid to him or to his widow. The Government is not indebted to the Chief-Justice or his widow either legally, equitably, or morally, one dollar. This is a proposition to give out of the Treasury of the United States something over $8,000 simply as a donation or gift. It is not pretended that the Chief-Justice rendered any services for which he was not paid according to the contract and according to the law. If it be right, as the Senator from Massachusetts insists, to pay the widow of a Senator or Member or a Chief-Justice, and I place them all on the same ground, then the Senator from Massachusetts ought to have the courage to bring in a bill and make it the law of the land in advance to say that a member of Congress shall have $5,000 per annum, and in case of his death that his widow shall receive $5,000 more.

But it is not the law yet; and when a member of Congress or a Senator dies it is sought to give them aid by putting it on an appropriation bill or something of that character, so that the world may not know what is being done. Gentlemen now seek to extend that practice to the widow of the Chief-Justice of the United States. If it be right to do that, why not make it in the law so that the people of the country may understand that when a man is elected to Congress or appointed Chief-Justice this is part and parcel of the contract.

The Senator from Massachusetts seeks to appeal to our sympathies by saying that the condition of the family is well known. Chief-Justice Waite drew a salary of $10,500 for twelve or fourteen years; I do not remember the time. If he was not able to save anything from that salary for his family, then I assert here upon the floor of this Senate he must have lived in a very extravagant way. I assert when it is said again and again that a family can not live respectably upon the sum of $10,500 and save anything in Washington, that it is not true. If the Chief-Justice was economical he ought to have saved a large amount for his family. Therefore the appeal for sympathy has no place here inasmuch as this is a gift pure and simple. There are 10,000, ay, 100,000 widows throughout this land whose husbands' salaries over and above expenses did not amount to $500 that would appeal to my sympathies ten times more strongly than the widow of one who received a salary of $10,500 a year.

These are the objections that I have to this bill. The same objections, I admit, apply to the widow of a Senator or Member. There is no law for either. It is a gift, pure and simple, and it is laying down a precedent—and each precedent is used to put some additional person on that list—it is laying down a precedent to build up here in the city of Washington an aristocratic class, those who live off the toil and labor of the laboring classes throughout this country. It is a gift pure and simple of eight thousand and odd dollars. It might as well be $50,000. There is no reason for saying one sum above another.

I am opposed to it upon principle. I would oppose it in the case of the President's widow, in the case of the widows of Senators and Members. I am opposed to giving it to the widow of the Chief-Justice of the United States. It is easy to be generous with money that does not belong to us. By what authority, by what right do you make donations and select out one person and say this money shall be given to this person, who has no claim, legal, equitable, or otherwise. It is upon this principle that I think the Senate ought not to pass this bill, and if precedents have been made we ought not to make another precedent which will be used hereafter to extend to the widow of every judge of a United States court. If it is given to the widow of the Chief-Justice, there can be no reason why it should not be given to the others.

I hope the bill will not pass.

Mr. CALL. Mr. President, I propose to vote for this bill, and I desire to say that in my judgment not a single proposition of the Senator from Arkansas can be sustained as a matter of reason and argument.

What are those propositions? They are often made here, and this is a question of important public policy. I am not willing to give money out of the Treasury without consideration. If there be no important and wise public policy which demands that compensation should be made to the widow of a Senator or Member of Congress, some allowance, if there is no public policy that requires that retired officers should receive pay, if the interests of the people do not demand that the widows of Presidents shall receive some consideration, I think that there is as much public virtue on my part and those who think with me in sustaining them as there is on the part of the Senator from Arkansas in refusing to do so.

But what are these propositions that the Senator makes? Nothing more than that Congress has no right to do what? To value the services of a public servant after his death, that it should forget to consider that George Washington or Thomas Jefferson or some other great patriot who has given his life to the people rendered services that in a money value are beyond amount. How unreasonable and absurd such a proposition! Why can you not value the services of Chief-Justice Waite to-day and say they were worth more than the sum that the law required to be paid him? And then, how unreasonable it is that it is so often urged here just like the report of the Committee on Epidemic Diseases—how unreasonable to say that there can be no consideration given to eminent public virtue.

How will you conduct a government if you say there can be no reward to a man for surpassing his fellows in devotion to the public interest, in sacrificing himself and his personal interest for them? Why, Mr. President, you can have no government, you must have a degraded people and institutions that ignore merit and public virtue if you act on such a notion.

Mr. BERRY. Will the Senator allow me a moment?

Mr. CALL. Certainly.

Mr. BERRY. I suppose the Senator proceeds upon the theory that these largesses are given only for great public merit, and then he would say that it is a proper thing for the Congress of the United States to resolve that we will give to the widows of the most deserving the money of the people; and then resolve that we and the Chief-Justice are the most deserving. That is the theory upon which he goes; that is, that whomsoever a majority of the members of Congress may think deserving they may give any amount of money they see proper out of the Treasury of the United States, and it is proper for them to say that they themselves are the most deserving persons; hence we will give our widows $5,000.

Mr. CALL. I do not understand that the Chief-Justice was a member of Congress.

Mr. BERRY. The Senator had spoken of members of Congress to-day, and referred to them specially.

Mr. CALL. Neither do I understand that the widow of a man who was a member of Congress is a member of Congress either, nor do I understand that the widow of a President is a member of Congress, but that proposition of the Senator is just as wide of the mark and unreasonable as the other.

Here is the simple question: Has the Congress of the United States the right to consider what was the moneyed value of the services of Chief-Justice Waite now that he is dead; and if they had the right before, have they not now?

Does the fact that a law has been passed fixing a particular amount of money for a particular service forbid Congress to consider the propriety of an increase or decrease of the amount? If the facts justify it, it should be done, and who will say that a Chief-Justice of the Supreme Court, a co-ordinate department of this Government, intrusted with the consideration of the great public questions upon which the happiness and welfare of the people depend, should not be allowed to live in a degree of dignity which will enable him to receive respectably the people of the United States who come here expecting to receive attention and consideration from him, or that he shall live like a beggar or a pauper, turning from his door the people who have honored him with public position.

Mr. President, I do not believe that the interests of public virtue, of free government, demand that the servants of the people shall be humiliated in the presence of themselves. Therefore I have upon all proper occasions when the question arose as to a faithful public servant who had given his life in the honest and meritorious performance of his duty and had left those behind him unprovided for—I, as a representative of the people, believing that I sympathize with them and represent them fully, and never having found in my public life in a single public meeting an unwillingnes on the part of the people to respond to that sentiment, I am willing and always shall be willing to make a reasonable and moderate provision for those they have left behind them for our care and consideration by our public servants who had meritoriously performed their duty.

Mr. COKE. Mr. President, being a member of the Judiciary Committee, from which this bill was reported, I rise to say that I opposed it in the committee and oppose its passage here. I believe in equality before the law of all the people of these United States. I believe one good respectable widow woman is exactly the same before the law as another is. There are hundreds of thousands of good widow-women in the United States as much entitled in law, in equity, and of right to a donation from the Congress of the United States as the estimable lady for whose relief this bill is pending before the Senate. Why shall we select one and ignore others? Chief-Justice Waite was paid all he expected to receive during his lifetime; and that which was due him of his salary, if it has not been paid, will be paid to his widow. There is nothing in the law, there is nothing in the equity of the case, there is nothing in the right and propriety of it, which separates this lady from hundreds of thousands of good respectable and needy women in the United States equally meritorious. Why shall they be ignored and she receive a donation?

Mr. President, I have uniformly voted against legislation of this character since I have been here and I always will. I am opposed to privilege and to classes among our people. I stand for equality before the law for all our people, and I stand here to oppose any donation to any individual to be selected from the mass of our people. They are meritorious alike. No man and no woman has a right to demand one thing before the law that all others have not an equal right to demand and to receive. The argument upon which the Senator from Florida would justify this bill will build up an aristocracy in this country to live upon the labors of the working people of the country.

It is all very well to talk about being liberal with other people's money. The money in the Treasury of the United States was placed there for the purpose of carrying on this Government, and it is no part of the administration of the Government for the Congress of the United States to take this treasure and give it away to selected objects and selected persons.

I submit, Mr. President, that the bill is of a character that should not pass, should not become a law. I have never supported one like it, and I never will.

Mr. HOAR. Will the Senator from Texas inform the Senate whether there is not as much constitutional authority for this proposition as for supplying the people of Texas with seeds, which he advocated, and which was passed on his recommendation a year or two ago?

Mr. COKE. The Senator from Massachusetts will be answered with a great deal of pleasure. Whether constitutional or not, the Agricultural Department has for more than a quarter of a century been established as one of the executive branches of this Government. As a part of the duty of that Department about $100,000 of appropriations, or perhaps more, have annually been expended for a number of years for seed for general distribution among the people. Now, if it is constitutional to appropriate money to buy seed for general distribution, is it not equally constitutional to appropriate money to buy seed for particular distribution where a particular reason exists for the particular distribution?

I do not defend the creation of the Agricultural Department. I believe that there was no warrant in the Constitution for it when it was created; but it having been ingrafted upon our governmental system, it being an existing and a subsisting fact, what is done by that Department in the way of acquiring and distributing seed, I do submit to the Senator from Massachusetts, is an ample justification and precedent for what was attempted to be done by the passage of the Texas seed bill.

I will add that I did not introduce the Texas seed bill. It was a House bill, passed there without a division, which came to the Senate in the usual way. I advocated its passage by the Senate in exactly the same constitutional views that sustains the votes cast every year in both Houses of Congress for the agricultural appropriation bill.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, this bill appeals to my sympathies. I knew Chief-Justice Waite, and esteemed him as a man and as a great magistrate. I think his services as Chief-Justice of the United States, though possibly not so brilliant as those of some of his predecessors, were of that solid and useful character which conferred great benefit upon this country. He held the highest place to which a man can aspire who belongs to the profession of which I am an humble member. There is nothing which I could do or say to honor his memory, to testify to his great worth, which I would not do if I had the power to do it; but I believe that this bill, though appealing to our sensibilities, is not only a very dangerous precedent for us to follow but it is without warrant in the Constitution.

I understand the appropriating power to be defined and limited and circumscribed exactly in the Constitution with the taxing power. When I look at that instrument I find that Congress has power to lay and collect taxes to carry on the Government, to pay the debts, and provide for the general welfare of the people of the United States. I believe, contrary to the opinion of some of my friends upon this side of the Chamber, that the power to tax and the power to appropriate are not confined simply to those purposes necessary to carry on the Government. I believe we have a broader power, as I have frequently expressed on this floor, a power to appropriate money to provide for the general welfare. But I do not believe that in that general welfare is included the power to make a gift, a donation pure and simple to a single individual. I believe that we, the Congress of the United States, are not the owners of the money in the Treasury. I believe we are simply trustees, and that we are bound to dispose of that money according to the letter of attorney under which we act. I do not think that letter of attorney extends to the making of private donations to private individuals, and, however much I might be disposed from sympathy, from a respect for the memory of the great man whose widow is named in the bill, I feel constrained from a sense of duty to cast my vote against this bill, not only as being without warrant in the Constitution, but as being another precedent in a dangerous direction, which will hereafter be quoted and relied upon as an authority on the part of Congress or as a persuasion to Congress to vote money to a private person whenever Congress in its judgment, in its discretion, may think that private person is entitled to its benefactions.

Mr. CALL. I think the Senators who make the statement that they are opposed to giving money out of the Treasury as a gift should be prepared to sustain the proposition that this is a gift. What is a gift? Can any one say that when a man has rendered valuable service and money is paid to him greater than the amount the law provides, that is a gift? What pretense is there for saying it is a gift, unless it be true that you can not measure the amount fixed in the law as the consideration for the service and say you have undervalued it? Can not a private individual say, "My contract is a harsh one; the services rendered demand more?" How, then, can this proposition be made that this is a gift because Congress says the services of this man, followed by his death, deserve as a matter of valuation, of compensation, a greater sum than was paid to him? Senators who make these remarks can not state the definition of debt without themselves refuting their proposition? What is a debt? Is it not an obligation—something owed by some person for something done, some service performed? And because you have promised less than the service was worth is it less a debt if you have the honesty to say "I paid you less than the service was worth?" These Senators say it is very wrong for them to do this; they claim that "debts *ex debito justitiæ*" can not exist between the people and their servants. They insist that there is great danger to the people if they shall consent when a man has died in their service, has given his life to them, to keep his wife and children from starving, by valuing his service more highly than they would have done if he had lived. This greater valuation of a service which involves the loss of life, in their argument is a crime.

Then, again, the Senator from Mississippi says it is unconstitutional, although he reads the words "Congress may levy taxes to pay the debts of the United States." What is a debt and who are authorized to say what shall be a debt of the United States but the two Houses of Congress of the United States? Who but they, the representatives of the people, can alter the consideration to be paid for a service and make it greater or less and recognize the service as a debt or *quantum meruit?*

Why is not that a debt when the Congress of the United States say it is a debt? What is a debt? As I have said before, a debt may be one of justice, or a debt of merit, or a debt to be awarded by the legislative power of the Government in consideration of services rendered. What is a debt? Why, those persons can not make a definition of it without justifying this bill. A debt is something due for services, something due either from equity or by the terms of a promise or because of merit, a *quantum meruit*, as much as it deserves, even according to the theories of the law.

Therefore there is nothing in these propositions of the Senator from Mississippi or the Senator from Texas or the Senator from Arkansas.

As to equality, why does not the Senator decline to receive the compensation provided here of $5,000, which is far in excess of the $350 average pay of the laborers and of the people of the United States? Why talk about equality when we recognize a difference in services always?

He is not the friend of the people and of equality who is willing to degrade and humiliate those who hold high public stations of the Government into pauperism or those whom they leave behind as beggars and forcing them to live upon the public charity. There is in the conditions of life in this world something due to appearances, something to the necessities of the public service, and the true friend of the people is he who by a public policy honors the faithful public servants, rewards them with just applause, and allows them, their wives, and their children the same respectability of appearance and the same opportunities and privileges as those that belong to other people in private life filling positions of dignity and important trust and duty.

The Senators would have a pandemonium upon earth if their systems of public policy could be adopted—no rewards for merit, for public virtue, for the sacrifice of life in the performance of duty—but they would inscribe over the public service, "Let him who performs public service leave all hope behind. Virtue and faithful public service have no rewards. The interests of the people require the punishment of the faithful public servant." I fail to see any truth or force in them.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, and was read the third time.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore* put the question on the passage of the bill, and declared that the "ayes" appeared to prevail.

Mr. BERRY. I ask for a division.

Mr. HOAR. Will the Chair allow me to appeal to the Senator from Arkansas not to insist on his call for a division? The Senator's opinion, and that of the other gentlemen who agree with him, has been put on record by their speeches, which will go into the RECORD, and the calling of a division at this time may very possibly disclose the want of a quorum and thus prevent the continuance of the business of the Senate—the speech of the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. BATE], which we are all expecting. I hope the Senator will consider his duty as done by recording his judgment without insisting upon a division.

Mr. BERRY. I have no disposition to take any course which will show that the Senate is in such a condition that no further business can be done when there is public business here that probably is a necessity.

I did state yesterday that I thought a majority of the Senate would vote for this bill. That opinion was based upon the fact that I believe every Republican Senator will cast his vote for it from the circumstance that they invariably vote for this character of legislation, and when they are re-enforced by the Senator from Florida [Mr. CALL] I have no doubt that a majority will vote for the bill.

Therefore, inasmuch as it is probable that a division may disclose the fact that there is not a quorum of the Senate in the city, and thereby prevent the passage of the general deficiency and other bills, I shall

withdraw the call with the hope, and almost with the certainty, that this bill can not, ought not, and will not pass the other House during the session, and therefore no great damage will be done.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. Shall the bill pass?

The bill was passed.

POTEAU RIVER BRIDGE.

Mr. JONES, of Arkansas. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the bill (H. R. 11107) to amend an act entitled "An act to authorize the Fort Smith and Choctaw Bridge Company to construct a bridge across the Poteau River, in the Choctaw Nation, near Fort Smith, Ark."

The motion was agreed to; and the bill was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

LEGAL REPRESENTATIVES OF ELIZA M. FERRIS.

Mr. SAWYER. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the bill (H. R. 1152) for the relief of the legal representatives of Eliza M. Ferris.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill. It proposes to pay to Reuben D. Smart, administrator of Eliza M. Ferris, deceased, the sum of money to which she would have been entitled by pension certificate 220860, and which was not issued until four days after her death.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

COOSA RIVER BRIDGE AT GADSDEN, ALA.

Mr. MORGAN. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the bill (H. R. 11338) to authorize the construction of a bridge across the Coosa River, at Gadsden, in the State of Alabama.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill.

The bill was reported from the Committee on Commerce with amendments.

The first amendment was, in section 1, line 3, after the word "railroad," to insert "company;" in line 5, after the word "constructed," to strike out "in accordance with the regulations of the Secretary of War;" in line 10, after the word "same," to insert "*Provided*, That the Secretary of War shall approve the plans and dimensions of said bridge;" and in line 12, after the word "bridge," to insert "if approved by the Secretary of War;" so as to make the section read:

That the Anniston and Cincinnati Railroad Company, a corporation created and existing under the laws of the State of Alabama, having constructed a bridge and approaches thereto over the Coosa River, at or near Gadsden, in Etowah County, on a direct line from Anniston, in Calhoun County, to Attalla, in Etowah County, in the State of Alabama, said company is hereby authorized to keep and maintain the same: *Provided*, That the Secretary of War shall approve the plans and dimensions of said bridge. Said bridge, if approved by the Secretary of War, shall be maintained so as to provide for the passage of railway trains, and, at the option of the corporation by which it is built, may be used for the passage of wagons and vehicles of all kinds, for the transit of animals, and for foot-passengers, upon conditions to be agreed upon between said corporation and the county commissioners' court of the said county of Etowah and approved by the Secretary of War.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in section 2, line 21, after the word "prescribed," to insert:

And provided further, That nothing herein contained shall be held to alter or affect existing laws as to the removal of bridges obstructing the navigation of rivers when the Secretary of War shall so determine.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in section 4, line 1, after the word "that," to strike out, "the bridge authorized under this act shall be built and located under and subject to such regulations for the security of navigation of said river as the Secretary of War may prescribe; and to secure that object the;" in line 10, after the word "and," to strike out "until said plan and location of the bridge shall have been approved by the Secretary of War" and insert "if the Secretary of War, upon an examination of the papers to him submitted, shall require any change in the location or plans of said bridge, or its entire removal, the company shall, at its own expense, comply with such requirements;" and in line 19, after the word "bridge," to insert "by reason of said bridge being alleged to be an obstruction to the navigation of said Coosa River;" so as to make the section read:

SEC. 4. That said company shall submit to the Secretary of War for his examination and approval the design and drawings of the bridge and a map of the location, giving the topography of the banks of the river, the shore-lines at high and low water, the direction and strength of the current at all stages, and the soundings, accurately showing the bed of the stream, and if the Secretary of War, upon an examination of the papers to him submitted, shall require any change in the location or plans of said bridge, or its entire removal, the company shall, at its own expense, comply with such requirements, said bridge shall not be built; and if any change be made in the plan of said bridge such change shall be subject to the approval of the Secretary of War; and if any litigation shall be had in regard to said bridge by reason of said bridge being alleged to be an obstruction to the navigation of said Coosa River, the same shall be in the circuit court of the United States in whose territorial jurisdiction said bridge or any part thereof is located.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was to strike out section 6, in the following words:

SEC. 6. That if actual construction of the bridge herein authorized shall not be commenced within one year from the passage of this act, and be completed within three years from the same date, the rights and privileges hereby granted shall cease, and this act shall be null and void.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendments were concurred in.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed, and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time, and passed.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. CLARK, its Clerk, announced that the House had agreed to the reports of the committees of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the following bills:

A bill (S. 307) for the relief of Margaret Kennedy;

A bill (H. R. 7547) granting the right of way to the Yankton and Missouri River Railway through the Yankton reservation in Dakota; and

A bill (H. R. 10896) making appropriations to supply deficiencies in the appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1888, and for prior years, and for other purposes.

Mr. MORGAN. I move that the Senate insist on its amendments, and ask for a conference with the House of Representatives thereon.

The motion was agreed to.

By unanimous consent, the President *pro tempore* was authorized to appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate; and Mr. VEST, Mr. SAWYER, and Mr. CULLOM were appointed.

CHIPPEWA INDIANS.

Mr. DAVIS. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the bill (H. R. 7935) for the relief and civilization of the Chippewa Indians in the State of Minnesota. This bill was considered the other day, and was then read at length.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The bill when last before the Senate was read at length, and the amendment reported by the Committee on Indian Affairs to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert a substitute was amended in certain particulars. The question now is upon agreeing to the amendment of the Committee on Indian Affairs as amended.

Mr. DAWES. I believe the Senator from Minnesota desires to offer an amendment to the committee amendment.

Mr. DAVIS. I desire to offer a further amendment, which is, in section 1, line 28, after the word "effect," to insert the following proviso:

Provided further, That in any case where an allotment in severalty has heretofore been made to any Indian of land upon any of said reservations, he shall not be deprived thereof or disturbed therein, except by his own individual consent, separately and previously given, in such form and manner as may be prescribed by the Secretary of the Interior.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendment was concurred in.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time, and passed.

HOMESTEAD ENTRIES.

Mr. TELLER. I ask that an order be made to print the bill (S. 3559) to amend section 2304 of the Revised Statutes of the United States to allow persons who have abandoned or relinquished their homestead entries to make another entry. The bill has not been printed, and I ask that an order may be made to print the usual number as it finally passed.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. In the absence of objection it will be so ordered.

KENTUCKY RIVER BRIDGES.

Mr. VEST. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the bill (H. R. 11262) to authorize the construction of bridges across the Kentucky River and its tributaries by the Richmond, Nicholasville, Irvine and Beattyville Railroad Company.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill.

The bill was reported from the Committee on Commerce with amendments.

The first amendment was, in section 1, line 16, after "foot-passenger," to insert the following proviso:

Provided, That the rates of toll charged by said company shall be first approved by the Secretary of War.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in section 3, line 12, after the word "War," to insert:

and if the Secretary of War shall at any time think any changes necessary in the plans of said bridge or bridges, or that the said bridge or bridges should be entirely removed, the said alterations or removal shall be at the expense of the company.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendments were concurred in.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time, and passed.

Mr. VEST. I move that the Senate insist on its amendments and request a conference with the House of Representatives thereon.

The motion was agreed to.

By unanimous consent, the President *pro tempore* was authorized to appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate, and Mr. VEST, Mr. SAWYER, and Mr. CULLOM were appointed.

PRESIDENTIAL APPROVALS.

A message from the President of the United States, by Mr. O. L. PRUDEN, one of his secretaries, announced that the President had on the 9th instant approved and signed the following acts:

An act (S. 937) for the relief of David L. Brainard and others;

An act (S. 145) for the relief of Edward Braden and Job W. Angus;

An act (S. 1668) for the relief of A. M. Woodruff;

An act (S. 1582) for the relief of the estate of Lucien Goyaŭx;

An act (S. 320) for the relief of John D. Adams;

An act (S. 3125) restoring the right of pre-emption to Alfonso Roberts;

An act (S. 3471) to authorize the construction of bridges across the Kentucky River and its tributaries by the Louisville Southern Railroad Company;

An act (S. 1101) granting a pension to Rachael A. Sinkinson;

An act (S. 1500) granting a pension to Margaret M. Miller;

An act (S. 2720) granting a pension to John B. Ross;

An act (S. 2836) granting a pension to William E. Taylor;

An act (S. 2862) granting a pension to William R. Dean;

An act (S. 2887) granting a pension to George H. Johnson;

An act (S. 1591) granting an increase of pension to Madison M. Meredith;

An act (S. 1958) granting an increase of pension to Eleanor B. Goodfellow;

An act (S. 2346) granting an increase of pension to Jenny Hart Mullany;

An act (S. 2675) granting an increase of pension to Lieut. John R. Durham;

An act (S. 2838) granting an increase of pension to Betsey A. Mower; and

An act (S. 2711) restoring Phebe McLaughlin to the pension-roll.

THE REVENUE LAWS.

Mr. ALLISON. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House bill 9051.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 9051) to reduce taxation and simplify the laws in relation to the collection of the revenue.

Mr. BATE. Mr. President, from December last to the present day this Congress has been engaged in an effort to meet the demand of the the people for the equalization, reform, and revision of taxation. For the last twenty years, from 1868 to 1888, that demand has been voiced in the platforms of the Democratic party at each Presidential election, and more than once found echo in the platforms, State and national, of the Republican party.

The present Democratic House of Representatives, recognizing its constitutional obligation to originate measures of taxation, has discharged its duty by sending to the Senate, for its concurrence, a bill which in its general scope partially complies with the demands and expectations of the people, with the pledges of the party, and with the bold, manly, and emphatic recommendations of the President in his official communications to the Congress and the country.

If possible to more emphasize the earnestness of its purpose to fulfill its promise of tariff reform in the line of reduction of taxation, the Democratic convention at St. Louis in June last, with a unanimity and enthusiasm unparalleled in American politics, has made Mr. Cleveland its nominee for re-election and Judge Thurman for the Vice-Presidency on a platform which admits of no equivocation and of no misunderstanding. The exigency of party and the desperate fortunes of partisans may misrepresent them, the Democratic party, and its platform as "free trade" and as seeking to compass the injury of American labor, but its platform language and its acts can not be misunderstood nor its honest purpose to reform taxation denied in the face of recent legislation by a Democratic House of Representatives, as evidenced by the "Mills bill" and the mode of its passing the House.

This bill, a Democratic measure, in its scope and terms is antagonistic to "free trade." When we consider that the Democratic party, by its every utterance in convention platforms, in speeches by its representative men, in measures presented to Congress and votes thereon, advocates, along with its measure of tariff reduction as its party policy, the raising of revenue through a tariff as the chief source of necessary national income, the charge against it of "free trade" becomes absurd. Indeed, it refutes itself when we recall the necessities of large revenues demanded by the interest on the public debt, the payment of pensions, the improvement of rivers and harbors, the erection of Government buildings throughout the country, the construction of a navy, the fortifications for the seaboard defense, and the necessary current expenses of the Government, increasing yearly with the growth of population and the expanse of country.

These all united, demand an amount of revenue which, when levied upon customs, will afford the incidental protection needed by the most enlarged and extended system of domestic manufactories, while they successfully destroy the force in any accusation of "free trade." The existing tariff is 47.2 per cent. on the $100. The Mills bill reduces it to 42 per cent., making a reduction of only about 5 per cent. Does this look like "free trade?" The census of 1880 shows that the average labor cost of manufactured articles was 18 per cent.; the average duty under existing tariff law is 47 per cent. Thus a protecting bounty of 29 per cent. was secured, not to labor, but to capital, and was a tax upon the whole people, laborers included, of 29 per cent. Of this the Mills bill takes off only 9 per cent. and leaves 20 per cent. still to capital. This is called free trade, and its lifting of the burden of taxation is attempted to be held up to labor as hostile to the interest of the workingman.

OBSTRUCTION TO REFORM BY REPUBLICANS.

On the other hand, the Republican party, notwithstanding its repeated pledges to reduce taxation—pledges, not flippantly uttered in the idle phrase of a heated political contest, when playing for party advantage, but in solemn utterances in party platforms, State and national; pledges, promulged in Executive messages, and in discussions of them by those whose recognition as party leaders was undisputed; pledges, by official reports of commissions, gravely made in response to demands of legislative enactments, and by commissions created for the purpose of ascertaining and reporting what was best to be done for the country in regard to this tariff question—notwithstanding these party pledges, expressed and implied, we find in this Senate Chamber to-day, after a delay in committee of two months and a half, obstacles thrown in the path of its progress by that which its authors call "a substitute," and, as was recently shown in the other end of this Capitol, a party seemingly organized to defeat that necessary revenue reform to which all parties stand committed. And what is that substitute but an obstruction aiming to compass the defeat of the will of the people in this regard and override and defy the oft-repeated pledges for reduction of the existing tariff?

Let us see how this comes about.

With all its professions, promises, and platforms, the Republican party, while professing to recommend and favor a reduction of the surplus and a reformation of the tariff, has obstructed nearly every movement in that direction. All of its distinguished leaders, Secretaries of the Treasury, and recent Presidents have, in speeches and messages as individuals and officers, urged and advised a reduction of the excessively high war-tariff to a reasonable peace basis. But as a party, and within the last four years as individuals and officials, the whole position has been changed. Capital and monopoly seem to have laid their violent hands upon the organization, suppressed or reversed the opinions of individuals, and thwarted, as they relate to this question, the plans and purposes of the party.

As to the only tariff act, 1883, that has become a law in recent years—after reading the criticism, in his minority report on the pending bill, by the senior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BECK], in which he caustically gives the history of the manner in which it became a law—I forbear criticism upon it, and only say it was satisfactorily shown on day before yesterday by the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. VANCE] that in its practical operation it did not reduce, but increased the revenue.

The public utterances of such men as Senator ALLISON, who has charge of this bill, and Senator SHERMAN, as a member of the committee who opened the discussion explaining this substitute, and President Arthur by messages, insisting that a time had long since been reached when the rate of taxation made necessary by a tremendous civil war should be reduced, are matters of public record and public history. But what has been done by that great party!

Following those expressions and urgent utterances, the Forty-eighth Congress was unable to pass any measure looking to the reduction. The measure introduced and known as "Morrison's horizontal 20 per cent. reduction" was defeated by striking out the enacting clause, the motion being supported *in solido* by the Republicans, aided by a few ultra-protection Democrats.

In the Forty-ninth Congress the same Republican party, again aided by the same contingent from the Democrats, defeated a bill prepared with great care and labor, by refusing consideration of it. They shut down the throttle-valve and refused even to consider the measure.

In the Fiftieth Congress what has been done? Governed by the same spirit of obstruction and relying upon division among Democrats, in confident expectation that no bill would pass, that party, either in the House or Senate, made no move, presented no measure, either as an originial or as a substitute, until to their consternation and surprise the Mills bill passed. Then, suddenly awakened to the necessity of doing something under the pressure of the growing public sentiment in favor of a reduction of the surplus, the Senate began to assume a sudden and unwonted activity. All at once, in the dog days of August, at the very heels of the longest session in American history, the Senate, with

its imperial toga on, suddenly concluded it would meet the requirement of the last fifteen or twenty years, and save the country from a redundant treasury and exorbitant and oppressive taxation.

But it requires much time and consideration to prepare so important a measure, especially when it is a measure not intended to be passed or to become a law. Several times did grave Senators from this side of the Chamber, in their anxiety to soothe and lull the growing discontent of the country, arise in their places in the Senate and anxiously inquire "when that bill was to be forthcoming?" And as frequently were they admonished to hold themselves in patience, that in a "few days" the measure would be presented. Finally, on the 4th of October, 1888, it was presented, at a time when every man in the Senate and House who had had anything to do in its preparation or presentation could see it had been delayed and withheld until it was impossible even to give it consideration with any view to final action before the close of the pending election. Was it prepared and intended to be passed? might well be asked. It is simply a monstrous delusion, not to say fraud, held up to placate the American people, while the Republican majority encompass its defeat, as they will, it and all other bills to substantially reduce the tariff. It is but another exemplification of how not to do it. With all its seeming plausibility it is simply an obstruction to any real and actual movement in the proper direction, and is simply a misleading equivalent of striking out the enacting clause or refusing consideration.

The Mills bill has passed the House and is an honest movement made in good faith. It is before the country. Now, supposing the friends of this substitute are in earnest and in good faith pushing it for passage, it is proper to glance at it a moment and see what virtue, if any, there is in it.

DECEPTIVENESS OF THE SENATE'S SUBSTITUTE.

This Senate substitute is a superstructure of protection erected upon a frame-work of revenue reform. That much at least the President and his party has wrested from the reluctant grasp of monopoly and manufacturers by demanding tariff reform.

In this substitute revenue reform is compassed by removing the tax from tobacco, as the Mills bill does, and reducing the tax on cigars, cheroots, and cigarettes, about which neither consumer nor manufacturer cared an iota. The latter puts it on his sales, and the former pays it fractionally.

Toward the further recognition of the public demand for revenue reform, spirits used in the arts and sciences are placed on the free-list in this substitute, and thus the door is opened to such frauds as may perhaps, no doubt will to a great extent, make whisky practically free. If so, sugar and bitters reduced, an untaxed cocktail will be at the demand of every toper before he eats his "free breakfast" at which his sugar is half taxed, his tin plates, his tin kitchen utensils, his canned meat and vegetables are heavily taxed, his clothing and tablecloths, his carpets and blankets are all doubly taxed beyond the demands of the revenue.

What the tax-payer gains on his sugar he loses on his woolen goods and on the metals which enter into every calling.

What the smoker gains on "cigars, cheroots, and cigarettes" is doubly taxed on the building and fencing materials of the farmer and mechanic. What science gains by "free whisky" the manufacturers enjoy, but the duty on salt is paid by all citizens; but when salted meat is exported the tax on salt is remitted; and yet this is called protection to the American consumer. New England fish is cured with free salt, but Western pork with taxed salt (having no rebate). Raw wool, which the Mills bill admits free, is divided by the Senate bill into three classes, and taxed from the sheep's back through all the manipulations of manufacture until it turns to "shoddy," when it again is taxed in the lowest-priced goods which the extremely poor people would be glad to have cheapened by the remission of all duties.

Iron ore, which the Senate committee's substitute retains on the dutiable-list at 75 cents per ton, and, thus starting taxation in the bowels of the mine, pursues the iron through every change, as in pig-iron, steel, and all kinds of hardware, until it rusts back into earth. The plow, the loom, and the anvil—agriculture, manufactures, and mechanics—are each and all taxed from the earliest beginning to the completest product—not to support the Government, but to pamper with the hard-earned money of the people the already inordinate profits of the few.

Protection under this "substitute," it is claimed, offers to the people a free-list of $6,500,000. Tariff reform as shown in the Mills bill tenders a remission of $19,750,000 duties, a difference of $13,250,000 toward the reduction of the surplus.

The duty remitted on sugar is largely in excess of that remitted by the Mills bill, and yet this step in the direction of "tariff reform" which follows the Mills bill is deceptive and misleading. The duties paid on sugar go more directly into the Treasury and affect less the price of the article than any goods on the dutiable-list, and hence they fall lightest upon the people. The duty on raw wool, on the contrary, follows that raw material through all stages of manufacture, increasing the price of domestic manufacture at every stage and falling upon the people with an arithmetical progressive increase until it becomes a real burden to the consumer. Thus revenue reduction in one article of consumption is followed by revenue protection in another; but the article reduced is an agricultural, while that protected is a manufactured product. The hand, hostile to agriculture, which framed this substitute, has been aided by another, partial to manufactures, and both seem to have labored to make the people pay for the profit of the favored classes.

When General Harrison, the Republican nominee, announced in his letter of acceptance that the issue in this campaign was not one of schedules but of principles, between free-trade and protection, he could not have supposed that his party in the Senate would reduce the issue to one purely of schedules and abandon all matters of principle, and that the question which the people would be called upon to decide in the approaching election related solely to how much the revenue should be reduced, and not to the principle upon which future revenue should be raised. The Republicans in the House voted and argued in a manly, straightforward way for protection, but the Republican Senate bill has brought the discussion to a mere matter of schedules. The public has thus gained something since the Mills bill passed the House.

The Republican platform declares that—

We favor the entire repeal of internal tax rather than surrender any part of our protective system.

And the nominee of the party, in reiterating the same purpose, announced that the issue before the people was not one of schedules, but of principles, and that the country was to decide between "free trade" and "protection" as systems of revenue.

The Senate substitute for the Mills bill, abandoning the declaration of the Republican platform and the nominee, reduces the issue to one of schedules merely.

ATTEMPT TO CHANGE THE ISSUE.

The argument of the Senator from Ohio [Mr. SHERMAN], as a member of the committee explaining this substitute, is directed more to the changes of the administrative sections of the revenue laws than to the subject-matter of revenue reduction, his principal argument for the substitute being based upon the fact that it embodies the act passed by the Senate at an early day of this Congress for a revision of customs laws in their administrative features. It is the changes introduced by the previous act which makes the substitute, in the opinion of the Ohio Senator, the most "perfect revenue measure ever placed on the statute-books of the United States."

Differing with the Senator, I am persuaded, upon an examination of it, that the proper characterization of this substitute is a scheme to reduce revenue without reducing burdensome taxes, and that protectionists do not fear in the "Mills bill," which it seeks to supplant, a reduction in the wages of labor, but in the profits of that labor, and that it is the excess of profits that is endangered by the Mills bill.

It is not improved administration, but relief from taxation that now troubles the people. "Overvaluation" may be an evil of large proportions, but "overtaxation" is the greater and more oppressive burden which now paralyzes trade and embarrasses both the Government and the community. The Senate substitute has endeavored to "sidetrack" the taxation train and give a clear way to the administrative engine, while the "Mills bill," without neglecting the administrative evil, has endeavored to relieve the taxation burden from the people. It is not "novel devices" of schedules, as the Senator from Ohio says, but new methods of tax relief which the people are awaiting.

But much has been gained in the long delay of preparing this substitute. Public opinion has asserted its right to be heard, and the demand for fair play and equal rights in taxation has driven the Senate committee from the party's platform of tariff for protection to the Democratic policy of a tariff for revenue with incidental protection. The issue, in Senator SHERMAN'S words, is between "a tariff for revenue only and a tariff for revenue and protection." The remarks of the Ohio Senator can be understood only as an apology for and explanation of the abandonment of a tariff for protection, and the adoption of a tariff for revenue with incidental protection. The matter of schedules is not as important as this abandonment of the purely protective tariff policy. Not only is the party's declaration at Chicago, that rather than abandon any part of the protective system it would abolish the whole internal revenue, given up by the substitute, but only a very small part of the internal revenue is repealed, some $24,000,000 out of the $124,000,000. In that, protection is given up as the basis and foundation of revenue. Between the Mills bill and the Senate substitute the dividing lines run entirely between schedules and rates, and the principle of protection finds but little left to stand upon and but few to do it reverence.

The tax on sugar is reduced one-half—from 82 per cent. to 41 per cent., and that on rice from 63 per cent. to 50 per cent. The principle that underlies these reductions, whatever may be said of their purpose, is to reduce revenue on articles of agriculture which enter not into manufactures and therefore do not multiply the cost of living (as the customs tax does not follow it), and which are easiest paid and of which the Government receives all that is paid by the people, while the increased duty on wool and on iron enters into manufactures and increases their cost nearly five times the amount of duty and inures to the manufacturers' profit and the people's loss. This is protection concealed under revenue reduction, a sham and a fraud, which the Senate's "substitute" dare not avow, even though it sustains the Chicago platform.

The seesaw schedule on wool—some duties going up and others com-

ing down—can not possibly be defended on any principle of protection. It can be justified only on that of revenue with incidental protection. But the Senator from Ohio is not entirely satisfied with that, but takes it, as he says, because "half a loaf is better than no bread;" in other words, as the country would not stand the bread of protection he takes the half-loaf of revenue with its incidental protection. And as there was no tin in this country to protect, the Senate committee's substitute treats tin-plate as sheet-iron, and conceals its protection under the cover of iron and again disavows the protection of tin, but hopes to encourage the manufacture of tin-plates by taxing "sheet-iron." This deceptive subterfuge will not recommend itself to the housewife, the laborer, the roofer, and the canner of agricultural products—to protect 5 per cent. of tin the substitute taxes 100 per cent. of iron; *i. e.*, all of the iron in the tin-plate.

Then, "the best revenue bill that was ever introduced into the Congress of the United States," as the Senator from Ohio designates the Senate's substitute, is founded not on the protective policy, but conceals that policy beneath the cloak of revenue reduction, and without the courage of protection convictions, yields that principle and that policy, under the guise, to the demands of the people for equal favors to all and protection to none.

The corner-stone of the Senate "substitute" for the Mills bill is correctly measured, in line and angle, in the views of the minority, by—

> The statements, arguments, and appeals of manufacturers and others, who demand that the present high rate of tariff taxation shall be maintained, and in many instances, prompted not by any revenue necessities, but alone for the purpose of increasing their own profits at the expense of sixty millions of taxpayers.

As the foundation was laid in these representations, so the superstructure was completed for the profits of the builders at the expense of the tax-payers.

The report of the Committee on Finance, which is designed to support and sustain the Senate substitute, erroneous in facts and illogical in deduction, is misleading, and confronted with the almost self-evident proposition that free raw material cheapens the cost of production and lessens the price of the article. The Republican majority of the committee, admitting the truth of this proposition, endeavors to qualify and limit its application by the substitution of "crude" for "raw materials," and by confining the material to the productions of foreign countries which can not be raised in this country; such raw material, the Republican majority admit, "should be placed on the free-list," thus making free a part of the raw material of foreign countries and taxing another part.

The Mills bill, on the other hand, enlarges the free-list with many articles of raw material without regard to the locality of production, because they are important elements in manufactures, and when lessened in cost will cheapen the product to the consumer.

There are many other inconsistencies and incongruities in the Senate committee's substitute which plainly reveal the embarrassments under which its framers labored in their effort to preserve protection from the demand of the people for tariff reform.

It is but a few days since the Senator, Mr. ALLISON, who reported this substitute, assailed on the floor of the Senate the expenditures of public money by the present Administration and alleged that there would be no addition to the surplus this year, because the expenditures were already within twenty millions of the estimated receipts. If that statement was founded in fact, how can the Senator recognize the propriety of reducing the receipts by $73,668,994.30?

In view of that statement, with what propriety do the Republican Senators in their report aver that before any tariff measure can go into effect the additions to the surplus which will accrue within the next four months will be sufficient to pay in full the outstanding 4½ per cent. bonds due in 1891, $221,000,000?

When debating an appropriation bill it is alleged that extravagance has squandered the revenue, but when reporting the tariff the very first reason assigned is that the object of the substitute is "to reduce the national revenues, which are now excessive," and will in four months be enough to retire $221,000,000 of bonds. To quote from the utterances of that Senator yesterday, "Consistency, thou art a jewel."

CONTRADICTORY EXAMPLES.

The inconsistencies of argument are not less than those of its statements. It is alleged in argument that low duties increase the revenue, and in support of that statement it is said in the minority report—

> That it was officially estimated at the time of the passage of the various acts (act July 14, 1870, and May 1 and June 6, 1872) that these changes (of duties) would result in a reduction of the revenue from customs of $57,227,500. The revenue from this source in 1869 was $176,114,904, and in 1873 it was $184,929,542, or an increase of $8,814,138, instead of a reduction of $57,227,510. * * * Similar results may be reasonably expected should the House bill become a law.

But when specific duties are urged in preference to ad valorem duties, then it is affirmed that low duties decrease the revenue; and in support of that argument it is said:

> That the value of all the articles upon which the rates of duty are changed by the bill, and which alone are affected by its provisions, imported in 1887, according to the statement furnished by the Committee on Ways and Means and printed in connection with the bill, was $249,806,796.20. Upon these articles there was imposed a duty in 1887 of $133,087,149.77, equivalent to 54.48 per cent. ad valorem. The same articles, if imported under the provisions of the proposed bill, would have paid, according to the same statement, duties amounting to $86,600,907.62, or an ad valorem rate of 34.67 per cent. The resulting deduction of 1887 would be $49,406,240.15.

Thus, reducing the duties in 1872 increased the revenue by $8,814,138 instead of reducing them $57,299,510 as had been expected. But the committee affirm that the reduction of the Mills bill will cause a reduction on the importation in 1887 of $49,406,240.15. It is not for this side of the Senate to reconcile statements so variant or conclusions so inconsistent.

The incongruities of the report are strikingly apparent throughout, but a single example need only be considered at present. The duty on horses and mules, $20 per head, is a Procrustean bed upon which a Canadian pony and Clydesdale stallion, a Mexican mustang or a broncho and an English thoroughbred are stretched side by side and adjusted and fitted to exactly the same amount of duty. It would have been a more consistant schedule to have classed horses and hay at $2 per ton, or with "acorns and dandelion root at 1½ cents per pound."

While the Mongolian race has been denied that same asylum which every other race finds in this country, the substitute of the Senate committee offers him the consolation of having his "joss-sticks or joss-lights" on the free-list. The disciples of Confucius and Brahma can not come to America, but the implements of their religion shall find free admission where the devotee is denied a resting place. "Free joss-sticks" comes from that side of the Senate which has consumed three months in discussing how to drive the Chinaman from their own free "joss-sticks" in this country.

REPUBLICAN INCONSISTENCY.

The substitute and the accompanying report, read either along or between the lines, are a recognition of the great demand for tariff reform which the people are pressing from all sections of the country upon Congress. But it is at the same time an effort to divert the current into a direction which shall save certain interests from their just contributions to the public welfare, and enable certain others to contrive to levy inordinate profits upon the public. No clamor about labor, or about home industries, or home markets, or other deceptive phrase can blind the people to the single and honest purpose of the Democratic party to adjust the tariff upon principles which shall know no favoritism, and by means of rates which shall confer no special privileges. Guarding invested capital and watching closely the interests of labor, the Democratic party will conform the tariff faithfully to the best interests of manufactures, commerce, and agriculture, without permitting American labor to suffer any diminution of its just reward.

The revision of the customs laws finds in the report of the Senate's committee justification from several existing evils, namely: Excessive revenues; frauds from undervaluation; defects, anomalies and incongruities in schedules; a necessity for a proper readjustment and equalization of tariff rates, and relief and protection to home industries. These reasons, with the exception of protection, are also the foundation of tariff reform in the Mills bill. The Senator from Iowa in his speech day before yesterday made protection the chief distinguishing feature of the Senate's substitute for the Mills bill. That protection has existed for more than twenty-five years under the laws which create all the evils which the substitute seeks to remedy. For the truth of this remark I need only refer to the speech of the Senator from Iowa [Mr. ALLISON] as a member of the House eighteen years ago, when, on March 24, 1870, he squarely and emphatically avowed the necessity for reform of the tariff in the interest of agriculture, remarking that—

> The agricultural interest, it will be seen, is much the largest interest in its aggregate product as well as in the number of persons employed. I believe no one will claim that this large interest is directly protected. It is true that under customs laws there is a small duty upon wheat, barley, oats, and other agricultural products, but it does not afford any protection to the great wheat and grain producing regions of the country. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Wilson], in discussing this question, stated that the cost of wheat in New England is about $1.70 per bushel, while in Illinois, Iowa, and Wisconsin the price is about 65 cents per bushel. The Canadian wheat is the only wheat that comes in competition with our own. Canada being nearer New England than the wheat-growing States more than makes up the duty in the reduced cost of transportation.
>
> What is true of wheat is equally true of other grains. Therefore the farmer has practically no protection at all, and whatever benefit he derives is from what the home market furnishes for home products. Unfortunately for the farmer, the market price of wheat is fixed by the price which the surplus will bring abroad, or the price of wheat in London or Liverpool. At that market, where the surplus is sold, and which fixes the value of the whole crop, he comes in competition with the grain produced in the Crimea, in Hungary, and in the region of the Baltic, from fields cultivated by what is known, in comparison with our own, as pauper labor.
>
> But I am told we must so legislate as to furnish a home market for all our agricultural products, and this can only be done by high tariff. Any one examining the subject will see that our agricultural products increase more rapidly than our population, so that if we do not export these products in their natural condition, we must do so by converting them into manufactured articles and export these articles. But this can not be done under a high tariff, for all nations will buy manufactured products where they are the cheapest, and the nation selling the cheapest will control the market. This rule excludes our highly-taxed manufactures made from highly-taxed materials from the markets of the world, although we have natural advantages possessed by no other nation.

The reduction of the revenue was not in 1870 so much the object which the Senator had in view, as the relief of agriculture from the baleful effects of "a high tariff." For in the same speech he assailed the duty on wool and woolens as particularly injurious to the farmer, and in illustration of this injury said:

> I will say with regard to the duty on wool and woolens that I regard it not as an intentional fraud, but as operating as though it were a fraud upon the great body of the people of the United States. I allude to the woolen tariff, a

law the effect of which has been to materially injure the sheep husbandry of this country. In a single county in the State of Iowa, between 1867 and 1869, the number of sheep was reduced from twenty-two thousand to about eighteen thousand in two years, and what is true of this county is true to a greater or less extent of other counties in Iowa, and during this time the price of wool has been constantly depreciated.

Mr. LAWRENCE. I should like the gentleman to inform me how a reduction of the duties on wool and woolen goods would inure to the advantage of the wool-grower?

Mr. ALLISON. I will tell the gentleman how, in my judgment, the wool-grower will be benefited. As the law now is the tariff upon fine wools of a character not produced in this country is 100 per cent. upon their cost. The tariff upon woolens of the same class is only about 50 per cent., so that the finer woolen goods are imported and not the coarser fabrics. Before the tariff of 1867 our manufacturers of fine goods mixed foreign fine wools with our domestic product, and were thus able to compete successfully with the foreign manufacturer of similar wools. But being prohibited from importing this class of wools, these fine goods can not now be produced in this country as cheaply as they can be imported. Consequently, mills that were formerly engaged in producing these goods have been compelled to abandon business or manufacture the coarser fabrics. If they could afford to manufacture those fine goods, they would make a market which we do not now have for our fine wools, to be mixed with other fine wools of a different character from abroad. This want of a market, as I understand it, is the reason why our fine wools now command so low a price. There is no demand for them at home, and we can not export them in competition with fine wools grown in other countries.

I know that the inconsistencies of Republican Senators are not Democratic arguments, but they are emphatic illustrations of the changes which party exigencies force upon party leaders, and will persuade the people that the Senate substitute is more a party measure than an effort to correct existing evils.

What becomes of the home-market delusion of 1870, when the duties were as high, if not higher, than now? The Senator was correct in saying: "The farmer has practically no protection at all," and "unfortunately for the farmer the market price of wheat is fixed by the price which the surplus will bring abroad, or the price of wheat in London or Liverpool." These were not free-trade arguments, but were those of protectionists in behalf of agriculture and the farmers. Why have they lost their force in 1888?

The present cry of free trade when tariff reform is mentioned was a favorite subterfuge when the Senator from Iowa was exerting his great abilities in behalf of reform. The predecessor of Mr. ALLISON in the Senate, the Hon. James W. Grimes, as far back as January 24, 1867, encountered the same outcry of free trade which Mr. ALLISON reiterates now:

Mr. President, the man who opposes the passage of this bill must expect to be slandered. The "protectionists," as they choose to call themselves, have already opened the vials of their indignant wrath upon the heads of those whose opposition they anticipated. Threats of utter political extinction are hurled against every man who, in the exercise of an independent judgment, is not prepared to impose upon his constituents the burdens which the various manufacturing combinations demand. That portion of the public press suborned to their interests is rife with charges that "the capital is thronged with free-traders, and that British gold is operating to secure American legislation for British interests." Every man is condemned in advance who would inquire before he would vote.

We know what all this means, and so far as I have the ability, I am resolved that the people shall know what it means.

It means that two or three large manufacturing interests in the country, not satisfied with the enormous profits they have realized during the last six years, are determined at whatever hazard to put more money in their pockets; and to this end they have persuaded some and coerced other manufacturing interests to unite with them in a great combination demand for what they call protection to American labor, but what some others call robbery of the American laborer and agriculturist.

It is the fashion to denounce every man who does not favor a prohibitory tariff as a free-trader. The charge is made that free-trade agents are at work to influence Congress, and that our tables are incumbered with free-trade documents. Who has seen these free-trade agents? I have yet to see the first man who was in favor of free trade, nor have I seen any man who was opposed to a revenue tariff which would incidentally protect such branches of American industry as needed the fostering aid of the Government. It is on questions of detail that we differ. We disagree as to how much money shall be taken from the pocket of Peter to support and enrich his brother Paul.

Iowa seems to have been represented on the tariff by gentlemen of every shade of opinion. When the Senator explains again, as he has promised, I hope he will reconcile his own opinions and explain why his predecessor and himself, both Republicans, are so divergent on the same question.

Time will not permit me to collect together the many inconsistencies of Republican leaders. They would fill volumes of no small size. I think I could show the Senator [Mr. HISCOCK], who has just preceded me in this debate, voting to put salt on the free-list and now sustaining the substitute with salt on the dutiable list. I could show other Senators now here voting free salt, but will confine my references to those who have just discussed this substitute.

The debate on the substitute will offer the opportunity to each Senator to explain his present position and reconcile what now appears to be a remarkable departure from previous expressions of political convictions.

SALT.

Apart from the vast utility of salt in domestic life, in preserving meat and fish both for domestic consumption and during the longest voyages, it furnishes muriatic acid and soda, a glaze for coarse pottery, improves the whiteness and clearness of glass, gives hardness to soap; in melting metals it preserves the surface from calcination; it is employed to advantage in some assays; it is used as a mordant and for improving certain colors, and enters more or less into as many of the other processes of the arts and sciences as alcohol, which the substitute relieves from tax.

Its tax was one of the causes of the first French revolution, and among the relief of that outbreak was the abolishment of the odious *gabelle* or salt tax. In England the duty was abolished in 1823. Its territorial distribution is co-extensive with the earth and the seas yield it also for the use of man. Its taxation marks the progress of despotism in ancient Rome, in France, in Russia, in Austria, and its relief from taxes measures the progress of enlightened government. The exigencies of war and the pressure of debt may excuse the burdening of this indispensable necessary of life with the increased cost of a tax, but such an imposition in time of peace and prosperity measures the extent to which privilege and favoritism oppress the people in their daily life and struggle. The Mills bill places salt on the free-list; the Senate substitute puts it on the dutiable-list. The first consults the interests of the people; the second looks only to the profits of the manufacturers.

NORTHERN AND SOUTHERN STATES.

The Senator from New York [Mr. HISCOCK] enters into statistical analysis to show, relatively and comparatively, the North and the South in manufactural interest. His theory seems to be that inasmuch as the South has but little investment in manufactures she has but little interest in the tariff question. I submit that this is neither a broad and liberal nor even a correct view. The interest taken by the South in manufactures is not restricted to the amount of capital which her citizens may have invested therein; with a broader and more liberal view she looks to the use of the raw materials which prosper more freely under her climate than in the colder regions of the North.

The manufacturers wherever located are dependent upon the productions of the South and West; and that is a narrow and contracted view which is confined either to the locality of manufactures or to the amount of interest invested. The exact line of demarkation drawn by the Senator to designate the North has escaped my memory, but I was forcibly impressed with the fact that in classifying the Southern States he failed to credit them with the large resources and extensive development of manufactures in Missouri, Kentucky, West Virginia, and Maryland. An estimate of resources of any kind for the Southern group of States which takes no account of these four States, is too palpably erroneous to call for reply. If I may use the expression, it is a statistical play of Hamlet with the Prince of Denmark left out.

Whatever the purpose of such restricted comparison, the effect is to belittle and dwarf the South, and then impute jealousy to her people, because they are presumed to be less prosperous than the North. I deny the proposition that the South is less prosperous than the North, except by the devastations of war and the greater devastations inflicted since by the Republican party. There is no standard or measurement for prosperity except that of money value, and even that is arrived at by statistics which are not always reliable. But by that standard it certainly comes with indifferent grace from the Senator who represents in part the great commercial metropolis, New York City, to forget the productive values of the South which flow through the channels of trade to and from that great city.

The cotton of the South, in value from thirty to fifty millions, finds its way to market through the commission houses which the Senator represents, and deposits its tolls of commission in the tills of his constituency; and to the cotton must be added the naval stores, the rice, the sugar, and the molasses, as well as the profits which her merchants leave behind them in their purchases of goods. When all these are estimated, the words of the farewell address of the father of his country will find greater significance than the Senator gives to them:

The North, in an unrestrained intercourse with the South, protected by the equal (not protective) laws of a common Government, finds in the productions of the latter great additional resources of maritime and commercial enterprise and precious materials of manufacturing industry.

REDUCTION CONFINED TO FOUR HEADINGS.

According to the report of the majority there are only four headings under which the people are to enjoy relief from taxation; they are:

Sugar relief	$27,759,783.95
Free-list relief	6,428,095.56
Tobacco relief	24,371,460.98
Alcohol relief	7,000,000.00
Total	65,559,340.49

Estimating the present population at 68,000,000 the per capita relief is, from sugar, 41 cents, or $2.05 for a family of 5 persons; from free-list 6½ cents, for the family 32 cents; from alcohol 9½ cents, for the family 47½ cents. Total per capita relief, 57 cents; total family relief, $2.84½.

The smokers, chewers, and snuffers only enjoy the reduction of the tax on tobacco, but these persons are but a small part of the whole people, and they are taxed only when they voluntarily use the weed. Therefore for every dollar of relief to the chewers, smokers, and snuffers a dollar of other tax remains on the whole people. There can be no per capita relief from tobacco, because the whole people do not use tobacco. The women and children, a very large part of the men and boys, neither smoke nor chew nor snuff, yet all the people wear woolen clothes, sleep under blankets, and consume the necessaries of life which remain taxed

because the smokers and chewers and snuffers are relieved from tax. The least commendable part of the Mills bill is made the chief virtue of the substitute.

The extent of relief to the family by the substitute is $2.84½. That is the relief which an ordinary family of five persons would receive under the substitute.

The amount which the same family would contribute to the Government under the substitute can not be stated until proper tables have been prepared. But as the duties which really bear heaviest on the people have not been reduced materially below those of the existing law, the subjoined table taken from the speech of Hon. JOHN D. STEWART, of Georgia, in the House on May 2, will serve to contrast the Mills bill with the substitute in the matter of relief to a family in an investment of $501. It will be seen that the Mills bill reduces taxes $84.29 and the substitute $2.94½ for the family of five persons.

Under the present law let us see what an ordinary family on a farm has to contribute to the Government. I submit a schedule of articles mostly used by a family as an illustration, and the duty on them, and also showing the reduction proposed under the Mills bill:

	Value.	Duty.		Net saving.
		Per cent.		
One cook stove	$35.00	47=	$16.45	
By Mills bill		31=	10.85	
				$5.60
One set crockery	12.00	55=	6.60	
By Mills bill		35=	4.20	
				2.40
One set cheap glassware	4.00	56=	2.24	
By Mills bill		41=	1.64	
				.60
One set cheap cutlery	2.00	50=	1.00	
By Mills bill		35=	.70	
				.30
Two carpets, $12 and $15	27.00	47=	12.00	
By Mills bill		30=	8.00	
				4.00
Sugar	20.00	60=	12.00	
By Mills bill		50=	10.00	
				2.00
Molasses	10.00	47=	4.70	
By Mills bill		35=	3.50	
				1.20
Salt	3.00	40=	1.20	
By Mills bill		Free-list.		
				1.20
Two suits each for father and two sons, six suits, $14	84.00	54=	45.36	
By Mills bill		45=	37.80	
				7.56
Two suits each for mother and two daughters, six suits, $14	84.00	82=	68.88	
By Mills bill		40=	33.60	
				35.28
Twelve pairs shoes, $2.50 each	30.00	30=	9.00	
By Mills bill		15=	4.50	
				4.50
Six wool hats, $1 each	6.00	73=	4.38	
By Mills bill		40=	2.40	
				1.98
Six fur hats, $2.50 each	15.00	52=	7.80	
By Mills bill		40=	6.20	
				1.60
Six ladies' hats, $3 each	18.00	70=	12.60	
By Mills bill		40=	7.20	
				5.40
Six bonnets for ladies, $3 each	18.00	70=	12.60	
By Mills bill		40=	7.20	
				5.40
Farming tools, including plows, gear, handsaw, ax, draw-knife, chains, etc.	$60.00	47=	$28.20	
By Mills bill		34=	13.60	
				14.60
Medicines	20.00	*48=	9.80	
By Mills bill		30=	6.00	
				3.80
Thread, needles, thimbles, scissors, etc.	12.00	35=	4.20	
By Mills bill		20=	2.40	
				1.80
Four pairs blankets, $3 each	12.00	70=	8.40	
By Mills bill		40=	4.80	
				3.60
Two umbrellas, $2.50 each	5.00	40=	2.00	
By Mills bill		30=	1.50	
				.50
Cotton hosiery, undershirts, etc.	8.00	45=	3.60	
By Mills bill		30=	2.40	
				1.20
Window glass	2.00	60=	1.20	
By Mills bill		43=	.86	
				.34
Starch	4.00	94=	3.70	
By Mills bill		47=	1.88	
				1.82
Rice	10.00	113=	11.30	
By Mills bill		100=	10.00	
				1.30
Total cost under present tariff	501.00		189.27	
Under Mills bill			104.98	
				84.29

*Average.

But, Mr. President, there must always follow unjust consequences and individual hardships under any system of taxation, and that policy which minimizes these hardships is sought by the Democratic party in a "tariff for revenue," while the maximum of benefits to the minimum of people is the natural and unavoidable result of protection.

Both parties, then, Mr. President, are agreed upon a tariff for the support of the Government, but the Republican party goes further and favors a tariff specially in the interest of manufactories, independent of such benefits as incidentally flow from a tariff for revenue. This, in the main, is the issue—the shibboleth by which parties will be recognized in the coming battle.

The difference seems to flow from the natural tendencies of the Democratic party to preserve equality and justice between individuals and interests, and of the Republican party to build up favorite interests out of labor and the more productive interests of the country. Despotisms, Mr. President, exercise dominion under the pretense of protection, but in a democracy the citizen exercises self-government and seeks the free exercise of his labor and the enjoyment of its proceeds without restriction of the government other than for the protection of his rights and liberty, in verification of that incisive and expressive utterance of Mr. Lincoln, that our Government was "of the people, by the people, and for the people."

Tax is defined to be a levy upon property for the support of government, and is just, as it regards equality of all interests and individuals, according to their ability to pay. The existing tariff exempts the $50,000,000,000 of capital of our country from taxation while it taxes the food and raiment and medicine consumed by the poor, without exception from age, sex, color, or condition.

Whilst the British Government emerged from barbarism, property, being mostly in the hands of the aristocracy, was not taxed, and the revenues of the sovereign were derived from hereditary customs, which embraced taxes on commerce, that still retain the name of "customs," from the rude prerogatives of the crown, or tariffs from "customs," equally piratical as at Tariffa on the Mediterranean. The means for the support of government were afterwards increased by the representatives of industrial communities, who voiced, to some extent, the will of the people; and since then the aristocracy have been taxed according to their property possessions, and commerce has become free, and wealth has multiplied and become more varied and diffused, and along with it has enlarged the spirit of liberty and equality among the people.

The manufactories of the American colonies were domestic, or were operated in the domestic circles by families, and in the workshops of mechanics; and as early as 1663 the colonists opposed all "navigation acts;" and in their resistance to restrictions on commerce was first displayed the spirit of the Revolution.

NO OPPOSITION TO MANUFACTURES.

Soon after its establishment, the Government of the United States passed (in 1789) a tariff for revenue that operated for the benefit of these domestic manufactories in the families of the people, and in the workshops of the mechanics, without distinction; for whilst it raised the prices of imported goods it also incidentally advanced the prices of their domestic manufactures of which the consumers were the owners.

The manufactures which were thus intended to be incidentally protected were chiefly those of individuals, which were made by the family in the household and workshop. They were the products of the distaff, the hand-loom, the hammer, the anvil, the jack-plane, the draw-knife, and the shoe-bench, and were not those of associated and aggregated capital of corporations, trusts, and combinations. Protection under that tariff, as well as under its modifications and changes, down to 1816, was to help the individual, or the simple partnership, where the individual liability obtained, and the competition which it guarded was between the individual citizens in the house and home and the aggregated capital abroad and foreign to the land. Our present system of manufactures had no existence under that tariff. Corporations with chartered privileges, relieving the individual property of its owners from liability for the debts of the concern, now the usual mode of operating, had then no existence here. The decision in the Dartmouth College case had not then found expression favoring charters and vested rights in response to the matchless argument of Mr. Webster, inspired by excessive devotional love for his *alma mater*.

I learn from Bishop's History of Manufactures that in a list of thirty-two iron manufactories whose names were attached to a petition in 1785 there is not the name of either a company or firm, much less a corporation. The one hundred and thirty families which in 1791 constituted the population of the town of Pittsburgh, by far the largest iron manufactory then on the continent, as it is to-day, were composed of five blacksmiths, two whitesmiths, three wheelwrights, two tinners, one clock and watch maker, and thirty-seven persons manufacturing, but not a single firm or corporation. Thomas Jefferson "made nails at the rate of about a ton a month at a considerable profit," and was an inventor of many useful devices, and, if I may so say, besides *inventing* the Democratic party.

In the great trades procession in Philadelphia, which in 1789 welcomed the formation of the Government under the Constitution, there were no corporations, combinations, pools, or trusts; but individuals

and firms represented American manufactures, and their individual property was legally held liable for all their obligations. The encouragement and protection which this tariff of 1789 extended to individuals was incidental to revenue; its 7½ per cent. duty on the invoice value of bar, bolt, and pig-iron, its one-half cent per pound duty on steel, and 1 cent per pound on nails were the liberal protection which individuals received from the Congress, composed to a very large extent of the framers of the Constitution.

That kind of protection, incidental to revenues at these low rates, compared to the present, was nominal, and continued until 1816, when the doctrine of subordinating revenues to protection made its first appearance in our politics. Under the fostering care of protection the individual manufacturer has disappeared and no longer enjoys the encouragement and protection of his Government. The scales, by some legerdemain, have turned, and the individual then protected, has today become the victim of protection, and in his place the associated wealth of corporations and the greed and chicanery of combinations, pools, and trusts, with modern "corsairs" at their head, now fill the land with hardship and want, domineer over the individual, and dictate the laws of Congress and of State Legislatures.

MONOPOLY THE CHILD OF PROTECTION.

In every department of business protection has planted and cultivated these un-American institutions. The food we eat, the beverages we drink, the clothes we wear, the conveyances that transport our persons or productions—in fact, all we are or all we can hope to become, is created, controlled, doctored and manipulated by these hectoring and domineering combinations. They are both under and outside of the tariff; they are everywhere and in every kind of production and mechanism, from the nursing-bottle of the infant to the nail driven in the coffin of the dead old man. And their monopoly of the necessaries of life, with increasing power, adds to the burdens incident to humanity and are inseparable from existence.

It was the expectation of Mr. Hamilton, expressed in his celebrated report in 1791 on manufactures, that their protection and encouragement by duties and imports would render monopoly impossible, but experience has refuted his conclusions and shows that monopolies have grown greater in volume and stronger in power and influence than in his day (see third volume Hamilton's Works); and the dream of Mr. Clay in 1824 was that prosperous manufactories would reduce prices and alleviate the hardships of life for the poor and the workingman and that protection would prove a barrier to monopolies. (See his speech on tariff in 1824.)

But the first century of our existence as a government is about to close with this people bound and fettered in every relation of life to hard task-masters of monopoly under its various and varying forms of combinations, pools, and trusts.

So, Mr. President, this original, our first tariff act, was thus preferred as a measure for revenue because it incidentally operated to benefit the laborer, who was both the maker and owner of these domestic manufactures; still the principle of equality was urged, not only for exercise in individual relations at home, but in our commerce with all nations.

Harmony and a liberal intercourse with all nations—

Says Washington in his farewell address—

are recommended by policy, humanity, and interest, and our commercial policy should hold an equal and impartial hand, neither seeking nor granting exclusive favors nor preferences, consulting the natural course of things, differing and diversifying by gentle means the streams of commerce by favoring nothing.

The incidental benefits of the tariff for revenue by raising the prices of these domestic manufactures, as all bounties will do, invited the competition of capital, which, with hired labor and machinery, has absorbed the family manufactures and those of the workshops of the laborers into its enlarged factories, until the laborers, while not ceasing to be consumers, have ceased to be the owners of their products, and their advanced prices now go to the stockholders and capitalists, who own these factories, and not as formerly to the laboring owners. And in competition with each other at home, as well as with those abroad, and for larger profits, these capitalists depress the wages of their laborers, who, for the subsistence of themselves and families, "strike" to prevent the competition among themselves that might impoverish and degrade them.

The tariff protected the laborer when he owned the goods, and it protects the capitalists now who own them and oppresses the laborer who pays the prices of the goods. The free exchange of their industries belongs to the natural equity of all legitimate industries, and it is the duty of Government to regard equally the rights of all, as it is also the duty of all to contribute according to their ability for its defense and support. Legislation, whenever a distinction has to be made, should be for the greatest good to the greatest number.

Agriculture is the foundation and support of all other industries, and, more largely than others, exercises labor in independent relations with capital, and contributes more perhaps than all others to the liberty and happiness of mankind. The values of the products of our fields are not confined to home demands, but are enlarged through the exchanges of the world, to feed and clothe its nations. It is not good policy that they should be confined, for there are no invading Tartars against whom we want to build a Chinese wall; let them find a market wherever one exists, for unless you sell you can not buy.

Should our agricultural products be exchanged abroad for money alone its increase at home would soon depreciate the value sufficiently to depress all industries and to damage all social and business relations.

Were our exchanges represented as by one of our merchants he must consider that after the exchange of our agricultural products for the cheaper goods abroad he would have to pay to our Government a tax or tariff for permission to sell them at home; hence he would convert abroad a sufficient quantity of his agricultural products into money to pay the tariff on the balance he should receive in exchange, which, after such deduction, would amount to about one-half the quantity he would have received had there been no tariff; and after paying the tariff to the Government he advances the prices of his goods to the consumer in selling then at home to the extent of the tariff, or freights, exchange, and insurance, interest upon the money invested, not failing to charge profits on all these, but places, in sales to the consumer, like profits on the amount paid as tariff, in order to compensate himself for the tax he had paid to the Government. The home manufacturer then advances the prices of his goods that pay no tariff, which advanced prices are paid by the consumers, including laborers and their families, which constitutes what, by a strange perversion, is called the "protection" of the home laborer against the foreign laborer.

The foreign laborer pays for his necessaries the reduced price paid abroad by the merchant, and only that, while the home laborer pays in addition the amount of the tariff to the merchant or to the home manufacturer; but by absorbing the domestic manufactures of our families and of the work-shops of our laborers and substituting, under the protection and by aid of class legislation, vast establishments in which work is done by iron muscles that never weary nor wear out, propelled by that wonder-worker, steam, the sales of the home manufactures have increased until they largely exceed those of goods imported, as they do in value the revenue of the Government; and on these sales of manufactured goods untold millions are realized by the favored few, and the millions of toilers and their families as consumers are being oppressed and becoming poorer and poorer.

By what mode of operation are these wonderful results brought about? Has the dream of the alchemist become a reality and the hidden secret of the "philosopher's stone" been discovered, by which the baser metals are turned to gold? Mr. President, does not the secret consist in that unequal, invidious class legislation, with its devious methods of enforcement known as the "war tariff?"

Let us glance for a moment at some of the inside workings of this scheme, miscalled protection, operating with the approval of national legislation, and see how the magic spell of this modern American necromancy turns all it touches into gold.

EFFECT OF THE TARIFF ON RAILROADS.

The Bessemer steel combination in 1866 effected a consolidation of all the American patents for the manufacture of this kind of steel, and then, under the protective tariff, was free to occupy and hold the country, its people, and its railroads, subject to its greed and powerless to escape from its exactions. In that year there was produced by the American steel combination 1,500,000 tons. The 140,000 miles of railroads in the United States have been made, by the existing protective tariff, helplessly subject to this combination. We built in 1887 from 10,000 to 12,000 miles of railroads, every mile of which required 90 tons of steel rail, which cost not less than $15 per ton more from that combination than they could have been purchased for in England. Here was a tax of $13,500,000 exacted of new railroads. The life of a rail is ten years, and the entire system requires renewal within that time. The additional cost of $1,350 per mile, exacted by this combination, entails, for 140,000 miles, a charge of $18,900,000. In other words, the existing protective tariff would impose upon the building and repairing of railroads a charge of $32,400,000 more than the same materials could be bought under a freer and less restrictive duty.

Again, sixty-odd companies are combined in the production of salt, whose exactions are aided and promoted by a protective duty of 39.3 per cent.

Again, the refiners' trust in the sugar trade is encouraged and protected by a duty of 82.04 per cent., and the same system of protection of exaction and imposition follows and adheres to almost every article necessary to life and comfort. Of these trusts Mr. Blaine says:

There is not one among them all that derives its being, owes its organization, or came up under the patronage of the National Government.

Strictly and exactly speaking this remark may be true, and yet nearly every one of these trusts is promoted and made profitable by the customs duty which, embarrassing the sale of the imported article, gives to the domestic article the control of the home market. In a prominent influential daily paper (the New York World of September

11, 1888) the following list of "tariff-fostered trusts" is given, with the per cent. of protection and the labor cost per $100:

Title.	Protection.	Labor.
	Per cent.	*Per $100.*
Tin trust	32	$21
General iron trust	45	25
Bessemer-steel trust	84	9
Soap trust	26	3
Linseed-oil trust	54	5
Envelope trust	25	11
Cordage trust	25	12
Paper-bag trust	35	15
Salt trust	50	25
Crockery trust	56	40
General steel trust	45	29
Plow-steel trust	45	29
Nail trust	45	22
Copper trust	24	22
Zinc trust	52	25
Lead trust	74	65
Glass trust	55	45
Rubber-shoe trust	25	24

And may be added cotton bagging and ties, which are now heavily oppressing the planter, and numerous others.

The President has well said of the Democratic party:

We believe that these trusts are the natural offspring of a market artificially restricted; that an inordinately high tariff, besides furnishing the temptation for their existence, enlarges the limits within which they may operate against the people and thus increase the extent of their power for wrong-doing. With an unutterable hatred of all such schemes we count the checking of their baleful operations among the good results produced by revenue reform.

And yet when the Democratic party seeks to relieve the people from these exactions by repealing and reducing duties which produce a revenue no longer needed in its present volume, that simple and necessary proposition crystallizes both parties around threads of ancient politics and turns back our approaching Presidential election to the questions which divided the country more than a half century ago when corporations, trusts, combinations, and pools were unknown, or certainly not known to such uses as they are now prostituted; so that almost at the threshold of a new century we find our countrymen thrashing over again the old straw our fathers left behind them, but with different and entirely new machinery.

It would be not more ridiculous, but less painful, to clothe ourselves in the old continental dress—the silk stockings, knee buckles, and buckskin shirts of our fathers—than to fetter and bind the energy, enterprise, and industry of sixty millions of their descendants in the leading-strings which helped their "infant industries" when the owners did their own work and enjoyed the profits themselves in their own simple and honest way, by which no one was oppressed—this before Whitney's gin had done its work by increasing a thousand-fold cotton culture in the South, or Arkwright's genius had multiplied the single spindle our grandmothers used as they "sat on the creepie and spun at the wheel" a single thread into the twirling millions which now sing in factories, with monopolistic hum, under the combination of machinery and pressure of steam.

These once simple threads spun and woven by our grandmothers, knew little of combined strength and served a plain and honest purpose, a stranger to political entanglements, but now its multiple has oppressive combinations, with commercial potency and political entanglements as troublesome to unravel as were those threads Penelope wrought for the shroud of Laertes while impatiently awaiting the return of Ulysses from his mysterious wanderings.

HOME MARKET AND AGRICULTURE.

The surplus domestic productions of the country over and above the consumption at home amounted in 1887 to $703,622,923, as stated in the report of the Secretary of the Treasury to this Congress. That vast value of our industries was sent abroad for a market, first, because it could not be consumed at home, and, second, because there were needed at home many articles of foreign productions.

In the exchange this country swapped, to use a homely phrase, $716,183,211 worth of its own products for $692,319,768 worth of the products of other people, and received also the difference, $23,863,443 worth of exchange. The products which composed the exports were, from agriculture, $523,073,798, or 74.41 per cent.; from manufacture, $136,735,105, or 19.45 per cent.; from mining (including mineral oil), $11,758,662, or 1.67 per cent.; from the forest, $21,126,273, or 3.01 per cent.; from fisheries, $5,155,775, or .73 per cent.; of other products, $5,173,310, or .73 per cent. (Fitzel's statistical report to Congress.)

Agriculture, which is victimized by these tariff laws, thus provided 74.41 per cent., or three-fourths, and all others 25.59 per cent. In the exports agriculture bears to manufacture the proportion of 75 to 20. In the labor of the country engaged in these two sources of production, agriculture employed, in 1880, 7,670,493 laborers, and manufacturers employed 2,732,595, in the ratio of 3 to 1. Why should the three agricultural laborers be forced to pay taxes for the one laborer in manufacture? The agricultural laborer may be unskilled, yet he guides the plow and gathers in the products which constitute 75 per cent. of the country's exports. Is he not as much entitled, and no more, to the protection and encouragement of the Government as his brother laborer in the factories of the country?

Agriculture, Mr. President, is the natural calling of man; it is the chief source of animal life; upon it depend the diversified interests of society; it turns the wheels of the factory, and propels the car of commerce; it gives strength to the "sinews of war," and potency to the wand of peace; then should it not rather be fostered than slighted by unfriendly legislation? Is not this culture of the field, the orchard, and garden the source of the bread of life on which all must live, and to which in destitution and want all turn, with the hope and faith of old Elijah when he prayed on Mount Carmel amidst the priests of Baal for the clouds to overcast and give rainfall on the dry earth to save a famishing people?

It is estimated that between one and two thousand millions of human beings, besides the domestic animals, are daily fed from the products of the soil; yet, notwithstanding the profusion and prodigality that greets us on every side in this teeming land, the soil untilled for a single year would cause the wail of woe to supplant "the song of the reaper," and the giant specter of famine to brood over every hearthstone. Then is it not suicide to visit upon this interest invidious and hurtful legislation?

What warrant exists in the Constitution, or institutions of this country, for favors to any class of its citizens which are not equally extended to all? If we listen to Washington's farewell address, heretofore quoted, equality among all the children of our common mother is, under the Constitution and teachings of our fathers, the American doctrine. In that (the principle of equality and justice) were laid by our fathers the foundation-stones of our political structure, and any system of obligation that exacts tribute from one class or one person for another class or another person to promote the individual interest of the one violates the fundamental idea of American equality, saps the foundation, and crushes the key of its supporting arch.

AGRICULTURE BUYS IMPORTS.

The agricultural products that are exported are those for which no market exists in this country, and amounted last year to seven hundred and three millions, which were sold in the markets where free trade fixes their price. On the other hand, more than 80 per cent. of products of manufactures were sold in this country with a protected market of over 47 per cent. And this 80 per cent. is five times the amount in value of revenue collected at the customs, and is a bounty that comes from the consumer and goes to the manufacturer who makes and sells the goods consumed in this country; for they sell their goods to the consumer at the same price as if they had paid the tariff tax. Thus the farmer is compelled to sell under free trade, but he must buy under protection.

The pauper labor of Europe and Asia fixes the price of the products of agriculture by competition in the open markets of the world, but the protected owners of factories in the United States fix the prices of what the farmer buys. Is it to be wondered that the farmer complains that while pauper labor abroad fixes the price of all he has to sell, that his clothing, his implements, his transportation, and many of the necessaries of life are not only taxed for the benefit of others, but the price itself is regulated and arranged to suit the greed and avarice of combinations, pools, and trusts?

The amount of goods imported in 1881 was estimated at $753,240,125; and the amount of home manufactures of all descriptions during the year ending June 30, 1883, was estimated at $7,800,000,000. For illustration, let it be supposed that the one-fifth of the latter amount was of the same description of goods as those taxed, then the amount received as incidental protection by our home manufacturers would be twice the amount raised by the Government. So far as this amount received by the Government results from a tariff for revenue, the advocates of the Mills bill, I will say the Democratic party, does not object to it. But it insists, inasmuch as the capital of the manufacturers pays nothing to the Government, and the advanced prices of their goods are paid by their laborers, as by other consumers, that the manufacturers should be satisfied with getting double the amount of the revenue that the Government receives.

But it seems their influence has become organized into the Republican party—for twenty-five years hitherto the strongest party, as a party organization, known to the country—and seeks to control legislation specially for large profits by the influence of capital in business relations—and employment, whether so considered or not, frequently operates to practically support their measures—whilst agricultural laborers vote almost universally against the wishes of their employers without the slightest apprehension of results on that account. Should the tariff average 50 per cent. on all our imports (and it does within a fraction), our exports would be exchanged abroad for a sufficiency of money to pay it, which would continue to swell the volume of our circulation till its depreciation would reduce the home value of $1.50 to that of $1 abroad.

The prices of commodities that make up the cost of home production would correspondingly rise, without any increase of value, till the cost of home production would amount to that of competition abroad and the tariff added, and would continue to advance till the foreign prod-

act would again become cheaper than similar varieties at home, when importations would be resumed on the basis of an increasing cost of not less than 50 per cent. on all home production. Fixed compensation, the wages of labor, and the prices of transportation, and of home products sold abroad, would not rise, but would lose, at least to the extent of the tariff, or 50 per cent. This would include our home manufactures sold abroad; for their home-cost having risen 50 per cent., would be equal to the tariff when there would be no protection at home, but in the foreign market; the foreign manufacturer would not pay our tariff, and our home-cost would follow our home manufactures as a tax of 50 per cent. in favor of the foreign manufacturer.

The amount of sales of cotton fabrics in South America from the United States has fallen to less than $3,000,000, whilst that of Great Britain has risen to more than $60,000,000.

ENLARGE THE MARKETS.

There is a Democratic international policy underlying the effort of that party at tariff reform; a policy which seeks to open the markets of the world to American manufacturers, which hopes to increase the number and wages of workingmen by multiplying the products of factories until every market of all the nations shall deal in the cheap and beautiful and useful products of American industry, invention, and ingenuity. To that end the national Democratic platform of 1884 announced that—

We favor an American policy based on more intimate commercial relations with the sixteen sister republics of North, Central, and South America, but entangling alliances with none.

That declaration is in perfect harmony with the initial platform of the party, the inaugural address of Mr. Jefferson, which declared for—

Peace, commerce, and honest friendship with all nations, entangling alliances with none.

In the line of the platform of 1884 the Senator from Maryland [Mr. GORMAN] introduced the "bill to provide for a joint celebration by the sixteen American republics on the 4th of March, 1889, in honor of the one hundredth anniversary of the Constitution of the parent Republic, the United States."

This was an important step to recover to American trade, commerce, and manufactures the great markets of the American republics—to remove the humiliating fact that with an annual manufacturing product valued at $5,369,579,191, according to the census of 1880, but a beggarly 2 per cent. of our manufactures finds a market in all the foreign markets. And that while the republics of South America annually import from all nations $475,000,000, of that sum the great manufactories of the United States furnish but $77,141,000.

The responsibility for this great loss of trade lies with the protective policy of the Republican party. The restrictive duties which that policy has imposed on the raw materials produced by American republics have driven their commerce and their products to the ports of European nations, where less duties or free trade awaits their arrival. Their hemlock, their dye-woods, their textile grasses, and their wool were all taxed at our custom-houses until the trade with the United States became unprofitable. Hence our manufactures find but a limited sale in these Central and South American countries. It is a universal rule that no people will buy where they can not sell, and hence where burdensome restrictions are imposed on imports there must be a corresponding decline of exports. The consular reports to the State Department contain many virtual protests from our consular representatives against the bad policy of restriction by high duties, as well as forcible arguments for a more liberal fiscal arrangement with the American republics.

In the same direction of liberality of trade and enlargement of markets were the resolutions introduced in the House of Representatives by Hon. R. W. TOWNSHEND, on January 7, 1884, for an American zollverein, or customs union, on the principle of free-trade between all American republics, and like, or common duties, on the products of all other nations.

The great Mississippi Valley, Mr. President, pours its abundant products both of the soil and the workshop through the great river into the very lap of all the American republics. But the restrictive policy of the Republican party has heretofore as effectually divested those markets of American products as the Gulf Stream has carried the waters northward and Europeward.

Tennessee, an important factor in all that concerns the Mississippi Valley, throbbing with vital energy, near the heart of this great country, has felt every restraint that impeded the progress or hindered the development of that great empire of production. The need that is greatest along that valley is markets for the wealth which nature and man annually turns out. That necessity will soon demand a larger field than the home market of 60,000,000 people. The world's market of more than 1,000,000,000 of people can only be opened to the country's energy by the liberal policy of the Democratic party, by which a fair exchange of national products is taxed only for the economic expenses of an honest government.

As the quantity of the precious metals—

Says Mr. Blackstone—

increases, this universal medium, or common sign, will sink in value and grow less precious, and *vice versa*.

The increased quantity of the whole—

Says Mr. Say, in his Political Economy—

reduces the value of any part, and *vice versa*.

The value, then, of our money is intensified or depreciated in the hands of our laborers as our agricultural products are exchanged abroad for products or money.

The laborers of our country, then, Mr. President, not only pay about 50 per cent. tax on their food and raiment and medicine to the Government and manufacturers, but the value of their wages is reduced in the same proportion, whilst the foreign laborers in competition do not pay such tax, and the value of their money is not depressed.

The tariff expressing the amount of cost of production in a nation operates as a tax on its productions in all the markets of the world besides its own, and at home, our financial history shows, is periodically repeated, in succession, an increase in the volume of circulation and depreciation in the value of money, a rise in the cost of production, excessive importations, and a demand for the coin, followed by the substitution and increase of paper and the convulsive contraction of its value, so that in all this the tendency is to absorb the accumulation of the money and to swell the fortunes of a few.

It will be seen from the American Almanac of 1879 that the cost of producing cotton in 1876 was about 9.2 cents per pound and the price obtained 9.8 cents per pound, and I suppose the statistics of later years, during the entire decade, would show, besides the waste of the fields and the tattered condition of the laborers, a more unfavorable comparison between its prices and the cost of its production. The same depression may be observed of all of our agricultural products sold abroad, and, meanwhile, to our shipping this depression has been more destructive than all the storms that have swept over the sea. And but for the amazing productive power of the agricultural South and West serious disaster would have ere now come upon us.

In this connection it is pertinent to say that Spain imported vast quantities of gold and silver from her discoveries in America, and as the volume of her circulation increased the cost of her production was proportionately greater than in the rest of Europe, for, as the money-metal became more plentiful, it became less valuable in its purchasing capacity. "England, under the first Mary, then under the Stuarts, sought the Spanish trade, and during the reign of James II, by the liberal policy of her laws, conducted almost the entire Spanish trade with Europe. The consequence was, the material wealth of England increased more rapidly during the latter reign than at any other period of the British Empire."

Spain passed tariff and restrictive laws to retain her circulation, whilst England enlarged her commerce. Spain, from her narrow policy, hemmed in her resources by restrictive commercial laws and lost much of her prestige and commerce with the world, which intensified the value of her money and reduced the cost of production. England grew richer and Spain poorer. England, then a "pent-up Utica," appealed to Neptune for the power of his trident, opened her ports, extended her commerce to the world, became rich, prosperous, and powerful.

And so, Mr. President, we are asked to play the part of Spain—draw around us a cordon, by allowing restrictive and onerous war-tariff laws to remain and become crystallized into our statutes, and thus continue to lessen the purchasing capacity of our money and increase the cost of production. Is this good political economy? Is it wise legislation? Furthermore, this tends to invite travel and investment abroad, where the purchasing capacity of money is greater. Hence, the hegira of capitalists and their families at every incoming spring and autumn, transferring millions of money annually from our shores to Europe, indulging in marvelous expenditures while enjoying with magnetic companions coaching trips beneath the Druid oaks of merry old England, and in Scotland toying with the historic curios of Abbotsford, lunching on the banks of the Clyde, or regaling with hilarity beneath the shadows of the peaks of Ben Lomond, and return less in love with the simple manners and plain democratic institutions of our fathers. And well may Mr. Carnegie spend a portion of his $5,000 daily income, arising from operating in iron under the protection of our existing tariff laws, in Scotland, where the purchasing capacity of money is greater.

The protectionists, under the inspiration of Mr. Blaine, in a celebrated speech three years ago, boast that $3,585,408,792.52 of the public debt, including interest since 1860, has been paid mainly through the proceeds of the tatiff. This boastful statement finds echo with Republicans now. To the extent that it was paid subsequent to the repeal of laws that taxed incomes, it may be replied that not one cent has been paid by capital nor by the proceeds of manufactures, but that the means were obtained by a tax on the goods received in exchange for our agricultural products (as the representative of labor) paid by consumers without any exception of age, color, or condition.

PROTECTION ADVANCES PRICES.

I have assumed, and I think correctly, that the amount paid to the manufacturers on the advanced prices of their goods is twice the amount paid to the Government, so that in paying the $3,585,408,792.52 to the Government, as is the boast of protectionists, the consumers, embracing all classes of laborers and their families, paid to the capitalists who owned the manufactories, for protection, twice that amount, or $7,170,517,585. Nor does this latter large amount include that received for the support of Government nor that paid on our debt and its interest

since 1860. Thus, all amounts raised by the tariff and expended for pensions, internal improvements, public buildings, education, etc., are paid, not by capital, but by consumers, embracing laborers of every description, who pay twice the amount to home manufacturers that they pay to the Government for these purposes.

Nor will it appear strange that the capitalists and protectionists should support schemes for profligate expenditure of money and the repeal of the tax on whisky and tobacco, etc., when it is considered that they will pay nothing beyond that paid by ordinary consumers and the manufacturers will receive $2 for every dollar the Government will collect by a tariff for such purposes as to supply the revenue thus withdrawn. Yet the manufacturer is not satisfied with the exemption of his capital from taxation, and with incidental protection, but as competition multiplies and the cost of production increases, he becomes clamorous, and with the greed of a Turkish bashaw reduces the wages of his laborers, and demands that the consumers, embracing all kinds of laborers, be further taxed, or tariffized, especially for his benefit; and now, under the operation of this special and partial legislation, besides a sufficiency for the support of Government, a vast amount has accumulated in the Treasury that invites wasteful appropriations.

Nor is the enormously-accumulated interest of manufacturers in sympathy with honesty, economy, and virtue in the administration of the Government; for every dollar that is wasted, or is stolen by dishonest Government officials, to replace it the consumer is taxed, through this unequal operation of the tariff for the benefit of the manufacturer, twice the amount wasted or taken, and for every dollar thus lost the manufacturer gets two. Nor is it in sympathy with republican institutions and their principle of equality, as it tends to build up rich and privileged classes, not only exempt from national taxation, but with power to tax the consumers of manufactures (including laborers and the poor of every description) at the same rates that Government taxes them for its support on goods from abroad.

Again, the friends of protection further compare the values of the property of the United States, estimated at $16,000,000,000 in 1860, and at $50,000,000,000 in 1883, and 1887, $62,000,000,000, and ignore all causes for such increase other than the operation of the tariff. (It is not claimed, however, more for a protective tariff than for a tariff for revenue.) It will be remembered that our circulation had a much larger representative value at the former, 1860, than at the latter period. And besides, our natural increase and foreign immigration, our railroads, our mines, and inventions for production and communication, besides the development of our vast domain from Mexico, with constant receipts into the Treasury of apples of gold from California on waiters of silver from Nevada.

These have all contributed to develop this immense wealth, and while being done our agricultural interests and our shipping having been retarded in their development by the operation of the tariff, and our manufactories have increased into mammoth institutions, mainly by absorbing the products of our fields, our domestic manufactures, and those of the workshops of our mechanics, as well as the developments which come most naturally from all these. Again, the protectionists further compare the prosperity of the North, as the friend of a protective tariff, with the condition of the South as opposed to it. The tariff with all of its ramifying influences has been enforced at the South and West as at the North and East.

The comparison is, however, good to show the different effects of the tariff by robbing the agricultural portion that opposes it to enrich the manufacturing interest that befriends it else by what operation of opposition to the tariff have the thousands of millions of their agricultural products been counted to their waste, and by what operation of support have grown up from their material barrenness the vast accumulations of the North and East? And may it not be that the recipients of those bounties, through the operation of the tariff, will still further strip the South as, from the resources which God gave her, she quickens into new life; and may it not be they will still further draw from the entire Northwest the proceeds of their agricultural products in order to pay the expenses of Government and build up a magnificent special class of wealth and influence, contrasted with the destitution of laborers who, driven from employment by trusts and combinations (the legitimate offspring and handmaids of this unequal and unjust tariff legislation), seek subsistence by "strikes" or as tramps on the highways begging for bread? These trusts and combinations, with their pooling policy—now becoming so numerous and gigantic under the operation of our present tariff laws—is the realization of the gravest and most alarming fears of our fathers as to monopolies.

EQUALITY OF TAXATION IN THE STATES.

Under the jurisdiction of home rule in the States all are taxed according to their ability to pay, and capital is taxed for the purpose of education, internal improvements, etc., except such limited amounts as may be exempt for the protection of the poor. These influences of enlightenment and development under State protection or home rule are fostered in harmony with natural advantages and through the inspiration of demand and supply. But under the jurisdiction of the General Government the operation of the tariff exempts capital from taxation and taxes the food, raiment, and medicine consumed by the poor, without distinction of age, sex, color, or condition, for the protection of capitalists engaged in manufactures. Our capitalists, therefore, can well offer to favor education by the Federal Government, and also internal improvements in a wild and extravagant manner rather than by home rule, as in the former case their capital is exempt and in the latter it is taxed according to value, while under local State government our food and raiment and medicine are exempt.

Again, let it not be said, Mr. President, that under existing tariff laws the merchant pays the tariff, for he is compensated by the advanced prices paid by the consumers; nor that the foreigner pays it, since he receives from the merchant the present prices of his goods in his own locality. But who pays the advanced prices of the goods of the home manufacturer? Why, Mr. President, if the consumers, who embrace all varieties of laborers, pay the tariff, how in the nature of things are our home laborers, who, as consumers, do pay it, protected against foreign laborers who do not pay it? Again, nor let it be said that goods can be sold as cheaply after paying the tariff as by paying nothing at all. If the tariff does not advance the price of goods, in what way, I ask, is it to afford protection to the home manufacturer? The question answers itself.

The arguments of the protectionists are much the same as those of the Irish and British landlords in favor of protection for their corn, but at last the laborers demanded cheaper food to keep off starvation, and they obtained privilege to buy where food and raiment were cheapest and bring it beneath their thatched roofs untaxed. This gave some relief, though a mere bagatelle compared to that needed by those oppressed consumers. American laborers and our poor need cheap food and clothing and medicines, and they are told that they can get them cheaper by paying either to the Government or to the manufacturers 47 per cent. on every dollar's worth to which the tariff applies, and that this is protection against the foreign laborer who pays not one cent. Heaven save the mark!

England invites her laborers to the more refined production at home and opens to them her commerce for the free exchange of her products for those of the world. Whilst we are expressing sympathy for home rule and the sufferings of Ireland as we should, we are inconsistently warring against "home rule" at home, and by laying an exorbitant embargo are closing to American laborers the commerce of the world and reducing the values of their wages even below the relief of hunger. Our revenues from customs, as I have said, are paid by the consumers of goods received in exchange for our agricultural products. From this source has flowed all the means of the tariff towards paying the expenses of the Government and a large portion of the public debt, to construct internal improvements, to build costly palaces all over the country, to pay $80,000,000 annually for pensions and bounties, and incidentally to afford twice as much as all these to manufactories, to swell the estimates of their growth and lessen those of the fields. What would the tariff have produced without our agricultural products that paid for the imports upon which the tariff was laid? And without these products, what would the tariff have produced to accomplish all the results represented by protectionists as of the tariff?

HENRY CLAY COULD NOT SUPPORT THE SUBSTITUTE.

Ah, but we are told by high-tariff protectionists that it is "the American system," and they invoke the name of the "great commoner," Henry Clay, to lend it inspiration and effect. In revamping, under existing auspices, the so-called American system of protection, they have superadded to its hardships and injustices the partial repeal of the easiest paid and lightest bearing tax.

There is around the so-called "American system" a hoariness of age and respectability of origin which entitles it to careful consideration, even when its original purpose has outlived the circumstances and conditions which gave it plausibility and won for it a widespread popularity. There lingers around the memory of Henry Clay a halo of admiration which, however any one may oppose his teaching, forbids any American from treating with disrespect any system which his genius originated and his eloquence exemplified.

But it is doing no violence to his well-earned fame to assert that the very principles and circumstances which in 1824 induced him to formulate and advocate protection would, if he were here to-day, make him eloquent in the advocacy of tariff reduction. Recognizing justice as the great underlying policy of civil society, and that any national departure from it lies under the suspicion of being a scheme to plunder the many for the benefit of the few, Henry Clay would recognize the existing tariff as, in the language of Justice Miller—

none the less robbery because it is done under the forms of law and is called taxation.

See among his later expressions in 1843, after the "infants" could stand alone—his Bronson letter. Henry Clay, who was the illustrious friend of these infant manufactures, met these charges by a positive denial. In his letter to S. F. Bronson, of Georgia, in September, 1843, he said:

The sum and substance of what I conceive to be the true policy of the United States in respect to a tariff may be briefly stated. In conformity with the principle announced in the compromise act, I think that whatever revenue is necessary to an economical and honest administration of the General Government ought to be derived from duties imposed on foreign imports. And I believe that in establishing a tariff of those duties such a discrimination ought to be made as will incidentally afford reasonable protection to our national interests. I

think there is no danger of a high tariff being ever established; that of 1828 was eminently deserving that denomination. I was not in Congress when it passed, and did not vote for it; but with its history and with the circumstances which gave it birth I am well acquainted. They were highly discreditable to American legislation, and I hope, for its honor, will never be repeated.

My opinion that there is no danger hereafter of a high tariff is founded on the gratifying fact that our manufactures have now taken a deep root. In their infancy they needed a greater measure of protection; but as they grow and advance they acquire strength and stability, and consequently will require less protection. Even now some branches of them are able to maintain in distant markets successful competition with rival foreign manufactures.

Mr. President, were Mr. Clay here now to see a tariff tax of 47.2 per cent., or an average of that, on every $100 worth of imported goods, from which was annually flowing an excessive revenue in time of profound peace and unexampled prosperity; to see, not the feeble, struggling manufactories of his day, mostly operated in the family circles, but the overgrown condition of the multiple of those infant industries, with an annual income of 10, 20, 30, yea, greater per cent., by which, through the outgrowth of class legislation, they have rapidly gathered untold wealth and grown to giant form; ay, sir, and were Mr. Clay here to see as the consequence thereof the vast drain that this so-called protection has made and is making upon the consumers, including the laborers, of this country, and to witness this process of absorption on which the favored few have fattened into very monopolies, do you think for a moment that this great commoner, who, when alluding to such protection as he advocated (arguing in a celebrated speech made in 1824, that it would tend to prevent monopolies), would recognize this present monopolistic machine as the bantling of that day which he, the high priest of his party, christened at the baptismal font of justice and equity as "the American system"—a system, which asked 25 not 47 per cent., and at a time when American manufactories were few, feeble, and not self-sustaining?

For him now to see not only the marvelous development, with its plethora of wealth, commanding millions of money with which to subsidize the press and command a powerful lobby to work for a continuance upon our statute-books of this existing and absorbing class legislation would be to invite his condemnation. Legislation, which under its deceptive shield called "protection," not only opens up channels through which the golden current of Pactolus seems to flow into a vast reservoir of wealth, with its concomitant results of social and political influence, but inviting, if not creating, ugly methods which give rise to those modern ravenous and unconscionable capitalized organizations known as trusts, combines, and pools—organizations which hold within their unrelenting grasp the body of dependent labor, and with power to paralyze at will its manhood and its strength; methods, that limit at will, by a ukase from the head-center, the amount and price of labor by which they operate—no matter whether operated by iron or human hands—as they shut down and lock out dependent employés. Not only so, but methods peculiar to corporations and combines that, boa-constrictor-like, wind their slimy folds around the honest industries of our country, and with constricting coils crush out that honorable competition through which alone this class of labor can find relief. And this, forsooth, is called "the American system of protection."

Ay, Mr. President, these methods, I insist, reach out, even to circumscribing and regulating the amount of field-culture, as in the sugar trust, and limiting the amount of yield of raw material, as in certain mining trusts, for fear that a more extensive culture or greater yield might lessen the power to control the market value of the product, and thus encourage that competition which would deprive them of the power to command and regulate the price of labor.

Past experience and current statistics show that all this tends to increase the wealth of the rich and the poverty of the poor; and while this is being done, the favored few who are in the "combine" are content to know that their share of the "pool" will await their checks at the end of every quarter.

That vast establishments have risen up, especially in the North and East, as by magic, is admitted, and with equal truth it is insisted that our laborers and agricultural producers have been wasted to construct them, as had been the builders of the ancient monuments that perpetuate the tyranny as well as the genius that built them. Where will we find in the records of the past a despotism that exempted the capital of the country from taxation and taxed alone the food and raiment consumed, without any exception, of the laborer and of the poor? The colored laborers of the fields, in exchange of their products for supplies, receive far short of the amount they would have received had there been no tariff, and they too are immensely profitable to the manufacturers, for they are nearly all agriculturists.

And what does this vast accumulation of wealth pay to the Government for its support? Its owners seem patriotic and zealous for the glory and prosperity of the country. They are grateful, and favor the gift of pensions and bounties to its defenders. They are liberal, and would give vast sums for internal improvement by the General Government, and are indignant at those who oppose them; but they exclaim: Hands off! do not tax our money, nor our lands, nor our manufacturers, nor our palaces, nor our railroads, nor our stocks, nor our bonds, to pay for them; but go and tax the food and raiment and medicine generally consumed by the poor, including the old pensioners, the children at school, the ministers in the cause of Christ, the sisters of charity, the laborers and their families, of all ages, sexes, colors, and conditions; go and tax them, but let the bondholder, the railroader, the factory-owner go free from paying taxes to the General Government. And while you collect Government taxes for such purposes, by such means and from such sources, the manufacturers will collect twice as much and call it the protection of the home against the foreign laborer. Away with such philosophy!

These advanced prices caused by the tariff are felt at every meal that is eaten, upon every garment that is worn, and every dose of medicine that is given. "Do we not also pay as consumers?" say the manufacturers. Yes, but you pay only as equals of the laborer and consumer, however poor, for the exemption of your millions, and that you may recover back, under the pretense of protection, thousands of dollars for every one that you pay. For the laborer and poor there is no exception, and all the money, lands, stocks, and bonds of the rich millionaires, being entirely untaxed by the Government, all together do not pay as much as the shirt of the pauper when living or his shroud when dead.

But may there not be a pursuing Nemesis, as capital in the South is now moving from our wasted fields, seeking more favored investments in manufactures, and competition is multiplying and enlarging—if not strangled by trusts—till an equilibrium will be produced and relieve the most oppressed. Capital, coward as it is, will seek investment where greatest and safest remuneration is found, and happily for the future of my section of this country, the policy of New England is forcing her reluctantly from the field into the factory. Her raw material in mountains of coal and iron, in fields of cotton, in forests of lumber, interspersed with water ways that, under a genial climate, are never ice-bound, are inviting generous rivalry. It asks justice and fairness, not invidious class legislation. Her development, in all save agriculture, in an economic way, affects New England interests; yet that agriculture languishes under oppressive legislation inspired by the land of the Puritan. If law is the perfection of reason, it must be just and bear on all alike, and if we would have prosperity and happiness to follow, our legislative councils must be guided by liberal and enlightened policy.

Let manufacturers continue to enlarge, and competition reduce the prices of their product, and our fields be restricted by trusts and combines in supplying them, and foreign products be driven from our shores by high tariffs, from what source, then, shall we derive our revenue? Protection, then, to the extent proposed, must lead to direct taxation, and that, too, to the extent necessary to pay the enormous amounts that profligacy and the disregard and absorption of the jurisdiction of the States must produce. Would it not be well to open a little wider our national toll-gates and further extend the free-list to raw material, inviting our sister republics of Central and South America, in a less selfish manner, to closer relationship, and allow them to enter our ports with less tax upon their commodities for exchange, thus extending abroad the market for our agricultural and manufactural products? With this extended market would come *pari passu* the demand for increase of labor at home, and with it employment at better wages, where now conspiracies between monopolies forbid it.

Would not this tend to paralyze and check these modern juggernauts or trusts, which limit labor and regulate its price? Is it not safer and better for the country to get rid of the present $120,000,000 and daily increasing surplus revenue in the Treasury, thus lessening temptation to extravagant, profligate, and demoralizing legislation, and so provide for the future that such vast excess shall not so accumulate, but be kept in the channels of trade to strengthen and enliven the business interests of the country? Is it not wiser, then, to adhere to a tariff for revenue with incidental protection; to properly guard home as against foreign labor; to an economical administration of the Government, under the guidance of the present strong, bold, honest hand which now grasps the helm of state?

I submit, Mr. President, with that respect due to the opinions of my senior Senators, that such is the wisest policy, meanwhile properly regarding the rights of the States as contemplated in our Constitution by our fathers, for the peace, happiness, and liberty of our people.

Mr. CULLOM. Mr. President——

Mr. DOLPH. I understand the Senator from Illinois does not care to proceed to-night.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. Does the Senator from Illinois desire to proceed this evening?

Mr. CULLOM. I should prefer not to proceed to-night if that course be agreeable to the Senate.

Mr. PLATT. I should like to say a word about the progress of debate upon the bill. The Senator from Illinois does not wish to proceed to-night, and it is manifest that he ought not to be required to do so. I wish to ask whether the bill can not be taken up at an earlier hour than 2 o'clock to-morrow, for if I address the Senate upon the subject I shall have to do so to-morrow.

Mr. ALLISON. I hope the course suggested by the Senator from Connecticut will be taken. In the nature of things we can not have much morning business at this stage of the session. Therefore I shall move to take up the bill at an earlier hour in the morning, so as to accommodate both Senators.

ESTATE OF JOSEPH H. MADDOX—VETO MESSAGE.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore* laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which was read:

To the Senate:

I herewith return without approval Senate bill No. 2201, entitled "An act for the relief of Laura E. Maddox, widow and executrix, and Robert Morrison, executor, of Joseph H. Maddox, deceased."

An act of Congress approved July 2, 1864, provided among other things that the Secretary of the Treasury, with the approval of the President, might authorize agents "to purchase for the United States any products of States declared in insurrection, at such price as should be agreed on with the seller, not exceeding the market price thereof at the place of delivery."

Under the authority of said act the Secretary of the Treasury, with the approval of the President, prescribed rules and regulations to govern the transactions thus permitted, and appointed one H. A. Risley an agent to act for the United States in making such purchases.

On or about the 13th day of November, 1864, said Risley entered into a written contract with Joseph H. Maddox and two other parties, whereby the latter agreed to sell and deliver to Risley as such agent, at Norfolk or New York, 6,000 boxes of tobacco, 350 barrels of turpentine, and 700 barrels of rosin. It was also agreed that all products transported under the contract should be consigned to said Risley as agent, and shipped on a Government transport, or if not so shipped, should be in the immediate charge of an agent of Risley's, whose compensation and expenses should be paid by the sellers. Said products were to be sold in New York or Baltimore under Risley's direction, and one-fourth of the proceeds, after deducting certain expenses, costs, and charges, were to be retained for the United States and three-fourths paid to Maddox and his associates.

It was expressly provided in said contract as follows: "Nothing in this contract contained shall be construed as incurring any liability on behalf of the United States."

It appears that Maddox, very soon after the contract was made, acquired all the interest of his associates therein.

The President of the United States signed an order or permit for the transportation of the goods, in fulfillment of the contract, and for the passage of the parties selling such goods through the Federal military lines, the permit declaring, however, that such transportation and passage should be "with strict compliance with the regulations of the Secretary of the Treasury, and for the fulfillment of said contract with the agent of the Government."

Maddox and his associates were not at the time the contract was entered into the owners of any of the property they agreed to sell and deliver. But it is alleged that Maddox, as one of the parties to the contract and as assignee of his co-contractors, purchased 4,042 boxes of tobacco, worth at the time more than $735,000, for the purpose of fulfilling this contract.

The tobacco was purchased by him within the rebel lines in the State of Virginia. A part of it, he charges, was forcibly taken by the military forces of the Government and converted to its use or destroyed while being transported to its destination, and the remainder of it having been detained in storage at Richmond, Va., was afterwards appropriated to the use of the United States or was destroyed in the fires at Richmond upon the capture of the city by the United States forces in 1865.

An action predicated upon the contract with Risley was brought by Maddox in the Court of Claims to recover the value of this property, but it was held by the court that the contract was void.

On appeal to the Supreme Court of the United States the decision of the Court of Claims was affirmed, upon the ground, as has been previously decided by said court, that under the law the Treasury regulations and the executive orders concerning the purchase of products of insurrectionary States a purchasing agent of the Government had no authority to negotiate with any one in relation to the purchase of such products, unless at the time of the negotiation the party either owned or controlled them; that neither the law nor the regulations for its execution protected a speculation wherein the products to be sold were to be procured by the contractor within the rebel lines after the contract was made; that private citizens were prohibited from trading at all in the insurrectionary districts; and that the object of the law, and the regulations to carry it into effect, was to encourage the insurgents themselves to bring their products to agents of the Government.

With this adverse decision all chance of recovery upon legal grounds or before the courts was dissipated. But recourse to Congress still remained. As appears from a memorandum furnished in support of this bill, the alleged equities of the case were presented to the Forty-second, Forty-third, Forty-fourth, Forty-fifth, Forty-sixth, Forty-eighth, and Forty-ninth Congresses. Two adverse and more than two favorable committee reports have been made upon the claim. No bill for the relief of the claimant has, however, passed Congress until the present session, when a favorable condition seems to have presented itself.

The bill herewith returned empowers and directs the accounting officers of the Treasury to settle and pay to the representatives of Maddox the amount found due him on account of the loss and damage he sustained by the seizure by our military forces of the tobacco purchased by him under the agreement referred to, excluding, however, the tobacco destroyed by fire in the city of Richmond, and provides that said claim shall be determined upon the evidence taken and now on file in the office of the clerk of the United States Court of Claims and the War Department and any other competent evidence.

I fail to appreciate the equities which entitle this claimant to further hearing.

Every intelligent man should be charged with the knowledge that, as a general rule, commercial intercourse with the enemy is entirely inconsistent with a state of war, and that the law of 1864 had for its object the encouragement of the insurgents themselves to bring their products to us, and not the authorization of persons to roam through the insurrectionary districts and purchase their products on speculation.

Even if the claimant did not understand these conditions, he certainly knew that his contract was based upon a statute; that the agent with whom he was contracting was a creature of statute, and that such statute and certain regulations of the Secretary of the Treasury made thereunder regulated the right and limited the action of all the parties to said contract. These things sufficiently appear from the very terms of the contract and the permit signed by the President. The privileges and liberties contained in this permit are expressly granted "with strict compliance with regulations of the Secretary of the Treasury."

If, before or after entering into this contract, the claimant had examined these regulations, he would have found that they provided that "commercial intercourse with localities beyond the lines of actual military occupation by the United States forces is absolutely prohibited." He would have also found that such regulations expressly provided that the power of the agent of the Government to make contracts should be founded upon the statement that the contractor then owned or controlled the products for which he contracted. And yet the permit of the President, which so completely put the claimant upon inquiry as to what he might or might not do, seems now to be relied upon as the source of equities in his favor, and is pressed into his service under the guise of a sanction of his unlawful proceedings.

Besides the general knowledge the claimant should have possessed of the commercial disabilities consequent upon a state of war, and the information afforded him by his contract and permit, a proclamation of the President, publicly issued September 24, 1864, furnished abundant notice of the kind of trading which would be permitted.

The property for which compensation is asked constitutes a part only of that agreed to be furnished. None of it ever reached the possession of the agent of the Government, but, as I understand the case, was at the time of its seizure or destruction still in the territory of the enemy and in rebellious possession. If, in the circumstances detailed, it was treated by our military forces in like manner as other property in the same situation, there would seem to be no hardship in holding that the contractor assumed this risk as one arising from his unauthorized and, if successful, his profitable venture.

Not being satisfied that there are any especial equities which entitle this claim to more consideration than many others where equities might be claimed in behalf of those who long ago violated our non-intercourse laws, I am unwilling to sanction a precedent which, if followed, might substantially work a repeal of these laws regarded necessary and expedient by those charged with legislation during the war of the rebellion and who had in full view all the necessities of that period.

GROVER CLEVELAND.

EXECUTIVE MANSION, *October* 10, 1888.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. Shall the bill pass, the objection of the President of the United States to the contrary notwithstanding?

Mr. SPOONER. I move that the bill and the message of the President be referred to the Committee on Claims and printed.

The motion was agreed to.

SAMUEL HEIN.

Mr. SPOONER. On behalf of the Senator from Nevada [Mr. STEWART] I report favorably from the Committee on Claims without amendment the bill (S. 3351) for the relief of Samuel Hein. I ask that the bill may be considered at this time.

By unanimous consent, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill. It proposes to pay to Samuel Hein, late disbursing agent of the Coast Survey, or his legal representatives, $1,285, being the amount disallowed by the accounting officers of the Treasury.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

YANKTON RESERVATION.

Mr. DAWES. I present a conference report. I suppose it does not require any action on the part of the Senate.

The report was read, as follows:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 7547) granting the right of way to the Yankton and Missouri River Railway through the Yankton reservation in Dakota having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the Senate amendment numbered 1.

That the title be agreed to as proposed by the Senate.

H. L. DAWES,
O. H. PLATT,
JAMES K. JONES,
Managers on the part of the Senate.
S. W. PEEL,
KNUTE NELSON,
Managers on the part of the House.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The report will be filed.

EXHIBITS FOR PARIS EXPOSITION.

Mr. DOLPH. I introduce a joint resolution, which I ask to have read at length with a view to its present consideration.

The joint resolution (S. R. 115) authorizing the Departments of the Government to use articles in their possession for exhibition at the Paris Exposition of 1889, was read the first time at length, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That the Executive and other Departments of the Government, the National Museum, the Geological Survey, and the Smithsonian Institute, be, and they are hereby, authorized to use for exhibition at the Paris Exposition of 1889 such articles and cases as may be on hand and for which space can be obtained; and that any unexpended balance of the appropriation for the Cincinnati Exhibition of 1888 may be applied for the preparation and boxing of such exhibits.

Mr. DOLPH. This joint resolution was handed to me by an officer of the State Department to-day. He came here to see the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, who is absent. The resolution, I think, will meet no opposition. I have consulted all the members of the Committee on Foreign Relations who are present to-day, and all are in favor of the resolution and agree to its being put upon its passage now.

Mr. HOAR. What does the joint resolution comprehend? It seems to be pretty vague in description. I should like to have it read once more.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The joint resolution will be read the second time at length.

The joint resolution was read the second time.

Mr. HOAR. I do not understand what the phrase means, "the Executive and other Departments of the Government." What are the "other Departments?"

Mr. DOLPH. I understand that the articles which it is proposed to place on exhibition at the Paris Exposition are the articles which are now on exhibition at Cincinnati, Ohio.

Mr. HOAR. The joint resolution does not say so.

Mr. DOLPH. I send to the desk and ask to have read a letter from the Acting Secretary of State to the chairman of the committee, which was handed to me in the absence of the chairman.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The letter will be read, if there be no objection.

The Secretary read as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE, *Washington, October* 10, 1888.

SIR: The attention of this Department has been called to the fact that, without Congressional action, the Director of the National Museum will have no authority to have articles shipped from that collection to Paris. The same is true of articles in the possession of the Smithsonian Institution and the Bureau of Ethnology, all of which Departments of the Government would be able at trifling expense, if authorized to do so, to make a satisfactory and creditable display at the Paris exposition which opens in May, 1889.

It will be quite unnecessary to make any further appropriation of funds for the purpose indicated if the unexpended balance of the sum appropriated for the Cincinnati Exposition may be devoted to packing and preparing the exhibits made by the Government there, and transferring them to Paris. All that is desired is that authority should be given to the various Departments of the Government that have articles on hand to use them in the direction indicated. It is proposed by the Commissioner General, who, I believe, has been in correspondence with the authorities of the Smithsonian Institution and the Geological Survey, that little more should be done than transfer the articles now on exhibition at Cincinnati to Paris.

A form of a proposed resolution is hereto appended.

I have the honor to be, sir, your obedient servant,

G. L. RIVES, *Acting Secretary.*

Hon. JOHN SHERMAN,
Chairman Committee on Foreign Relations, United States Senate.

Inclosure: Joint resolution (proposed).

Mr. HOAR. The joint resolution is slovenly, unmeaning, and utterly unworthy of the Senate or of a legislative body. The Senator from Oregon ought to put it in proper shape before it is passed.

The Geological Survey—

What is the "Geological Survey" as an official?

The Geological Survey is hereby authorized to use for exhibition at the Paris Exposition of 1889 such articles and cases as may be on hand.

Where? It is accompanied by a letter saying that it refers to the articles which have been already exhibited at Cincinnati.

The Executive and other Departments of the Government—

are also authorized.

There is no limitation in the joint resolution to articles which have been exhibited at Cincinnati.

Mr. DOLPH. I will ask the Senator if he knows of any such resolution that has been passed which specifies the articles in the different departments which are to be put on exhibition?

Mr. HOAR. The resolution might at least state, not indicating the several articles, that the responsibility of selecting such articles should be put upon some official or person named.

Mr. DOLPH. I understand the resolution to do that. It specifies the heads of the various bureaus or Departments which have the articles.

Mr. HOAR. It seems to me very extraordinary legal phraseology to say that the Geological Survey is authorized to send to Paris "such articles and cases as may be on hand."

Mr. DOLPH. I am not going to get up a controversy with the Senator from Massachusetts about the joint resolution. I did not draw it. It was transmitted here by the Department of State——

Mr. HOAR. I shall object to it until it is put in proper form.

Mr. DOLPH. Otherwise I might feel disposed to defend the joint resolution and its phraseology.

Mr. HOAR. I object to its present consideration.

Mr. TELLER. While "the Geological Survey" is a common term, perhaps it is not technically correct. That designation ought to be be stricken out, and the Interior Department inserted. The Geological Survey is but a bureau under the Secretary of the Interior.

Mr. DOLPH. I have no objection to that amendment being made. I will modify the joint resolution in that manner if it will be satisfactory to the Senator from Massachusetts; but if the rest of the resolution is not satisfactory to him, of course it must go over.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The joint resolution having been read twice, is there objection to its present consideration?

Mr. HOAR. I object.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The resolution will be referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations or placed on the Calendar, at the option of the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. DOLPH. Let it go on the Calendar.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The joint resolution will be placed on the Calendar.

COMMITTEE ON EPIDEMIC DISEASES.

Mr. HAMPTON submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate:

Resolved, That the Committee on Epidemic Diseases have leave to sit during the recess of Congress, and any necessary expenses shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the Senate.

THE REVENUE LAWS.

Mr. DOLPH. I move that the Senate now proceed to the consideration of executive business.

Mr. CALL. I ask the Senator to withdraw that motion for a moment.

Mr. DOLPH. I will withdraw it for the purpose of hearing what the Senator proposes.

Mr. CALL. I wish to give notice that at the conclusion to-morrow of the remarks of the Senator from Illinois [Mr. CULLOM], unless some other Senator is prepared to speak, I shall address the Senate, by their leave, on the bill (H. R. 9051) to reduce taxation and simplify the laws in relation to the collection of the revenue, reported by the Senate Committee on Finance.

Mr. TELLER. I think the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. PLATT] gave notice that he would follow the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. CALL. Then I will say at the conclusion of the remarks of the Senator from Connecticut.

EXECUTIVE SESSION.

Mr. DOLPH. I renew my motion.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The Senator from Oregon moves that the Senate do now proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business. After nine minutes spent in executive session the doors were reopened, and (at 4 o'clock and 26 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until to-morrow, Thursday, October 11, 1888, at 12 o'clock m.

CONFIRMATIONS.

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate October 8, 1888.

POSTMASTERS.

Everington D. Kelly, to be postmaster at Oregon City, in the county of Clackamas and State of Oregon.

Robert M. Carpenter, to be postmaster at Audubon, in the county of Audubon and State of Iowa.

Samuel E. Carrell, to be postmaster at Adel, in the county of Dallas and State of Iowa.

Perry M. Trumbower, to be postmaster at Muncy, in the county of Lycoming and State of Pennsylvania.

RECEIVER OF PUBLIC MONEYS.

Robert F. Coates, of Wichita, Kans., to be receiver of public moneys at Wichita, Kans.

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate October 10, 1888.

James Petigru Lesoesne, of South Carolina, to be consul-general of the United States at Melbourne, Australia.

PROMOTION IN THE ARMY.

First Lieut. James Parker, regimental quartermaster, to be captain, October 2, 1888, *vice* Lawton, who resigns his line commission only.

PROMOTIONS IN THE NAVY.

Assistant naval constructors to be constructors in the Navy: John F. Hanscom, of Massachusetts; John B. Hoover, of Pennsylvania; Joseph Foster, of Pennsylvania; Richard Gatewood, of Virginia; and Francis T. Bowles, of Massachusetts.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

WEDNESDAY, *October* 10, 1888.

The House met at 12 o'clock m. Prayer by Rev. J. H. CUTHBERT D. D.

The Journal of yesterday's proceedings was read.

Mr. DOUGHERTY. Mr. Speaker, I desire to undertake to make a correction of the Journal, if in order.

The SPEAKER. Of the RECORD?

Mr. DOUGHERTY. No, of the Journal. I would like to have read again that portion of the Journal which refers to the passage of Senate bill No. 3620 on yesterday.

The SPEAKER. What is the title?

Mr. DOUGHERTY. A bill supplementary to an act approved February 3, 1887, entitled "An act to fix the day for the meeting of the electors of President and Vice-President."

The SPEAKER. What correction does the gentleman suggest?

Mr. DOUGHERTY. I desire to call the attention of the House to a fact in reference to that matter, and in support of the statements I shall now make I will ask the Official Reporter to read his stenographic notes of what actually occurred, and have that compared with what the RECORD, which is before me, shows occurred, in connection with the passage of that bill.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will again read that portion of the Journal to which the gentleman refers.

The Clerk read as follows:

On motion of Mr. PEEL, by unanimous consent, the said bill, Senate No. 3620, was taken from the Speaker's table and read twice.

The House having, by unanimous consent, proceeded to its consideration, the said bill was read the third time, and passed.

Mr. PEEL moved to reconsider, etc.

Mr. DOUGHERTY. If it is competent to do so now, I desire to have the Journal corrected so as to show that if that bill did pass this House at all it passed without a quorum. The gentleman from Kentucky, Mr. STONE, occupied the chair temporarily during that proceeding.

He rose in his place and put the question to the House. I think no member except myself voted in the negative. But I certainly voted "no," and loud enough to be heard by all of the members about me. Immediately upon voting "no," and before the gentleman from Kentucky, occupying the chair, rose to decide the question, I called for a division. The Chair either did not hear me or refused to hear me. I heard distinctly every word uttered by the Chair in reference to that bill, and my voice is certainly as powerful as his.

But if he did not hear me it was his fault, not mine; for he should have preserved order in the House and upon the floor, so that members rising and respectfully addressing the Chair could be heard.

My object now, sir, is to have the Journal corrected so as to show the exact facts in reference to the passage of that bill; and I want to know whether this is to be a precedent that the Chair, by a quick decision, shall be able to cut off a member from exercising his constitutional rights upon this floor.

The SPEAKER. The Journal, the Chair will state, can not be corrected in that particular. The Journal does not purport to contain what is said by members, but only records the action of the House in its proceedings.

Mr. DOUGHERTY. It undertakes to show what is done in the House.

The SPEAKER. The RECORD contains the official report of the debates and proceedings in the House. But the Journal is correct, as the gentleman states.

Mr. DOUGHERTY. The Journal states that the bill passed.

The SPEAKER. And the gentleman's statement, of course, goes into the RECORD of to-day.

Mr. DOUGHERTY. Yes, sir; but it should go into the Journal and show that when this bill passed it passed without a quorum as required by the Constitution of the country, if the point be raised.

The SPEAKER. The Chair does not see how the Journal can be corrected to show that the gentleman made the point that no quorum had voted; because if it was done the bill was not passed at all until a quorum had voted, and the gentleman had the right then to insist and to continue to insist if he had desired to make the point that no quorum had voted.

Mr. DOUGHERTY. I could not do that, because I could not be recognized by the Chair. But if the Speaker would examine the RECORD——

The SPEAKER. The Chair will submit the gentleman's motion to the House as to whether or not the Journal can be so corrected as to show that the gentleman on the floor made the point of order that no quorum had voted.

Mr. DOUGHERTY. That would not be a fact, Mr. Speaker. The point that no quorum had voted was not made, for the simple reason that although occupying the floor for that purpose the Chair refused to recognize me to make that point.

The SPEAKER. The present occupant of the chair was absent at the time, having called the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. STONE] to occupy the chair during the hour for the consideration of bills, which hour expired before the present occupant returned. The Chair therefore can have no personal knowledge of what occurred on the floor of the House. The Chair understands the gentleman's statement now to be that the point of no quorum was not made.

Mr. DOUGHERTY. It was not.

The SPEAKER. And therefore the Journal is correct.

Mr. DOUGHERTY. I desire that the stenographer, if he has his official notes, shall read them to show how the language as it appears in the RECORD compares with what actually took place on the floor.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will have the official notes read, and if necessary have the RECORD corrected to conform to them.

Mr. DOUGHERTY. The object in correcting the RECORD is to find out whether the action taken by the Chair on yesterday is to be considered a precedent to be followed by this House in the future.

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Speaker, I was not present when the matter referred to here took place and know nothing of it; but I would suggest that the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. STONE] is not now in his seat.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Kentucky is in the Hall.

Mr. ROGERS. I now perceive that he is.

The SPEAKER. The Chair has sent for the original notes of the Official Reporter, and will have them compared with the RECORD. While waiting for that the Chair will submit some personal requests of members.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. HARE, indefinitely, on account of important business.

To Mr. MOORE, indefinitely, on account of important business.

To Mr. GEST, indefinitely.

To Mr. MANSUR, for the balance of the week, on account of important business.

To Mr. JOHNSTON, of North Carolina, indefinitely.

To Mr. SAWYER, indefinitely, on account of important business.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED.

Mr. KILGORE, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that they had examined and found duly enrolled bills of the House and Senate of the following titles; when the Speaker signed the same:

A bill (H. R. 4765) for the relief of G. W. McAdam;

A bill (H. R. 8962) for the relief of Anthony L. Woodson;

A bill (S. 3427) to amend section 4474 of the Revised Statutes of the United States;

A bill (S. 3241) granting a pension to Easter A. Jackson;

A bill (S. 3230) granting a pension to Martha J. Cole;

A bill (S. 3197) granting a pension to Albert L. Ham;

A bill (S. 3083) restoring to the pension-roll the name of Florian Lischewsky;

A bill (S. 3175) granting a pension to Mrs. Caroline Taylor;

A bill (S. 3030) granting a pension to Mary J. Foster;

A bill (S. 3018) granting an increase of pension to John N. Bovee;

A bill (S. 2742) to incorporote the Brightwood Railway Company of the District of Columbia;

A bill (S. 2593) granting a pension to Sarah E. McNamara;

A bill (S. 2567) granting a pension to Nancy Polock;

A bill (S. 1926) granting a pension to William Smith;

A bill (S. 1671) for the relief of the heirs of Martin Kenofsky;

A bill (S. 1614) granting a pension to Phillipe Ray;

A bill (S. 1219) granting a pension to David Heinbach;

A bill (S. 1089) for the relief of Henrietta M. Sands, widow of the late Rear-Admiral Benjamin F. Sands, United States Navy;

A bill (S. 889) granting a pension to Mary O. Hall;

A bill (S. 741) for the relief of William Tabb;

A bill (S. 619) granting an increase of pension to Leopold Mayer;

A bill (S. 664) for the relief of William P. Wheaton and Charles H. Chamberlain, of California; and

A bill (S. 70) to provide for warehousing fruit brandy.

ORDER OF BUSINESS.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. Speaker, I desire to make a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. KILGORE. I want to ask whether it is competent to make a motion to reconsider when unanimous consent had been given to a matter.

The SPEAKER. It is. Unanimous consent is nothing more than a unanimous vote.

Mr. KILGORE. Then, on yesterday, the gentleman from Maine [Mr. DINGLEY] obtained unanimous consent to fix a certain day in December for the consideration of a bill. I want to enter a motion to reconsider that vote.

The SPEAKER. The motion can be entered, and the Chair will see whether it was not made on yesterday. The Chair will cause the Journal to be examined.

Mr. McRAE. Mr. Speaker, I desire to rise to a question of privilege.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

SWAMP AND OVERFLOWED LANDS.

Mr. McRAE. On yesterday when considering Senate bill 758 to relieve purchasers of, and to indemnify certain States for, swamp and overflowed lands disposed of, those who were present will remember that in the little discussion had the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. JACKSON] wanted to oppose the bill. I offered to yield him time out of the hour allotted to me. He declined to accept it. In the RECORD this morning there is a speech of over a column in length from him, very little of which was spoken on the floor in my presence. There are some incorrect statements and unjust conclusions in his remarks as they appear that I would have noticed if they had been delivered. I shall not ask that the RECORD be corrected in that respect, but call attention to the fact that these statements were not made on the floor to show why they were not replied to by me. I was prepared to defend the bill and to answer the gentleman at the time, and think it was hardly fair to so extend his remarks after I had offered him time to be heard. I suppose the remarks are properly credited to him. He assumes the responsibility for them, and I only call attention to them to show that they were not spoken in debate and could not have been answered by me at the time, and to now say that when the bill is reached again for consideration I shall take occasion to answer the objections made by the gentleman and satisfy any reasonable man of the justice of the measure.

Mr. KILGORE. I demand the regular order.

Mr. JACKSON. I would like to say one word in reply to the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. McRAE] in regard to the statements he has made. I will be very brief.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. JACKSON] asks to make a statement.

Mr. JACKSON. The gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. McRAE] is correct in his statement that my remarks made yesterday on the floor were revised and corrected in the published RECORD, but not with more liberality than I think is customary in members. In fact, the gentleman's own remarks made yesterday were revised by himself so liberally and freely that when I saw the copy it seemed to be generally rewritten, and this called my attention to the need of revising my

own. But I make no complaint of this. I think he improved them, although they are printed very different from the Reporter's copy. After all, the gentleman and I have discussed this question before, and I think there is nothing there that is not in line with the position we have both generally taken and did take yesterday. So far as I know, there are no disputed facts. The contest is as to policy and arguments.

Mr. MCRAE. It is not the revision of the gentleman's remarks that I complain of, but of making a speech in the RECORD that he ought to have known I would reply to if I had heard. I so stated to him, and I stated to him when the bill was up that I would yield him a portion of my time, reserving to myself the right to reply, and he ought to have made his points upon the floor of the House so that I could have an opportunity of replying.

Mr. JACKSON. I insisted on going on and discussing the bill, taking my own time, but the gentleman would not agree to this. I did not need to take time from the gentleman.

In the way of revision I did simply what the gentleman himself did in the same connection, only a little more so, as I had more to say.

Mr. MCRAE. I revised and corrected the report of what I said, while you after doing that extended a single sentence into an argument, say, of a column when you had no time at all.

Mr. JACKSON. Your revision in the same way consisted in striking out and putting in something else.

The SPEAKER. The regular order is——

Mr. MCRAE. I only corrected what the reporter made me say, and made no attempt to discuss the bill further than to answer questions asked me about it. I have no more to say.

Mr. TAULBEE. I ask the gentleman from Texas to yield to me for a moment in order to offer a resolution and make a brief statement with reference to it.

Mr. KILGORE. I yield to the gentleman for that purpose.

BRIDGE FROM LOUISVILLE, KY., TO JEFFERSONVILLE, IND.

Mr. TAULBEE. This is a resolution of inquiry which relates to the navigation of the Ohio River, and I consider it very important that it should pass at this time. It would properly go to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, but there is not a quorum of that committee present in the city; and if the House will hear the resolution read I do not think there will be any objection to its passage. If, on the reading of the resolution, there should be any objection to its immediate consideration, I shall not insist upon it; but I do not believe there will be any.

There being no objection, the resolution was read, as follows:

Whereas a proposition is now pending before the War Department for the construction of a bridge between Louisville, Ky., and Jeffersonville, Ind., etc.: Therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Treasury be requested, if not inconsistent with the public interests, to inform this House—

1. Whether the proposed bridge can be built without violating existing law.
2. What effect its construction will have upon the coal, iron, and river interests of the Ohio and Mississippi Valleys.
3. What public necessity has been disclosed for the building of a bridge at that point.
4. Whether any evidence bearing upon the foregoing questions have been presented to the War Department, and if so, what is its purport and character?

Mr. TAULBEE. The Clerk, very properly, did not read the preamble in full, but now that the House has heard the resolution I do not think there will be any objection to it.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the consideration of the resolution just read?

There was no objection.

The resolution was adopted.

Mr. TAULBEE moved to reconsider the vote by which the resolution was adopted; and also moved that the motion to reconsider be laid on the table.

The latter motion was agreed to.

ORDER OF BUSINESS.

Mr. KILGORE. I demand the regular order.

Mr. O'NEILL, of Pennsylvania. I want to ask the gentleman from Texas [Mr. KILGORE] whether he will not let me, on behalf of the State of Pennsylvania, call up a bill to authorize the auditing of an account between that State and the United States. I have a request in relation to it from the executive department of the State of Pennsylvania, and there is some comity due to a State in such a matter, and I am sure the bill can meet no objection.

Mr. KILGORE. Let it wait until another day.

The SPEAKER. The regular order is demanded. The regular order is the call of committees for the presentation of reports.

Mr. LAWLER. I ask unanimous consent that gentlemen having reports to present may be allowed to file them with the Clerk.

Mr. O'NEILL, of Pennsylvania. I must object to that. I want to call up a bill for consideration.

The committees were called for the presentation of reports.

Mr. LAWLER. Mr. Speaker——

The SPEAKER. The regular order is insisted upon, which cuts off all request for unanimous consent. The regular order is the hour for the consideration of bills reported from committees. The hour begins at half past 12 o'clock, and the call rests with the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Mr. PEEL. Mr. Speaker, when the hour expired yesterday House bill 1407 was under consideration. While I am of opinion that if members fairly understood the object of the bill there would be no objection to it, yet as there seems to be some difference of opinion about it, and as it is a bill of considerable importance, I desire to say to gentlemen who objected yesterday that if they still insist upon making the point of "no quorum," I shall ask that it be passed over without losing its place, so that it may come up for consideration when we have a quorum.

Mr. EZRA B. TAYLOR. There will be the same objection. There can be no more legislation in this House without a quorum.

Mr. PEEL. Then I ask unanimous consent that the call of the Committee on Indian Affairs be passed over without losing its place, so that when we meet in December with a quorum present we shall be able to proceed with this bill.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore* (Mr. MCMILLIN). The gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. PEEL] asks unanimous consent that the call of the Committee on Indian Affairs be passed over, and that that committee may not lose the remainder of its time, which would be one hour, the call having been exhausted so far as yesterday was concerned. Is there objection?

Mr. KILGORE. Does it not have its place anyhow?

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The Chair will state to the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. PEEL] that if consent is given to his request the status will be that there will be one hour for the consideration of this bill, but the committee can not call up any other bill unless by unanimous consent.

Mr. PEEL. I understand that.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. PEEL]?

Mr. KILGORE. Yes, sir; I object to this House now fixing any day or hour for the consideration of business at the next session.

Mr. PEEL. My request does not fix any day.

Mr. KILGORE. I object to giving anybody any special rights for next session.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The gentleman from Texas objects. Objection having been made, this bill is in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, and the House will have to resolve itself into Committee of the Whole in order to reach it. What is the desire of the gentleman?

Mr. PEEL. I suppose it is idle to consume further time upon this, as there seems to be a disposition to stop all business. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. EZRA B. TAYLOR] announces that he does not propose to let us go on without a quorum: and the gentleman from Texas [Mr. KILGORE] objects to the committee being passed over, and I do not see what we can do. [Laughter.]

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. Speaker, I rise to a parliamentary inquiry, with a view to accommodate my friend from Arkansas [Mr. PEEL]. I understand his proposition to be that his committee shall not lose its place in the call.

The SPEAKER. The request of the gentleman from Arkansas was that the Committee on Indian Affairs should be passed over for the present without losing the right to occupy the remainder of the time belonging to it in this hour under the rules of the House. The Chair supposes that the usual course would be pursued and that the committee could come in and claim the remainder of its time whenever no other committee was occupying the consideration hour.

Mr. KILGORE. And the request would not fix a day for the consideration of this bill?

The SPEAKER. It would not.

Mr. KILGORE. Then I will make no objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there further objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. PEEL]?

Mr. MCMILLIN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

Mr. O'NEILL, of Pennsylvania. Before that motion is put, I wish the gentleman would let us have the call of committees for the consideration of bills continued, as I am very anxious that the Library Committee should be called. Even though I know there will be objection to considering the bill which the committee will present, on account of the absence of a quorum, I would like to have the call appear on the record, just as I would like to have it appear of record and go to the country that there are forty or fifty of us here present and that we might, if we chose, pass a number of unobjectionable bills which are on the Calendar and which would help many of our individual constituents.

The SPEAKER. The motion to adjourn is pending, and debate is not in order.

Mr. MCMILLIN. I only wish to state that the reason I make the motion is because of the announcement on the part of the gentleman from Ohio that no business could be done.

Mr. LANHAM. Pending that I move that when the House adjourn to-day it be to meet on Friday next.

The question was taken on the motion of Mr. LANHAM; and on a division there were—ayes 30, noes 32.

So the motion was rejected.

The question recurred on the motion of Mr. MCMILLIN, which was rejected.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will continue the call of committees.

The Committee on the Territories was called.

Mr. BAKER, of New York. I would like to ask my colleague from Texas on the Committee on the Territories if he would make the point of "no quorum" on the bill for the admission of South Dakota?

Mr. KILGORE. Yes, sir.

Mr. BAKER, of New York. Then I will not call it up.

Mr. O'NEILL, of Pennsylvania. Will the gentleman make the point of "no quorum" on the consideration of pension bills on next Friday night? If so, I should approve of the motion to adjourn over until Friday, and from Friday until Tuesday, and so on.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will continue the call of committees.

Mr. BAKER, of New York. I desire to ask the question of my friend from Texas, if he proposes to oppose the consideration of any further bills, whether it is not better to adjourn for a few days. I notice from the morning papers to-day that the House is falling to pieces like the petals of a flower——

Mr. SOWDEN. Regular order.

The Committee on Labor was called.

Mr. BAKER, of New York. Pending that call I desire to ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Territories may be considered as not passed so that it may be called at the next session.

Mr. CLEMENTS. I object.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will state that the probabilities are that the whole list of committees is likely to be called through anyway.

EIGHT-HOUR LAW.

Mr. PLUMB. On behalf of the Committee on Labor, I ask unanimous consent to discharge the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union from the further consideration of the bill S. No. 405, and consider the same in the House.

The SPEAKER. The bill will be read, after which the Chair will ask for objection.

The bill was read at length.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois asks unanimous consent to discharge the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union from the further consideration of this bill and consider it in the House.

Mr. ALLEN, of Mississippi. I object.

Mr. PLUMB. I move that the House now resolve itself into Committee of the Whole on the state of the Union for the purpose of considering this bill.

The question was taken; and on a division there were—ayes 24, noes 14.

Mr. ALLEN, of Mississippi. No quorum.

The SPEAKER. The point of order being made that no quorum has voted, the Chair will order tellers.

Mr. ALLEN, of Mississippi, and Mr. PLUMB were appointed tellers.

Mr. ALLEN, of Mississippi. It is unnecessary to go into the consideration of that bill, as the gentleman from Ohio has notified us there can be no legislation.

ORDER OF BUSINESS.

Mr. BURNES. Pending the vote on this question, I ask unanimous consent to suspend the count until I can make a statement and a request of the House.

The SPEAKER. If there be no objection, the gentleman will be permitted to submit a suggestion.

There was no objection.

Mr. BURNES. It will be remembered that on yesterday a certain bill relating to the Presidential count was called up by the gentleman from Kentucky and passed, and the motion was made to reconsider the action of the passage of the bill, which motion was laid on the table in the usual form. The failure of the presiding officer to hear the objection on the part of a member, which objection was undoubtedly made—and no member in the House will hesitate for a moment to indorse the integrity of the gentleman who occupied the chair—but it was evident he did not hear the objection made. Under all the circumstances, and in order that we may be in a shape which will be fair to all sides, I ask unanimous consent that so much of the action of the House as laid on the table the motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed be rescinded.

Mr. MILLIKEN. What is the bill?

Mr. BURNES. It is the bill in reference to the Presidential count.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore* (Mr. MILLIKEN). The Clerk will report the title of the bill, after which the Chair will ask for objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 3620) supplementary to the act approved February 3, 1887, entitled "An act to fix the day for the meeting of the electors of President and Vice-President to provide for and regulate the counting of the votes for President and Vice-President and the decision of questions arising thereon."

Mr. BURNES. Now, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent simply to set aside the action of the House which moved to reconsider and laid on the table the motion to reconsider the passage of that bill.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

Mr. DOUGHERTY. Mr. Speaker——

Mr. EZRA B. TAYLOR. I object.

Mr. BURNES. I hope the objection will not be insisted upon.

Mr. DOUGHERTY. Do I understand that objection is made to the request?

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The gentleman from Ohio objects.

Mr. STONE, of Kentucky. I ask the gentleman at least to withdraw his objection until a statement is made by the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. EZRA B. TAYLOR. I have no objection to do that.

Mr. DOUGHERTY. I did not desire to make a statement, Mr. Speaker, but simply rose to ask, if the objection had been withdrawn to the action as proposed by the gentleman from Missouri, what would be the parliamentary status of that bill?

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The Chair will state that if the request of the gentleman from Missouri for unanimous consent had been granted, the bill would have stood as passed, with a motion pending to reconsider the action passing it.

Mr. DOUGHERTY. And no new motion to reconsider would have to be entered.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. No new motion would have to be entered. The request of the gentleman from Missouri was to set aside the order to lay on the table the motion to reconsider, which would have left the motion to reconsider pending.

Mr. BURNES. Mr. Speaker, I trust that this proposition, which will leave the bill in the control of the House subject to any action that may be taken now or hereafter, will be acquiesced in by the House. We desire to adopt without further delay the conference report on the general deficiency bill. Ten thousand poor fellows are needing the money we are appropriating for them; they ought to have had it long ago. This is a bill in which numbers of poor people of this country are interested; and I do trust—I ask as a personal favor—that the bill may not be longer allowed to hang. By taking the action now requested we can pass this general appropriation bill, and I do hope——

Mr. MORRILL. I would like to ask the gentleman from Missouri what connection there is between the two propositions?

Mr. BURNES. The gentleman from Florida thinks that he was deprived of the right of objecting to the passage of a bill called up by the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. BRECKINRIDGE] by the accident of the Speaker *pro tempore* not hearing his objection; and if that matter be put *in statu quo* so that the gentleman from Florida can be heard upon it or have a vote on it at any time he may call it up, he will not further object to the passage of this appropriation bill. That is the whole matter.

Mr. MORRILL. That is just what I wanted to ascertain.

Mr. BURNES. It enables us to pass the general deficiency bill.

Mr. MORRILL. I was utterly unable to see any connection between the two propositions; and I do not see now why the gentleman from Florida should undertake to punish the whole House.

Mr. EZRA B. TAYLOR. I objected to the proposition because I thought a bill which had been passed by the House ought to remain passed. I did not know what connection there was between the two propositions. I would like to know whether it is understood by anybody that this bill in regard to which the motion to reconsider is to be pending shall not pass into law. If there is anybody in the House who objects to that bill, I would like to know it; for I care more for that bill than for the general deficiency bill.

Mr. BURNES. I will say to my friend from Ohio that I do not know what action is proposed to be taken by any member of the House in regard to that bill; but the bill will be left as passed, with a motion to reconsider pending.

Mr. EZRA B. TAYLOR. I withdraw my objection.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The Chair will state that the bill has been returned to the Senate.

Mr. HOOKER. I wish to say, in connection with what has been stated by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BURNES] and other gentlemen, that I conceive it natural that the gentleman from Florida, having called for a division which was not heard by the gentleman at that time occupying the chair, and which I thought, with due deference——

Mr. BURNES. Will the gentleman yield for a moment?

Mr. HOOKER. Certainly.

Mr. BURNES. I ask unanimous consent to send a message to the Senate recalling the bill.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The Chair will ask whether there is further objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. HOOKER. Before the question is put I want to make this remark——

Mr. FARQUHAR. One word. This is seemingly a bargain; it is not a matter of parliamentary proceeding at all; and I should certainly feel like objecting unless I were very sure that no other gentleman would make objection to the passage of this deficiency bill. I agree with the gentleman from Missouri that this bill ought to have been passed long ago. If it is now simply an accommodation to the gentleman from Florida that his motion shall be placed on record so that he may appear as objecting to the passage of the bill with reference to the Presidential electors, I see no difficulty in agreeing to it, because the matter of reconsideration is a privileged question. But if there are

other objectors lying by, and the gentleman from Florida is given this opportunity also, I think it would be taking an unfair advantage of the courtesy of the House to hang up this deficiency bill any longer. I would like to reserve that point.

Mr. BURNES. I am sure there will be no further objection.

Mr. FARQUHAR. If the gentleman is satisfied of that, all right. I did not know but that the gentleman from Mississippi intended to make a point.

Mr. BURNES. Oh, no; I think not.

Mr. FARQUHAR. I certainly am not disposed to object to the request; but I feel it urgent that this deficiency bill should be passed at once, for the honor of this House and for the credit of the country.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

Mr. HOOKER. I want to make a single remark before the House passes upon that request.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The gentleman will suspend his remarks for a moment, until a message from the Senate is received.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

A message from the Senate, by Mr. McCOOK, its Secretary, announced that the Senate had receded from its amendments to bills of the following titles:

A bill (H. R. 1239) to extend the jurisdiction of the Light-House Board to the Sacramento and San Joaquin Rivers, California;

A bill (H. R. 1249) for establishing a light-house and fog-signal on Roe Island, Suisun Bay, California;

A bill (H. R. 1641) for the erection of a light-house at or near a point about midway between Barnegat and Navesink lights, in the State of New Jersey;

A bill (H. R. 5700) to facilitate the transportation of life-saving and light-house supplies at Hog Island, Virginia;

A bill (H. R. 7421) for establishing a light off Pamlico Point, North Carolina;

A bill (H. R. 7604) for the establishment of a light-house and fog-signal at or near Gull Shoal, Pamlico Sound, North Carolina;

A bill (H. R. 8855) for the establishment of a light-ship with a steam fog-signal at Sandy Hook, New York Harbor; and

A bill (H. R. 10183) to establish a light-ship off Great Round Shoal, near Nantucket, Mass.

The message further announced that the Senate had passed without amendment bills of the following titles:

A bill (H. R. 6619) for the relief of Eliza A. Cutler; and

A bill (H. R. 8674) for the relief of Starling H. Tucker and others.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed with amendments the bill (H. R. 11139) to authorize the building of a bridge or bridges across the Mississippi River at La Crosse, Wis.; asked a conference with the House on said bill and amendments, and had appointed as conferees on the part of the Senate Mr. SAWYER, Mr. DOLPH, and Mr. VEST.

ORDER OF BUSINESS.

Mr. HOOKER. I was proceeding to remark, Mr. Speaker, that when the gentleman from Florida [Mr. DOUGHERTY] called for a division, I think, with due deference to my friend who was then in the chair, and who, I know, endeavored to decide this matter according to what was right, he ought to have been recognized in the demand for a division. But, sir, at the same time I regard the bill which has been passed as an important one. It is for the purpose of correcting an error in reference to the electoral count which existed in the statute as it passed in 1887. It is a Senate bill, that is, it was introduced in the Senate and passed that body unanimously. I should regard it as unfortunate after the bill had been passed by the unanimous approbation of the House if any action should be taken on our part at this time by which that important bill should be defeated; and anxious as I am to see the deficiency bill acted upon and passed, I should regret very much seeing the House put itself in the attitude where we might be very much embarrassed in reference to the passage of that electoral-count bill. I think that is an important bill. I think it was right on our part that it was passed.

Now if it is understood the gentleman from Florida will not persist in his opposition to that bill, and will not raise the question of a quorum on the deficiency bill, then I think we should agree to the request which has been made and let the matter stand in that attitude. The deficiency bill is of great importance. There are several thousand people interested in it. It is one of the general appropriation bills, and it is important that it should be passed at once. I hope, therefore, there will be no further objection, but that it will be allowed to go through.

Mr. ROGERS. I was temporarily called out of the House, and I wish to know what is the question before the House.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. It is on the request of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BURNES] to set aside the action of the House laying on the table the motion to reconsider the vote by which the electoral-count bill was passed.

Mr. ROGERS. He wants to enter the motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. It was passed, and the motion was made to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed, and that motion was laid on the table. The gentleman's request is to set aside by unanimous consent the vote by which the motion to reconsider was laid on the table, and to allow the motion to be entered to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed.

Mr. ROGERS. I should like to know, if I am in order, what is the object of the gentleman from Missouri in reconsidering that matter.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. It has been already stated.

Mr. ROGERS. I was out of the House at the time.

Mr. BURNES. It is done because of the feeling that by the action of the Chair, of course unintentionally, the gentleman from Florida was deprived of his right to have a division on the passage of the bill. Those of us who sat near the gentleman from Florida are aware of the fact that he did call for a division, which, however, was not heard by the Chair. If the vote by which the motion to reconsider was laid upon the table be vacated that leaves the matter standing before the House on the motion of the gentleman from Florida to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed.

Mr. ROGERS. Is the gentleman from Florida opposed to this electoral-count bill at all?

Mr. BURNES. I do not know that the gentleman has urged any reason why he was opposed to that bill, but evidently he showed signs of opposition to its passage.

Mr. STONE, of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I was in the chair as Speaker *pro tempore* at the time this matter took place. The vote was taken on the bill. The Chair announced the ayes seemed to have it, and then with some deliberation announced that the ayes had it and that the bill was passed. At that time the gentleman from Florida rose and demanded a division. He states to me in private conversation that he demanded a division before the result was announced by the Chair. The Chair did not hear his demand. The bill was then announced as passed. No motion was made or put to the House that the vote by which the bill was passed should be reconsidered. The RECORD shows exactly what occurred from beginning to end. I do not know what the Journal shows, but I do know that the RECORD shows that there was no motion made to reconsider, and therefore no motion was made to lay the motion to reconsider upon the table. That is all I have to say.

While I regret that the gentleman from Florida was deprived of his right, I wish to say for myself distinctly that I had no intention to deprive the gentleman from Florida, or any other gentleman, of any right which he possessed. The decision I made when I occupied the chair in reference to this bill was only what the House had the right to demand at my hands as its presiding officer at the time.

That was the only question in the matter; and beyond that no motion was made or action was taken in regard to the bill. No motion was made to reconsider.

Mr. DOUGHERTY. I will state, in reference to what the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. STONE] has said, that it has not at any time been my intention to impugn his motives in this matter.

Mr. STONE, of Kentucky. I did not understand the gentleman to do so.

Mr. DOUGHERTY. I make the statement to this House, and I think the gentlemen who were sitting in my vicinity at the time I was on the floor will bear out the statement, that, having voted "no," immediately after voting I called for a division. The Chair evidently did not hear me, and decided the question. Now, as to the matter of deliberation—the deliberation with which he decided it—I think that gentlemen upon this floor will agree that the decision was certainly a very quick one. The gentleman, however, is of course the best judge of the deliberation with which he decided that question; and I raise no point upon that.

The practice on this floor has been—if I am any judge of the procedure since I have been a member on this floor—a question having been put, a member calls for a division, and even after the Chair has decided the question and a gentleman has arisen and stated that he had called for a division it has certainly been the custom of the House to have the division. It has certainly been the uniform custom of the present occupant of the chair.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will state that he now has the original notes of the Official Reporter, which can be read if the gentleman from Florida [Mr. DOUGHERTY] desires; but these notes show what has already been stated by the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. STONE] that no motion to reconsider was made. If there be no objection, therefore, the Journal will be corrected, and it will be in order for the gentleman from Florida [Mr. DOUGHERTY] to make the motion to reconsider.

Mr. ROGERS. A point of order. Can he do so, having voted "no?"

The SPEAKER. The Chair does not know how any gentleman voted, the yeas and nays not having been taken.

Mr. DOUGHERTY. If having voted in the minority——

The SPEAKER. There is no record of the vote, and in such cases any gentleman can make a motion to reconsider.

Mr. DOUGHERTY. A parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Speaker. Would the fact of a motion being entered to reconsider the vote by which that bill was passed bring the bill back from the Senate?

The SPEAKER. The House would then, the Chair presumes, in accordance with the usual custom, request the Senate to return the bill.

Mr. DOUGHERTY. Is there any precedent for the Senate refusing to return the bill? [Laughter.]

The SPEAKER. The Chair has not examined the precedents; but if there be no objection, the Journal will be corrected in accordance with what is shown by the record and the statement by the gentleman presiding at the time, and if the gentleman desires he can make a motion to reconsider. If there be no objection, the Journal as corrected will be approved.

Mr. STONE, of Kentucky. If while occupying the chair on yesterday the gentleman from Florida [Mr. DOUGHERTY] feels that by any action of mine he was deprived of any right to which he was entitled as a member upon this floor, I simply want to say that I desire the House to give to the gentleman from Florida the opportunity to exercise any right that he might have thus been deprived of. I will at the same time make my humble acknowledgment to the House for any error I may have committed, if I did so.

Mr. DOUGHERTY. I will state that so far as I am concerned I will do the gentleman from Kentucky the justice to say that whatever right I may have been deprived of it was inadvertently done on the part of the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. Speaker, I would first ask that the Journal be corrected.

The SPEAKER. That has been done.

Mr. DOUGHERTY. Then I ask to enter a motion to reconsider.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman has the right to enter that motion. If there be no objection, the Clerk will be instructed to request the Senate to return the bill to the House.

Mr. FARQUHAR. Mr. Speaker, I desire to ask a parliamentary question on Rule XVIII, which I send to the Clerk's desk to be read.

The Clerk read Rule XVIII, as follows:

When a motion has been made and carried or lost it shall be in order for any member of the majority, on the same or succeeding day, to move for the reconsideration thereof, and such motion shall take precedence of all other questions, except the consideration of a conference report, a motion to fix the day to which the House shall adjourn, to adjourn, or to take a recess, and shall not be withdrawn after the said succeeding day without the consent of the House, and thereafter any member may call it up for consideration: *Provided*, That such motion, if made during the last six days of a session, shall be disposed of when made.

Mr. FARQUHAR. Now, Mr. Speaker, to my mind the arrangement proposed this morning sets aside the spirit of that rule, from the fact that the gentleman from Florida [Mr. DOUGHERTY] did not vote with the majority. So far as the status of the electoral bill is concerned, I think that every gentleman here, except the gentleman from Florida, feels that it ought not to be changed. There is, however, one point with reference to the status of the bill upon which my mind is not clear, and that is how far it will be affected by the motion to reconsider.

Mr. DOUGHERTY. No such motion was made.

Mr. FARQUHAR. I refer to the proposition of the gentleman to make a motion to lay the motion to reconsider on the table. What I desire to know of the Chair is this: What is the exact status of the bill, provided the House agree unanimously to the gentleman's request?

The SPEAKER. The Chair will first decide the point of order made by the gentleman from New York. The gentleman makes the point of order that the gentleman from Florida [Mr. DOUGHERTY] has no right to make the motion to reconsider because as a matter of fact he voted in the negative or with the minority. But that question has been frequently presented to the House, and ever since the Twenty-third Congress at least, and perhaps before that time, it has been decided as the Chair decided it awhile ago. The Clerk will read the decision made in the Twenty-third Congress, which has been followed ever since.

The Clerk read as follows:

Where a vote is not taken by yeas and nays, and consequently no record made of each member's vote, it is the well-settled practice to permit any member to move a reconsideration.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thinks, therefore, that the gentleman from Florida has a right to enter the motion to reconsider.

The status of the bill is this. The bill was passed yesterday, and the gentleman from Florida [Mr. DOUGHERTY] now makes a motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed. If that motion is called up now, it must be acted upon now.

Mr. EZRA B. TAYLOR. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The question was taken on the motion of Mr. EZRA B. TAYLOR, and the Speaker declared that the ayes seemed to have it.

Mr. DOUGHERTY. I call for a division.

The House divided; and there were—ayes 40, noes 8.

Mr. DOUGHERTY. No quorum.

Mr. PLUMB. I rise to a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. PLUMB. I desire to inquire what has become of the business that was progressing when the matter came up?

The SPEAKER. The Chair is advised that this matter was taken up by unanimous consent upon the request of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BURNES]. Of course, if the regular order is demanded, the Chair must proceed with the regular order, which is the hour for the consideration of bills reported from committees.

Mr. PLUMB. Then, for want of making an objection, we are taking up time in this way?

The SPEAKER. The present occupant of the chair was out when this matter came up, but is advised that it came up by unanimous consent.

Mr. MCMILLIN. The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BURNES] asked unanimous consent that this matter might be taken up pending the action as to tellers, and it was done. The tellers were standing on the floor when the consent was given.

The SPEAKER. That is the information given to the present occupant of the chair.

Mr. PLUMB. I desire to inquire whether the former order of business can now be proceeded with?

The SPEAKER. It can. The matter which came up by unanimous consent was a request by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BURNES], which was not agreed to, and afterward the gentleman from Florida [Mr. DOUGHERTY], as a matter of right, entered a motion to reconsider, which motion will be pending, and also the motion of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. EZRA B. TAYLOR] to lay the motion to reconsider on the table.

The tellers will resume their places. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Illinois, that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill the title of which was read.

Mr. BURNES. I wish to make a parliamentary inquiry. Would it be proper for me now to call up as a privileged matter the conference report on the deficiency bill?

The SPEAKER. That is in order.

Mr. BURNES. Then I call up that report.

The SPEAKER. A conference report is in order, even when a motion to adjourn is pending. The gentleman calls up for further consideration the report of the conference committee on the deficiency appropriation bill.

Mr. BURNES. I move that the report be adopted.

The SPEAKER. The motion was made yesterday; the previous question was ordered upon it, and the House was dividing, but no quorum voted. The tellers will resume their places.

Mr. DOUGHERTY. I wish to make a parliamentary inquiry. What is now the status——

The SPEAKER. The Chair has stated that on the bill with reference to the electoral count the gentleman from Florida has entered his motion to reconsider, and the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. EZRA B. TAYLOR] has made a motion to lay that on the table. The pending question in reference to that bill is upon the motion to lay on the table.

Mr. DOUGHERTY. Where is the bill in fact?

The SPEAKER. The bill has passed the House, and has been returned to the Senate.

Mr. DOUGHERTY. Would it be in order to offer a resolution asking the Senate to return the bill to the House, as a motion to reconsider has been entered?

The SPEAKER. Not at this time, because the gentleman from Missouri has called up the conference report.

Mr. JACKSON. I wish to make a parliamentary inquiry. At one time during this discussion a request was made, and, I believe, submitted by the Chair, that the Clerk request the Senate to return this bill. I wish to know whether that request was submitted.

The SPEAKER. The Chair stated that in accordance with the custom in such cases it would be in order to make such a request of the Senate, but it was not made.

The gentleman from Florida [Mr. DOUGHERTY] and the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BURNES] will resume their places as tellers upon the question of agreeing to the report of the conference committee.

Mr. BURNES. As it has been announced that the bill in reference to the electoral count has been returned to the Senate, I ask unanimous consent to offer a resolution requesting the Senate to return the bill, pending the motion of the gentleman from Florida to reconsider.

Mr. BAKER, of New York. I would like to inquire the object in having the bill reconsidered.

Mr. BURNES. There is a motion pending now to reconsider, and the bill ought to be here.

Mr. JACKSON. A motion was made to lay the motion to reconsider on the table.

Mr. BURNES. The motion to reconsider is pending and also the motion to lay on the table.

Mr. EZRA B. TAYLOR. There is no more use in talking. I will say to the gentleman from Missouri that if Florida controls this Government let her take possession.

Mr. BURNES. Oh, well, Florida does not.

Mr. DOUGHERTY. Florida is not undertaking to do anything of the kind. A Representative from Florida is undertaking to place himself in a position where he will not be deprived of his rights as a member on this floor. That is all.

Mr. BURNES. I ask unanimous consent to offer the resolution I have indicated.

Mr. BAKER, of New York. I object.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will inform the Senate that a motion

to reconsider is pending, and the Senate can take its own course in regard to the bill.

Mr. PLUMB. Now is it in order to proceed with our business?

The SPEAKER. The tellers will resume their places.

Mr. BURNES. I rise to a point of order. The record now discloses the condition of this bill; and I submit that the House, as a matter of right, should demand the recall of the bill. I make the point that it is the duty of this House, pending the motion to reconsider, to bring the bill back.

The SPEAKER. The present recollection of the Chair is that when there were joint rules in force covering proceedings between the two Houses—rules agreed to by both branches of Congress—there was a provision of the kind which the gentleman indicates. But those rules have not been regarded as in force since 1877; and the House and the Senate have, since that time, conducted their business with each other upon the principles of general parliamentary law. All that the House can do as a matter of privilege or right, is, through its Clerk, to notify the Senate that a motion to reconsider has been made and is pending.

Mr. DOUGHERTY. And to ask the return of the bill. It is usual to ask the Senate in such cases to return the bill.

Mr. BAKER, of New York. Is it not necessary that there should be an order of the House directing the Clerk to make the notification?

The SPEAKER. The Chair thinks it is the duty of the Clerk to convey to the Senate that information in regard to the state of the bill.

Mr. BAKER, of New York. Regardless of any instruction by the House?

The SPEAKER. The Clerk always notifies the Senate of the fact that a bill has passed the House; and the Chair thinks that when a motion to reconsider the passage of a bill is entered the Clerk should notify the Senate that there is such a motion pending. But the House has control of this matter. If the Committee on Enrolled Bills should report this bill to the House as being duly enrolled and ready for the signature of the Speaker, the House may refuse to receive the report and may refuse to permit the Speaker to sign the bill, because a motion to reconsider is pending. The House must always have control over its own proceedings.

Mr. ROGERS. I wish to submit a parliamentary inquiry, or it may be a point of order. I desire to know whether the Clerk of the House has the right to bear any message to the Senate which he is not directed to communicate by an order of the House entered on its Journal.

The SPEAKER. The Chair would hesitate about deciding as to the actual right of the Clerk; but the Chair thinks it has been the custom to communicate to the Senate all proceedings of the House in relation to bills passed by the House—House bills, and certainly Senate bills.

Mr. ROGERS. I desire to raise a point of order.

The SPEAKER. What is it?

Mr. ROGERS. It is that the Clerk of the House has no business and it is not his duty to make a communication to the Senate requesting the return of a bill passed by the House without first having the authority of the House for so doing.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will examine the matter.

Mr. DOUGHERTY. Has it not been the practice of the House to take such action as is proposed to be taken by that resolution in cases identical with the one now before us?

The SPEAKER. It has; and invariably unanimous consent has been granted for such a request, so far as the Chair remembers.

Mr. BAKER, of New York. I desire to withdraw my objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BURNES].

Mr. HIESTAND. I demand the regular order.

The SPEAKER. The objection having been renewed, the Chair will take time to investigate and see what has been the practice of the House in similar cases heretofore. Heretofore, so far as the Chair knows, there has never been objection to the request for the recall of a bill from the Senate. It may be the question has never yet been presented to the House.

The tellers will take their places in reference to the report of the committee of conference on the deficiency bill.

Mr. EZRA B. TAYLOR. I move that the House do now adjourn.

The question was put, and the Chair declared that the noes seemed to have it.

Mr. EZRA B. TAYLOR. I demand a division.

The House divided; and there were—ayes 8, noes 37.

So the House refused to adjourn.

Mr. BAKER, of New York. What is the present status of the request of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BURNES] in reference to the electoral count?

The SPEAKER. It was objected to.

Mr. LAWLER. I desire to present a privileged report.

The SPEAKER. There is one before the House.

Mr. HIESTAND. I withdraw the motion for the regular order.

The SPEAKER. Objection having been withdrawn, the question recurs on the request made by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BURNES] for the adoption of the resolution which the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That the Clerk of the House request the Senate to have returned to the House the bill S. 3620, a motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed having been made.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE, of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I think it is far more important that bill should pass than that the deficiency bill should pass. The election of the President may depend on the passage of that bill, and I therefore must object.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will look into the question and determine what the practice of the House has been.

Mr. DOUGHERTY. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw the demand for a further count.

The SPEAKER. The point of order being withdrawn, the Chair will announce the result of the vote.

The tellers report—ayes 51, noes 1.

So, no further count being demanded, the conference report was agreed to.

Mr. BURNES moved to reconsider the vote by which the conference report was adopted, and also moved that the motion to reconsider be laid on the table.

The latter motion was agreed to.

MARGARET KENNEDY.

Mr. LAWLER. I wish to submit a privileged report. This report is signed by the committee on the part of the Senate and the House, except Mr. BROWER, who was not in the city.

The report was read, as follows:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 307) for the relief of Margaret Kennedy, having met, after full and free conference have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its amendment.

W. J. STONE,
FRANK LAWLER,
Managers on the part of the House.
WM. M. STEWART,
JOHN C. SPOONER,
JAMES K. JONES,
Managers on the part of the Senate.

The conference report was adopted.

Mr. LAWLER moved to reconsider the vote by which the conference report was adopted; and also moved that the motion to reconsider be laid on the table.

The latter motion was agreed to.

ORDER OF BUSINESS.

Mr. PLUMB. Mr. Speaker, I rise to a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. PLUMB. I wish to know whether on to-morrow the Committee on Labor will have an additional hour on this same question?

The SPEAKER. The Committee on Labor will have on to-morrow, or whenever that character of business is reached, an hour to complete the consideration of the bill before the House.

YANKTON AND MISSOURI RIVER RAILROAD.

Mr. PEEL submitted the following conference report:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 7547) entitled "A bill granting the right of way to the Yankton and Missouri River Railway through the Yankton reservation in Dakota," having met, after full and free conference have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the Senate amendment numbered 1.

That the title be agreed to as proposed by the Senate.

S. W. PEEL,
KNUTE NELSON,
Managers on the part of the House.
H. L. DAWES,
O. H. PLATT,
JAMES K. JONES,
Managers on the part of the Senate.

The statement submitted by the House conferees was read, as follows:

The managers appointed on the part of the House upon the disagreement of the House to the Senate amendments to House bill 7547, entitled "A bill granting the right of way to the Yankton and Missouri River Railway through the Yankton reservation in Dakota," respectfully report: That the Senate amendment to said bill constitutes after the title an entire new bill. But inasmuch as the restrictions upon the railway company are increased, and the interests of the Indians are equally or better protected by the said amendment, your committee recommend concurrence therein. The bill as presented provides that the proposed railway shall pay to the Indians whatever damages they sustain in consequence of the appropriation of their lands, etc., for the construction of the road, the amount to be ascertained in such manner as the President may determine, and to pay in addition thereto the sum of $15 per mile per annum to the Indians.

And further, that said road shall at all times be under the control of the Congress of the United States until the said Territory is admitted into the Union as a State, and then to be under the control of the said State.

S. W. PEEL,
K. NELSON,
Managers on the part of the House.

The report was adopted.

Mr. PEEL moved to reconsider the vote by which the conference report was adopted; and also moved that the motion to reconsider be laid on the table.

The latter motion was agreed to.

ADJOURNMENT.

Mr. McMILLIN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

Mr. LANHAM. Pending that, I move that when the House adjourns to-day it adjourn to meet on Friday next.

The motion was agreed to.

The motion of Mr. MCMILLIN was then agreed to; and accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 40 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until Friday next.

PRIVATE BILL INTRODUCED AND REFERRED.

Under the rule private bill of the following title was introduced and referred as indicated below:

By Mr. RICE: A bill (H. R. 11584) for the relief of Florida Kennerly—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

PETITIONS, ETC.

The following petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk, under the rule, and referred as follows:

By Mr. ABBOTT: Petition of heirs of David and Barbette Carb, of Tarrant County, Texas, for reference of their claim to the Court of Claims—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. PHELAN: Petition of Mrs. C. A. Russell, administratrix of B. B. Neville, of Shelby County, and of M. E. Eubanks, heir of Ann B. McGowan, of Hardeman County, Tennessee, for reference of their claims to the Court of Claims—to the Committee on War Claims.

SENATE.

THURSDAY, *October* 11, 1888.

Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. J. G. BUTLER, D. D.

The Journal of yesterday's proceedings was read and approved.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

Mr. CULLOM presented the petition of Thomas S. Hasler, late surgeon of Company K, Fifty-fifth Regiment Ohio Infantry Volunteers, praying to be allowed a pension; which was referred to the Committee on Pensions.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES.

Mr. SAWYER, from the Committee on Pensions, to whom were referred the following bills, reported them severally without amendment and submitted reports thereon:

A bill (H. R. 2702) granting a pension to Mary Ann Shock;

A bill (H. R. 10515) to increase the pension of William Gallagher;

A bill (H. R. 5751) for the relief of Margaret M. Hatch; and

A bill (H. R. 7887) granting an increase of pension to Jonathan C. Harrison.

CHINESE EXCLUSION.

Mr. ALLISON. I am instructed by the Committee on Appropriations to report favorably without amendment the bill (H. R. 11581) making an appropriation for the enforcement of the Chinese exclusion act. I should like to have the bill passed now, if there is no objection.

By unanimous consent, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill for the purpose of carrying into effect the provisions of the act approved October 1, 1888, entitled "An act a supplement to an act entitled 'An act to execute certain treaty stipulations relating to Chinese,' approved the 6th day of May, 1882," and for defraying the expenses which may be incurred in the enforcement of that act by the Secretary of the Treasury during the fiscal year 1889 the sum of $50,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary, is appropriated by the bill.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

BILLS INTRODUCED.

Mr. CAMERON introduced a bill (S. 3627) to increase the pension of John B. Davis; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 3628) granting an increase of pension to Emma Biddle; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 3629) for the relief of the heir or heirs of John Howard Payne; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Claims.

REDUCTION OF LETTER-POSTAGE.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. If there are no resolutions, concurrent or other, the order of morning business is closed.

Mr. MITCHELL. There is a bill on the table which I had the honor of introducing on the 17th of September, relating to the reduction of letter-postage. If agreeable to the Senate, I ask that it be taken up for the purpose of enabling me to submit some brief remarks upon it.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The bill will be read.

The Secretary read as follows:

A bill (S. 3558) to reduce letter-postage to 1 cent per ounce.

Be it enacted, etc., That from and after March 4, 1889, the rates of letter-postage shall be as follows: On all letters weighing 1 ounce or less, the postage from any point or place in the United States to any other point or place within the limits of the United States, and on all drop-letters, shall be 1 cent, and for each additional ounce or fraction thereof the postage shall be 1 cent additional.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. If there be no objection, the bill is before the Senate, and the Senator from Oregon will proceed.

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. President, before moving a reference of this bill to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads, I desire to submit a few observations for the consideration of that committee and of the Senate.

Cheap postage on letters is something that interests every man, woman, and I might perhaps with propriety say, every child in the United States; especially are the business communities, as well as those who are poor, interested in having letter-postage as low as possible. In considering this subject, of course it is proper that the revenues of the Post-Office Department should be taken into account; and while, in my judgment, it never was expected that the Post-Office Department in this country would be self-sustaining, nor is there in either law or logic any very good reason why it should be, especially at the sacrifice, either total or partial, of the interests of the great masses of the people, any more than the War, Navy, or Interior Departments should be self-sustaining, at the same time it is well we should look to the practical effect in the matter of revenues and the interests of tax-payers generally, of any proposed law looking to a reduction of letter-postage.

There was evidently a radical difference in intention between those who framed the articles of confederation and the framers of our Constitution. Under the former it is plainly to be observed it was expected the Department would be self-supporting, while under the latter it is quite apparent there was upon the part of those who established our present Government an entire absence of all expectation of self-support.

The great fundamental idea upon which the postal system of the United States rests is not that of revenue—as is the case in most European countries—but to disseminate intelligence, accommodate the people, encourage trade, aid commerce, strengthen the ties of friendship and social intercourse, and give stability and vitality to the social, business, and political fabric.

In most of the countries of Europe the main object of the postal service is to produce revenue; we see, consequently, in England, that out of gross receipts amounting to £8,705,337, on money-order and postal business proper, during the year ending March 31, 1888, a net revenue of £2,771,517, or nearly $14,000,000, was realized; in Germany, that out of gross receipts from all branches of the postal service, amounting to 252,933,664 francs, in the year ending March 31, 1887, a net revenue of 34,088,665 francs, or over $6,800,000, was realized; and in France, that out of gross receipts amounting to 172,945,928 francs, during the year ending December 31, 1886, a net revenue of 33,069,462 francs was realized.

It is, therefore, to the postal service of these countries respectively that they look in a large measure for the revenues necessary to revolve the wheels of government in the various *other* departments of the public service, and it is, therefore, a species of general taxation impressed upon and collected annually from the convenience, the business, and social intercourse, and the means of dissemination of intelligence among the people. It is, in other words, a direct and burdensome tax in these European countries and under these European systems upon those things which can not but be properly classed among the very *essentials* of life.

In the United States it is wholly different. There is no reason whatever that the Post-Office Department in this country should be self-supporting, much less that it should be looked to as a source of revenue to be used in liquidating the ordinary expenses of the Government in other Departments. Taxes from other sources, on the luxuries of life and on those articles of foreign production which come in direct competition with the home products of our own country are more than sufficient to meet the ordinary expenses of the Government, including any annual deficit in the revenues of the Post-Office Department. From these sources of taxation we are to-day confronted with what by some is regarded a dangerous surplus in the national Treasury, and all parties are insisting on a reduction of taxation of from $60,000,000 to $75,000,000.

It may further be said in this connection that our present rates of letter-postage are as cheap, perhaps a fraction cheaper, than are the rates of any other country on the globe. The penny postage of Great Britain is a large fraction higher than our present 2-cent letter-postage, weight, distances, and value of coins considered. But however this may be, if without any serious embarrassment either to the revenues of the Government or the postal service generally in all its varied and important ramifications the rates of letter-postage can be reduced below the present rate of 2 cents for each ounce or fraction thereof, thus extending a most material service to the great body of the American people, then it should be done without any hesitation or unnecessary delay.

We are a progressive nation; none more so—yea, none by a very large percentage so much so among civilized men; and with our progress it is but right that our legislation should gradually tend to reduce, so far as possible, the burdens of the people, and lighten, so far as consistent with good government, the taxes of the masses upon all those articles of general use, which, like letters, must be ranked, not among the

luxuries, but the necessities of life. Especially is the ordinary business letter, as also the every-day letter of social intercourse between separated friends, to be properly ranked among the indispensable necessities of business and social life.

Prior to 1845, forty-three years ago, letter-postage was in this country 25 cents on each letter of a single sheet of paper sent any distance over 400 miles, and 50 cents on a letter containing two sheets of paper a similar distance, and 75 cents on a three-sheet letter. In that year (1845) the first reduction was made by Congress, whereby the letter rate was fixed at 5 cents on all letters going any distance under 300 miles, and 10 cents on all distances over 300 miles; and what was the effect? The increase of letters written and sent was such that, although there was a temporary falling off in the aggregate annual receipts, it was not enough to create a deficiency. Seven years elapsed before another reduction was made. This was in 1851, when letter-postage was reduced from 5 cents to 3 cents, and rates generally on second and third class matter were reduced, and yet, in 1865, there was a surplus in the Post-Office Department of $861,430. In 1882 the surplus was $1,400,000, and in 1883 about $2,000,000. The next reduction in letter-postage was in October, 1883, when the rate of letter-postage was reduced to 2 cents for each half-ounce. This resulted in a deficiency the ensuing fiscal year of about $1,888,601, and in 1885 the deficiency, we are told, was about $7,000,000.

But notwithstanding this great deficiency, a Republican administration intervened again in 1884 in behalf of the masses of the people and of the business interests of the country, and provided that letters not exceeding 1 ounce in weight should go for 2 cents between any points however remote throughout the States and Territories of the Union; and the rates, moreover, on newspapers and periodicals were reduced one-half. Still, notwithstanding this increase in the weight of the letter to be conveyed and the reduction of rates for other matter, the deficiency in 1886 was not as great as in 1885. In the latter year, as we have seen, it was about $7,000,000, while in 1886 it was about $6,930,000, and one year later, in 1887, as we are advised by the report of the Postmaster-General, the deficiency was only about $4,000,000, or nearly $3,000,000 less than that of the previous year—a result brought about mainly by the large increase of mailable matter transmitted through the mails, and also by a very serious and indefensible curtailment of the star-route mail service throughout the States and Territories of the Pacific coast and elsewhere, whereby the people were unjustly deprived of proper mail service.

But not only so. Notwithstanding the decrease in postage rates, the revenues to the Department increased in the fiscal year ending June 30, 1887, $4,840,000 over those of the preceding year. Postmaster-General Vilas in his last annual report says:

> In part arising from an extension of the limits of mailable matter of the fourth class, ordered to meet the requirements of trade, and from the receipts of the special delivery service, but chiefly from the greater employment of all postal facilities consequent upon the rising business prosperity of the country, faithfully reflected in the postal service, the revenues have gained upon the preceding year by nearly $4,840,000, attaining a height never reached before, despite the restrictive operation of various reductions in the rates of postage.

It is true the expenditures of the Post-Office Department for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1888, were largely in excess of those of the preceding year; the expenditures for the year 1887 being $53,723,782, and for the year ending June 30, 1888, $55,723,782, or an increase in one year of $2,717,588. It is furthermore true that the expenditures of this Department were in the fiscal year ending June 30 last in excess of those in the last year of President Arthur's administration—that is, the fiscal year ending June 30, 1885—in the sum of $5,677,547, the expenditures in 1885 being only $50,046,235, while in the fiscal year just closed, June 30, 1888, they were $55,723,782. While this is all undoubtedly true, it is plain that, with a commendable but not parsimonious economy in the administration of the Post-Office Department, in connection with the vast increase of population and business throughout the country and the consequent multiplication of post-offices and of postal business, the deficiency now existing in the Post-Office accounts must, under existing rates, soon give place to a very large surplus. In fact, the late Postmaster-General, Mr. Vilas, while not favoring a present reduction in the rates of letter-postage, so states in his annual report. He says, in speaking of the reduction in the deficiency of last year over that of the previous year and of the great increase of business:

> While the fair augury from our present circumstances gives hope that during the current year it (the deficiency) will nearly if not entirely disappear.

He further says:

> It may, therefore, be fairly affirmed that from the beginning of the current fiscal year (July 1, 1887) the postal service has again become substantially self-sustaining.

This prediction of the late Postmaster-General Vilas in his last annual report, it is true, has not been entirely verified, inasmuch as the Department, instead of showing an entire disappearance of any deficiency for the current year referred to by Mr. Vilas, or that the postal service has from the beginning of the current fiscal year (July 1, 1887) again become self-sustaining, there is an actual deficiency of $2,555,040. Still it is true that although the expenditures are thus largely increased, that is, in the sum of $5,677,547 over those of 1885, the last year of Republican administration—still, owing to the largely increased revenues, it is true the gap between revenue and expenditure is gradually, if not rapidly, growing less, and as has been the case within two or three or four years at most, after all, cases of reduction of the rates of letter-postage, will soon disappear.

And hence it follows that without any detriment whatever to the fiscal operations of the Government in connection with the affairs of the Post-Office Department, and without drawing upon the tax-payers to supply annual deficiencies, and with immense benefit to the great masses of the people, especially the business community, and in another form the indigent classes, a reduction of letter-postage to 1 cent to each 1-ounce letter or fraction thereof, and also including all drop letters, may very properly be made. Such a move would be in the interest of the rapid exchange of intelligence; it would increase and add strength and vigor to business transactions, and tend to the maintenance, perpetuity, and strengthening of those ties of kindred, connecting millions of individuals throughout the length and breadth of our wide domain, and which add strength, stability, and unity to the nation, and by means of all which national prosperity is promoted and the great cause of civilization advanced.

THE HISTORY OF LEGISLATION RELATING TO THE RATES OF LETTER POSTAGE IN THE AMERICAN COLONIES.

It may be interesting, in connection with this proposed legislation, as showing the rapidity of the national growth, to note the first steps taken by the English Parliament looking to the establishment of a regular system of mails in America. The first enactment on this subject was made in the year 1710. It is contained in chapter 10 of the 9th Queen Anne and was an act providing for the establishment of a general post-office for all Her Majesty's dominions and for setting apart a weekly sum out of the revenues thereof, that is of the revenues of the post-office for, to quote the act, "the service of the war and other Her Majesty's occasions."

This act also fixed a schedule of postage rates throughout the English dominions, including, of course, the American colonies. The schedule was lengthy and complicated. It provided, for instance, among other things—

> That on all letters and packets from New York to New London, the chief town in Connecticut, in New England, and from Philadelphia, the chief town in Pennsylvania, and from those places back to New York, the postage should be on a single letter 9 pence; double letter, 1*s.* 6*d.*; treble letter, 2*s.* 3*d.*; a 1-ounce letter, 3*s.*

It also provided—

> That on all letters and packets from New London and Philadelphia to any place not exceeding 50 English miles, and thence back again, the postage should be on a single letter, 4*d.*; double letter, 8*d.*; treble, 1*s.*, and on an ounce letter, 1*s.* and 4*d.*

The next important step was taken in 1765 (chapter 25 of 5 George III), which was an act to alter certain rates of postage and to amend, explain, and enlarge several provisions in an act made in the ninth year of the reign of Queen Anne, and in other acts relating to the revenue of the post-office.

LEGISLATION AS TO LETTER POSTAGE BY THE CONTINENTAL CONGRESS.

The next important legislation in reference to this general subject of postal service in America was the act of the Continental Congress of July 26, 1775. This act provided that a Postmaster-General should be appointed for the United Colonies, who should hold his office at Philadelphia and should be allowed a salary of $1,000 per annum for himself and $340 per annum for a secretary and comptroller, with power to suggest so many deputies as to him might seem proper and necessary.

This act also provided that a line of posts should be appointed, under the direction of the Postmaster-General, from Falmouth in New England to Savannah in Georgia, with as many cross-posts as he should think fit.

This act further provided an allowance to the deputies in lieu of salary and of contingent expenses of 20 per cent. on the sums they collected and paid into the general post-office annually when the whole was under or not exceeding $1,000 and 10 per cent. for all sums above $1,000 a year.

It was also recommended by the Continental Congress that the Postmaster-General should establish a weekly post to South Carolina. The Journals of the Continental Congress further show that on that date (July 26, 1775), the Congress proceeded to the election of a Postmaster-General for one year and until another should be appointed by a future Congress, at which election Benjamin Franklin was unanimously chosen Postmaster-General.

By the act of the Continental Congress of April 16, 1779, the then rates of postage, which were fixed by chapter 10, 9 Queen Anne, in 1710, were doubled.

The next change in postal rates is to be found in a resolution of the Continental Congress of December 28, 1779, by which it was provided that the rate of postage until the further orders of Congress should be, "twenty prices upon the sums paid in the year 1775." Five months later, on May 5, 1780, by a resolution adopted on that date, the rates of postage were doubled. This act also provided as follows:

> That all masters of packets and other vessels in Continental service be, and they are hereby, required to lodge whatever letters they bring from abroad, in the post-office nearest to the port where they shall arrive and immediately after their arrival.

While on December 12, 1780, it was provided by a resolution of the Continental Congress as follows:

That the rates of postage on letters be fixed at half the rates paid at the commencement of the war.

This resolution further provided as follows:

That the post-riders to the eastward during their necessary stay at Fishkill have their horses kept in the public stables, and that a reasonable deduction be made from their pay for the forage they shall be supplied with.

And it was further ordered:

That the Postmaster-General order the post-riders to travel through Connecticut at a distance from the sea shore in such a manner as may render them secure from attempts of a like nature with that which lately happened at Stratford, in that State.

It would seem from this that the people of Connecticut in and about Stratford had about that time, 1780, been interfering in some way with the English mail service in this country.

The next change made by the Continental Congress in postage on letters was by resolution of October 19, 1781, when it was resolved as follows:

That the price to be paid for the postage of letters be reduced to what it was at the commencement of the present war.

This resolution authorized the Postmaster-General—

To allow the several postmasters such commission per cent. as he should think their respective services merit, so that the said commissions did not in the whole exceed 20 per cent.; and, further, that he cause the mail to be carried with all dispatch once a week; and, still further, that from and after the 1st day of December next (1871) all express riders on constant pay be dismissed from the public service.

This state of the postal service, in so far as the rates of postage on letters were concerned, continued for one year, until October, 1782, when a lengthy enactment upon the subject of the mail service in this country, entitled "An ordinance for regulating the post-office of the United States of America," was passed. By this ordinance the rates of postage on letters to and from the different post-offices within the United States were as follows, in pennyweights and grains of silver, estimating each pennyweight at five-ninetieths of a dollar, to wit: For any distance not exceeding 60 miles, 1 pennyweight 8 grains; upwards of 60 and not exceeding 100 miles, 2 pennyweights; upward of 100 and not exceeding 200 miles, 2 pennyweights 16 grains; and so on, 16 grains advance for every 100 miles. These were the inland rates; other rates were provided for foreign mail matter.

The next change in the letter postal rates in this country was brought about by a resolution of Congress on October 20, 1787, when it was resolved as follows:

That the Postmaster-General be, and he is hereby, authorized and instructed to alter the present rates of postage so as to reduce them as nearly 25 per cent as will consist with the present mode of calculating pennyweights and grains of silver, in order to reduce them to the currencies of the several States, and that he make the necessary arrangements so that the new rates may take place on the 5th day of April next.

This resolution also provided as follows:

Whereas large packets would frequently be sent by post if a proportionably less rate of postage were charged for them than for letters: Therefore,

Resolved, That the Postmaster-General be, and he hereby is, authorized to fix such rates per pound weight for the carriage of such packets as he may judge will be most likely to induce persons to send such by post.

LETTER POSTAL LEGISLATION UNDER THE PRESENT GOVERNMENT.

The history of legislation in reference to the rates of letter postage in this country since the adoption of our Constitution is very interesting and may very properly be considered with profit in connection with the consideration of the pending measure looking to the reduction of postage on letters to 1 cent per ounce, and especially with reference to the question already briefly referred to, that of the effect of the several reductions on the revenues of the Post-Office Department.

The act of February 20, 1792, was the first act under our present Constitution fixing the rates of postage on domestic letters. That act established the following rates, to take effect on the 1st day of June, 1792. Section 9 provided—

For every single letter not exceeding 30 miles, 6 cents; for every single letter over 30 miles and not exceeding 60 miles, 8 cents; for every single letter over 60 miles and not exceeding 100 miles, 10 cents; for every single letter over 100 miles and not exceeding 150 miles, 12½ cents; for every single letter over 150 miles and not exceeding 200 miles, 15 cents; for every single letter over 200 miles and not exceeding 250 miles, 17 cents; for every single letter over 250 miles and not exceeding 350 miles, 20 cents; for every single letter over 350 miles and not exceeding 450 miles, 22 cents; and for every single letter over 450 miles, 25 cents.

This act also provided that for every double letter double these rates should be paid, and for every triple letter triple such rates.

The next change in rates of domestic letter-postage was made by section 7 of the act of March 2, 1799. That act established a general post-office at the seat of Government of the United States, and provided that—

For every letter composed of a single sheet of paper conveyed not exceeding 40 miles, 8 cents; over 40 miles and not exceeding 90 miles, 10 cents; over 90 miles and not exceeding 150 miles, 12½ cents; over 150 miles and not exceeding 300 miles, 17 cents; over 300 miles and not exceeding 500 miles, 20 cents; over 500 miles, 25 cents.

By this act a letter containing two pieces of paper was designated as "a double letter," and double the above rates of postage were to be paid. A letter containing three pieces of paper was designated as "a triple letter," and on which triple the above rates were to be paid.

This act also, in section 13, authorized postmasters—

to pay mail-carriers 1 cent for each way-letter delivered to them, also mail-carriers authorized to demand and receive 2 cents in addition to the ordinary postage for every letter delivered by them to persons living between post-offices on their route.

The next change in the rates of postage on letters was made by section 11 of the act of April 30, 1810, and was as follows:

A letter containing a single sheet of paper to be sent—	Cents.
Forty miles	8
From 40 to 90 miles	10
From 90 to 150 miles	12½
From 150 to 300 miles	17
From 300 to 500 miles	20
And all over 500 miles	25

On double letters, or two pieces of paper double, these rates were charged, and on triple, or three pieces of paper, triple rates.

The thirty-fourth section of this act also provided that the rate of postage on drop or local letters should be 1 cent each.

Another change in the rates of letter-postage was made by section 1 of the act of April 9, 1816, which provided that rates of postage after May 1, 1816, should be as follows:

Every letter composed of a single sheet of paper—	Cents.
Less than 30 miles	6
Over 30 miles and not exceeding 80 miles	10
Over 80 miles and not exceeding 150 miles	12½
Over 150 miles and not exceeding 400 miles	18½
Over 400 miles	25

Every double letter composed of two pieces of paper double these rates, and for every triple letter, or three pieces of paper, triple these rates.

This was, it will be perceived, a slight increase in the rates of letter-postage over those provided by the act of April 30, 1810.

The next legislation in reference to letter-postage was that of section 13 of the act of March 3, 1825. The rates, however, fixed by this act were substantially similar to those of the act of April 9, 1816. This act also provided that on all drop or local letters delivered at the post-office 1 cent each should be paid.

The next material change in the rates of domestic letter-postage in this country was made by section 1 of the act of March 3, 1845, and was in substance as follows:

For every single letter in manuscript, or marks and signs, by mail, under 300 miles, 5 cents; over 300 miles, 10 cents; double letter, double rates; treble letter, treble rates; quadruple letter, quadruple rates; and every letter or parcel not exceeding one-half ounce in weight shall be deemed a single letter, and every additional weight of one-half ounce or less shall be charged with an additional single postage. Drop or local letters shall be charged a postage rate of 2 cents each.

This act went into effect July 1, 1845.

This is the first legislation, it will be perceived, by which the rate of letter-postage on letters was based partly on the weight of the letter sent. The act still maintained distance sent as an element, but reduced the schedule from a number of distances as recognized in all previous legislation to simply two measures of distance; that is to say, all distances under 300 miles and all distances over 300 miles.

MAIL SERVICE ON THE PACIFIC COAST.

The first postal legislation looking specially to the establishment of a proper postal service on the Pacific coast is to be found in the act of March 3, 1847. By section 1 of this act, which was entitled "An act to establish certain post-routes, and for other purposes," the following post-routes were established on the Pacific coast. I quote from the act:

From Oregon City, via Fort Vancouver and Fort Nisqually, to the mouth of Admiralty Inlet.

And—

From Oregon City, up the Willamette Valley, to the Kalamet River in the direction of San Francisco.

The act further provided in this wise:

The above routes shall go into operation July 1, 1847, or sooner should the funds of the Department justify the same.

Section 6 of this act (March 3, 1847) also provided as follows:

That the Postmaster-General be, and he is hereby, authorized to contract for transporting a mail from Charleston, S. C., to Chagres, touching at St. Augustine and Key West, and also at Havana, in the Island of Cuba, if deemed expedient, and across the Isthmus to Panama, and from thence to Astoria, or the mouth of the Columbia River, touching at Monterey, San Francisco, and such other places on the coast as the Postmaster-General may direct; the mail to be carried from Charleston to Chagres, and from Panama to Astoria, in steam-ships, and to be transported each way once every two months, or oftener as the public service may require.

By section 7 of this act the Postmaster-General was authorized to establish a post-office and appoint a deputy postmaster at Astoria, Oregon, and at such other places on the coast of the Pacific within the territory of the United States as the public interests may require. That act also provided that—

All letters conveyed to or from—	Cents.
Chagres should be	20
Havana	12½
Panama	30
Astoria	40
Any other place on the Pacific	40

It was, moreover, by virtue of the provisions of this act (March 3, 1847) that the postage-stamp was first introduced to the letter-senders of the United States. Section 11 provided as follows:

That to facilitate the transportation of letters in the mail, the Postmaster-

General be authorized to prepare postage-stamps which, when attached to any letter or packet, shall be evidence of the payment of the postage chargeable on such letter.

The next reduction in letter postage was made by the act of March 3, 1851, section 1 of which act provided that the letter-postage rates should be as follows:

For every single letter, in writing, marks, or signs, by mail, not exceeding 3,000 miles, prepaid postage, 3 cents; not prepaid, 5 cents; for any greater distance, double these rates.

This act went into effect July 1, 1851.

The next reduction in letter postage was made by the act of March 3, 1855. Section 1 of that act provided that in lieu of the rates of postage then in force, the rate should be as follows:

For every single letter, in manuscript or paper of any kind, in writing, marks, or signs, conveyed in the mail between places in the United States, not exceeding 3,000 miles, 3 cents; and for any greater distance, 10 cents; for a double letter, double rates; treble letter, treble rates; quadruple letter, quadruple rates.

This act also provided that every letter or parcel not exceeding one-half ounce in weight should be deemed a single letter, and every additional weight of one-half ounce or less should be charged an additional rate.

This act also provided that all postage should be prepaid, and that postage on drop or local letters should be 1 cent each.

The act of April 3, 1860, provided in section 2 that postage on drop or local letters delivered by carriers should be 1 cent each.

The next change in postal rates on letters was made by the act of February 22, 1861, section 17 of which provided that the rate of letter-postage between any State or Territory east of the Rocky Mountains and any State or Territory on the Pacific should be 10 cents for every one-half ounce.

It was also provided by the act of March 2, 1861, section 9, that contractors on the overland route to San Francisco shall be—

required to run a pony-express during the continuance of their contract or until the completion of the overland telegraph, at certain times, carrying for the Government free of charge 5 pounds of mail-matter, with the liberty of charging the public, for transportation of letters by said express, not exceeding $1 for one-half ounce; to commence before the 25th day of March, 1862, and expire July 1, 1864.

By the act of March 3, 1863, the first regular division into classes of mailable matter was made. That act divided mailable matter into three classes: First class, letters; second class, regular printed matter; third class, miscellaneous matter.

This act also fixed the uniform single rate of postage at 3 cents prepaid by stamp for all distances.

The act of March 3, 1865, section 15, fixed the prepaid postage on drop-letters at all offices except free delivery, at 1 cent; while the act of June 8, 1872, section 157, established the postage on drop or local letters at letter-carrier offices at 2 cents the half-ounce or fraction thereof, and 1 cent the half-ounce or fraction thereof at all other offices.

By this act, furthermore (section 170), the first provision was made in this country for the issue and transmission of postal-cards at 1 cent each.

By the act of March 3, 1879, letter rates of postage were fixed at 3 cents on each half-ounce, or fraction thereof, postal-cards at 1 cent, and drop-letters at the rate of 2 cents per half-ounce or fraction thereof, including delivery at letter-carrier offices; and 1 cent for each half-ounce or fraction thereof where free delivery by carrier is not established.

The next important and most radical reduction in the rates of letter-postage was made by the act of March 3, 1883, the act having been passed by a Republican Congress and signed by President Arthur, whereby letter-postage was reduced one-third, or from 3 cents to 2 cents for each half ounce. This act took effect October 1, 1883.

But not only so. On the last day of the last Republican administration, on March 3, 1885, another reduction of one-half the then existing rates was brought about by the approval on that day by President Arthur of an act providing that on and after July 1, 1885, letter-postage should be charged at the rate of 2 cents for each *ounce* or fraction thereof. Prior to that the rate was 2 cents on each *half* ounce.

It will be observed the most important changes in the matter of reductions of postage on letters occurred in the years 1845, 1851, 1855, 1863, 1883, and 1885. It is well to observe a little more carefully what effect in respect of the revenue was produced by these several reductions of letter-postage.

The postal revenues, for instance, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1845, the year immediately preceding the reduction made by the act of March 3, 1845, were $4,439,841.80, while the revenue for the fiscal year succeeding that of 1846, being the first year after the adoption of the reduced rate, the revenues were $4,089,089.97, showing a reduction of only $350,751.83, while in the next five succeeding years the average annual postal revenues amounted to $5,158,078.05, or an increase on the average annually for these five years of $718,236.25.

The following table gives the yearly gross postal revenues for these five fiscal years:

For the fiscal year—	
1847	$4,013,447.14
1848	4,161,077.85
1849	4,705,176.28
1850	5,499,986.66
1851	6,410,604.33

In the case of the next material reduction in letter-postage, that of the act of March 3, 1851, by which the 5 and 10 cent rates for inland letters, established by the act of March 3, 1845, were reduced to 3 cents prepaid and 5 cents unpaid for any distance under 3,000 miles, and double said rates for distances over 3,000 miles, there was really a marked increase in the revenues from the very start.

The postal revenues for the year 1852 were $6,925,971.28 as against $6,410,604.33 the preceding year under the old rates, being an increase, as will be seen, of $515,366.95, while the average yearly postal revenues for the three succeeding years, 1853, 1854, and 1855, were $6,749,482.35, or an average increase of $338,878.02 over the revenues of 1851.

Coming to consider the effect of the next material reduction in letter-postage, that of the act of March 3, 1855, we find there was a material increase in the revenues as will be seen from the following statement:

The postal revenues for the fiscal year 1856, being the first year after the adoption of the reduced rates fixed by the act of March 3, 1855, were $7,620,821.66 as against $7,352,136.13 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1855, the year preceding the reduction in letter postage, showing an increase in the revenue the first year after the decrease in the rates of letter-postage of $268,685.53.

So, too, with the reduction made by the act of March 3, 1863, whereby a uniform letter rate of 3 cents was fixed for all distances. We find that for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1863, the postal revenues were $11,163,789.59, while for the next succeeding year under the reduced rates the postal revenues were $12,438,253.78, or an increase of $1,274,464.19; while in the second year subsequent to this reduction of letter-postage, that of 1865, the gross postal revenues were $14,566,158.70, or an increase over those of the fiscal year 1863, the year immediately preceding this reduction of $3,392,369.11.

I here insert the following table showing the yearly gross revenues and expenditures of the Post-Office Department for the last ninety-eight years, commencing with the year 1790, and from which it will appear at a glance that through all these several reductions in the rates of letter-postage (and there were still greater reductions from time to time in the postage on second and third class matter, and which I have not cited or discussed) there has been a gradual and marvelously rapid increase each year in the gross revenues of the Post-Office Department, the gross annual revenues to-day being more than six times greater than they were thirty years ago:

United States postal statistics, 1790–1888.

Years.	Revenue of the Department.	Expenditure of the Department.	Years.	Revenue of the Department.	Expenditure of the Department.
1790	$37,935	$32,140	1840	4,543,522	4,718,236
1791	46,284	35,657	1841	4,407,726	4,499,528
1792	67,443	54,530	1842	4,546,849	5,674,752
1793	104,746	72,039	1843	4,296,225	4,374,754
1794	128,947	89,972	1844	4,237,288	4,296,513
1795	160,629	117,903	1845	4,289,841	4,320,732
1796	195,066	131,571	1846	3,487,199	4,084,297
1797	213,998	150,114	1847	3,955,893	3,979,570
1798	232,977	169,084	1848	4,371,077	4,326,850
1799	264,846	188,037	1849	4,905,176	4,479,049
1800	280,804	213,994	1850	5,552,971	5,212,953
1801	320,442	231,248	1851	6,727,867	6,278,402
1802	327,044	269,895	1852	6,925,971	7,108,459
1803	351,822	288,988	1853	5,940,725	7,982,957
1804	389,449	337,502	1854	6,935,596	8,577,424
1805	421,373	377,397	1855	7,342,136	9,968,342
1806	446,105	412,233	1856	7,620,822	10,465,286
1807	478,762	453,885	1857	8,053,952	11,508,053
1808	495,564	462,828	1858	8,186,703	12,722,470
1809	506,633	498,412	1859	8,668,484	15,754,093
1810	552,366	495,969	1860	8,518,067	19,170,610
1811	587,246	499,098	1861	8,349,296	13,606,759
1812	649,208	540,165	1862	8,299,821	11,125,364
1813	703,154	681,011	1863	11,163,789	11,314,207
1814	730,370	727,126	1864	12,438,254	12,644,786
1815	1,043,065	748,121	1865	14,556,159	13,694,728
1816	951,782	804,422	1866	14,388,986	15,352,079
1817	1,002,973	916,515	1867	15,237,027	19,235,483
1818	1,130,235	1,035,832	1868	16,292,604	22,730,593
1819	1,204,737	1,117,861	1869	18,344,541	23,698,131
1820	1,111,927	1,160,926	1870	19,772,321	23,998,837
1821	1,059,087	1,184,283	1871	20,037,645	24,380,104
1822	1,117,490	1,167,572	1872	21,915,436	26,658,191
1823	1,130,115	1,195,995	1873	22,996,742	29,004,946
1824	1,197,758	1,188,019	1874	26,477,672	32,136,475
1825	1,306,325	1,229,043	1875	29,791,399	33,611,309
1826	1,447,703	1,366,712	1876	27,805,908	38,293,488
1827	1,524,633	1,468,999	1877	27,468,323	33,486,322
1828	1,659,915	1,689,945	1878	29,277,517	34,105,084
1829	1,707,418	1,782,132	1879	30,041,993	33,449,808
1830	1,850,583	1,932,708	1880	33,315,479	36,542,801
1831	1,997,811	1,936,122	1881	36,785,398	39,251,736
1832	2,258,570	2,266,171	1882	41,883,005	40,482,021
1833	2,617,011	2,939,414	1883	45,508,666	43,282,944
1834	2,823,749	2,910,605	1884	45,335,959	47,224,560
1835	2,993,356	2,757,350	1885	42,560,844	50,046,235
1836	3,408,323	3,841,766	1886	43,948,433	51,004,744
1837	4,236,779	3,544,630	1887	48,837,609	53,006,194
1838	4,238,733	4,430,662	1888	*53,173,742	*55,723,782
1839	4,484,657	4,636,536			

*In these amounts the business of the last quarter of the fiscal year ending June 30, 1888, has been estimated.

THE POSTAL SERVICE IN GREAT BRITAIN.

A similar lesson as to the effect of reduced postal rates resulting in largely increased postal revenues is gleaned from an examination of the postal service of Great Britain.

The inland rate of letter-postage in the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland was reduced by act of Parliament in 1839 from 4 pence to 1 penny per one-half ounce. This act went into effect on January 10, 1840. It may be interesting to observe the effect on the postal revenues of the United Kingdom from this very large reduction in the rates of letter-postage. The immediate effect of course was a very large increase in the number of letters annually sent; and while for the first few years there was a material falling off in the revenues, it was but a short time until the gross postal revenues of the Government were largely in excess of those in 1839 and preceding years, when the letter-postage was 4 pence. The number of letters delivered in the United Kingdom in 1839, the year preceding the establishment of penny-postage, was reported at 75,907,572, while the number delivered in 1840, the first year after the rate had been reduced to a penny, was 168,768,344, or an increase of 122¼ per cent. The number of letters delivered in 1841, as shown by the statistics, the second year of the reduced postage, was 196,500,191, while in each succeeding year the letters rapidly increased. In 1845 the number was 271,410,789; in 1850, 347,399,197; in 1855, 456,216,171; in 1860, 564,000,000; in 1865, 648,000,000; in 1870, 863,000,000; in 1871, 915,000,000.

Another reduction of one-half on letter-postage was brought about in Great Britain by the act of Parliament of October 5, 1871, by which the standard weight of a single letter was increased from one-half to 1 ounce, the postage remaining the same, 1 penny. The effect of the reduced inland rate of postage on the revenues of the British post-office department, first, by the act of 1839, providing for a penny-postage, and, secondly, by the act of October 5, 1871, increasing the weight of a single letter from one-half to 1 ounce, may be seen from the following table, showing the gross revenues, in pounds, of the British post-office each year, commencing with the year 1838 and ending with the year 1887:

Year.	Gross revenue.	Year.	Gross revenue.
1838	£2,346,278	1875	£5,670,000
1849	2,390,763	1876	5,950,000
1840	1,359,466	1877	6,000,000
1841–1845*	1,658,214	1878	6,150,000
1846–1850*	2,143,717	1879	6,240,000
1851–1855*	2,569,836	1880	6,350,000
1856–1860*	3,135,587	1881	6,700,000
1861–1865*	3,891,568	1882	7,000,000
1866–1870*	4,618,146	1883	7,300,000
1871	4,900,454	1884	7,730,000
1872	4,680,000	1885	7,905,000
1873	4,820,000	1886	8,150,000
1874	5,792,000	1887	8,450,000

*Average for five years.

POSTAL RATES ON LETTERS IN SEVERAL EUROPEAN COUNTRIES.

The following tables will show the present domestic rates of postage for letters in Belgium, France, Germany, Greece, Great Britain, Italy, Netherlands, Portugal, Spain, Sweden, and Switzerland, all of which may be considered with interest and profit in connection with the consideration of this subject:

Domestic rates of postage for letters.

1. BELGIUM.

For a letter not above 15 grams (½ ounce) 10 centimes (2 cents).
For every additional 15 grams, 10 centimes (2 cents).

2. FRANCE.

For a letter not above 15 grams, 15 centimes (3 cents).
For a letter above 15, but not above 30 grams, 30 centimes (6 cents).
For a letter above 30, but not above 45 grams, 45 centimes (9 cents).
For a letter above 45, but not above 60 grams, 60 centimes (12 cents).
For a letter above 60, and not above 75 grams, 75 centimes (15 cents), etc., 15 centimes (3 cents) for every additional 15 grams.

3. GERMANY.

For a letter not above 15 grams, 10 pfennig (2½ cents).
For a letter above 15, and not above 250 grams (8¾ ounces), 20 pfennig (4 cents).
Unpaid letters, 20 pfennig (4 cents) for letters up to 15 grams, and 30 pfennig (6 cents) for all letters above that weight and below 250 grams.

4. GREECE.

For a letter not above 15 grams, 20 lepta (4 cents).
For a letter above 15, and not above 30 grams 40 lepta, (8 cents).
For a letter above 30, and not above 60 grams, 60 lepta (12 cents).
For a letter above 60, and not above 100 grams, 80 lepta (16 cents).
For every additional 100 grams, 80 lepta (16 cents).

5. GREAT BRITAIN.

For a letter not above 1 ounce, 1d. (2 cents).
For a letter above 1 ounce, but not above 2 ounces, 1½d. (3 cents).
For a letter above 2 ounces, but not above 4 ounces, 2d. (4 cents).
For a letter above 4 ounces, but not above 6 ounces, 2½d. (5 cents).
For a letter above 6 ounces, but not above 8 ounces, 3d. (6 cents).
For a letter above 8 ounces, but not above 10 ounces, 3½d. (7 cents).
For a letter above 10 ounces, but not above 12 ounces, 4d. (8 cents).
A letter above the weight of 12 ounces is liable to a postage of 1d. (2 cents) for every ounce, beginning with the first ounce. Thus a letter weighing between 14 and 15 ounces must be prepaid 1s. 3d. (30 cents).

6. ITALY.

For a letter not above 15 grams, prepaid, 20 centesimi (4 cents); unpaid, 30 centesimi (6 cents).
For a letter above 15 and not above 30 grams, prepaid, 40 centesimi (8 cents); unpaid, 60 centesimi (12 cents).
For a letter above 30 and not above 45 grams, prepaid, 60 centesimi (12 cents); unpaid, 90 centesimi (18 cents).
For a letter above 45 and not above 60 grams, prepaid, 80 centesimi (16 cents); unpaid, 1.20 liras (24 cents).
For a letter above 60 and not above 75 grams, prepaid, 1 liras (20 cents); unpaid, 1.50 liras (30 cents).
For a letter above 75 and not above 90 grams, prepaid, 1.20 liras (24 cents); unpaid, 1.80 liras (36 cents).

7. NETHERLANDS.

For a letter not above 15 grams, 5 cents, Dutch (2 cents).
For a letter above 15 and not above 50 grams (1¾ ounces), 10 cents, Dutch (4 cents).
For a letter above 50 and not above 100 grams (3½ ounces), 15 cents, Dutch (6 cents).
For a letter above 100 and not above 150 grams (5 ounces), 20 cents, Dutch (8 cents).
For a letter above 150 and not above 200 grams (7 ounces), 25 cents, Dutch (10 cents).
For a letter above 200 and not above 300 grams (10½ ounces), 30 cents, Dutch (12 cents).
For a letter above 300 and not above 400 grams (14 ounces), 35 cents, Dutch (14 cents).
For a letter above 400 and not above 500 grams (17½ ounces), 40 cents, Dutch (16 cents).
For a letter above 500 and not above 750 grams (26½ ounces), 45 cents, Dutch (18 cents).
For a letter above 750 and not above 1,000 grams (35 ounces), 50 cents, Dutch (20 cents).

8. PORTUGAL.

For every 15 grams, or fraction of 15 grams, 25 reis (2.5 cents).

9. SPAIN.

For a letter not above 15 grams, 25 centimos (5 cents).
For a letter above 15 and not above 30 grams, 35 centimos (7 cents).
For a letter above 30 and not above 45 grams, 45 centimos (9 cents).
And 10 centimos (2 cents) for every additional 15 grams.

10. SWEDEN.

For a letter not above 15 grams, 12 ore (2.2 cents).
For a letter above 15 and not above 125 grams, 24 ore (4.4 cents).
For a letter above 125 and not above 250 grams, 36 ore (6.6 cents).

11. SWITZERLAND.

For a letter not above 15 grams, 10 centimes (2 cents), 20 centimes (4 cents).
For a letter above 15 and not above 250 grams, 20 centimes (4 cents), 40 centimes (8 cents).

THE GREAT DISPROPORTION BETWEEN LETTER RATES AND RATES ON SECOND AND THIRD CLASS MATTER.

While perhaps some forcible reasons may be advanced in favor of the existing disproportion in postage rates as between letter-senders and the publishers of newspapers and periodicals, it is a somewhat startling fact, perhaps not generally known, that while the latter furnish about one-third of the aggregate weight and bulk of the mail matter transmitted through the United States mails, only about one-fortieth, as we learn from the recent report of the late Postmaster-General, of the postal revenues, arises from this source. So that it will be observed that while the first, third, and fourth class mail matter, mainly letters, constitute but two-thirds of the weight and bulk of our entire mails, these classes of mail matter furnish about thirty-nine fortieths of the postal revenues.

While the great advantages to the people arising from the cheap and rapid dissemination of intelligence through newspapers and periodicals can not well be overestimated, with the startling disproportion in the postal revenues made respectively on these different classes of mailable matter, letter postage ought in reason and justice to be reduced. In fact, the first, third, and fourth class mail matter is taxed in postal rates not only a sum far in excess of the cost of the transmission of such matter, but a sum in excess sufficient to meet and more than meet the immense loss that annually necessarily occurs to the Department in the carriage of newspapers and periodicals. In other words, the letter-senders of this nation not only pay, by way of postage on letters sent, the full cost of transmission and handling of letters thus sent, but in addition contribute a large bonus to the publishers of newspapers and periodicals to enable them to send their mail matter through the mails of the country.

It is, however, proper to be stated in this connection that it has been the public policy in this country, and especially has it been the policy of the Republican party, to keep the postal rates on newspapers and periodicals at the lowest possible minimum; and this for the reason, the validity and force of which will be recognized by all, that these are the great vehicles of the dissemination of intelligence among all classes and conditions of people. That such a policy should be continued in the interest of public intelligence, in the universality of current news, public thought, and literature must be conceded by all.

While, therefore, not favoring any increase in the postage on newspapers and periodicals, it would seem reasonably plain that the present wide disproportion in existing rates as between these classes of mail matter should be materially lessened by a reduction of at least *one-half* in the present rates of *letter-postage*, as proposed by the pending bill.

The Republican party in its recent national convention did not fail to give consideration to this important subject. The propriety of reducing postage rates on letter-mail was recognized, and the party was pledged to action in that direction.

The following is one of the planks in the platform of the Republican

party, adopted at Chicago at the recent national convention, and it correctly voices the present prevailing sentiment of the great majority of the people throughout the Republic:

We demand the reduction of letter-postage to 1 cent per ounce.

Inasmuch as the national Democratic platform is silent on this important subject, it is fair to presume the Democratic party, or at least its recognized leaders, who hold its conventions, prepare and adopt its platform, and nominate the Presidential candidate of the party, are opposed to any reduction in the rates of letter-postage. The late Postmaster-General and present Secretary of the Interior, Mr. Vilas, in his late annual message, recorded his opposition to any reduction.

As an humble member, therefore, of the Senate Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads, following out my own convictions on this subject, and in accordance, moreover, with what I believe to be the largely predominating public sentiment on this question, and in accordance, furthermore, with what I believe to be equal, exact justice as between all interested in the transmission of mailable matter throughout the United States, and in consonance with the position assumed by the Republican party in national convention assembled, I have introduced this bill. It provides that from and after March 4, 1889, the rates of letter-postage in the United States shall be 1 cent on each letter weighing not to exceed 1 ounce and 1 cent additional for each additional ounce or fraction thereof—this to apply to all letters transmitted from any post-office in any State or Territory of the United States or the District of Columbia to any other post-office, however near or remote, in that or any other State or Territory of the United States or in such District.

The bill further provides that a similar rate of 1 cent only shall be exacted as postage on each drop letter not exceeding 1 ounce in weight, and an additional cent for each additional ounce or fraction thereof, at any post-office in the United States.

In conclusion, it may perhaps with propriety be said that in the event of the reduction of letter-postage to a 1-cent rate, there is no very good reason why the unit of weight should not also be increased to two ounces; for as the average weight of letters is much less than even one ounce—the present standard—an increase in the unit would not add materially to the weight of the letter mails. Should this be done, fourth-class matter, or merchandise, should then be put on an equality with third-class matter, the rate of postage on which is now 1 cent for two ounces.

With these changes all the present absurd distinctions between first, third, and fourth-class matter would be wiped out. An uniform rate of 1 cent for every 2 ounces of weight would exist on all mail matter except newspapers and periodicals sent to subscribers. The annoyances that so often now result from the detention of matter for insufficient postage could be made to disappear; the temptation to petty fraud by the concealment of written matter in matter of a lower grade would vanish, and absolute privacy could be given to every parcel of matter mailed, for there would no longer be any reason why it should not all be sealed.

For valuable data in connection with the statistics employed by me I must express my grateful acknowledgments to Mr. Madison Davis, the present efficient chief clerk in the office of the Third Assistant Postmaster-General.

Before concluding I also desire to attract attention, by inserting the same in my remarks, to the very interesting and instructive paper upon the subject of letter postage, which I hold in my hand, prepared in 1883 by Hon. A. D. Hazen, then and for many years the very able and efficient Third Assistant Postmaster-General.

It was upon the facts and reasonings mainly of General Hazen contained in this document that the recommendation of President Arthur for a reduction of letter postage from a 3 to a 2 cent rate was based, and which finally led to the act of Congress of March 3, 1883, reducing the letter rate from 3 to 2 cents on each half ounce.

The bill under consideration is a measure destitute of any element of sectionalism. It is free from anything in the nature of partisanship. It is pregnant with material benefit to all classes, races, and conditions; to those of every business, profession, or occupation in life; to the old and young, men and women, rich and poor, native-born and adopted citizen, and to the alien resident or traveler within our borders as well. Its advantages, blessings, and benefits are unrestricted and universal.

APPENDIX.

[Paper submitted to the Postmaster-General by the Third Assistant Postmaster-General for his consideration, November 18, 1882.]

TWO-CENT POSTAGE FOR DOMESTIC LETTERS.

The balance-sheet of the Department for the last fiscal year showed a handsome surplus of receipts over expenditures, and this has occurred but once since 1851, when the letter-rate of postage was reduced to 3 cents. The exception was in the year 1865, when there was a slight profit, owing to the suspension of mail service in the Southern States. During the year ended June 30, 1851, the receipts amounted to $6,410,604.33, and the expenditures to $6,278,401.68. In the year 1852 the receipts were $5,184,526.84 and the expenditures $7,108,459.04, leaving a deficiency of $1,923,932.20, or 27 per cent. to be supplied from the general Treasury.

This deficiency steadily grew, principally by reason of largely increased expenditures, until 1860, nearly one-half of the expenditures for which year were paid out of the Treasury. During the four years of the war, from 1861 to 1865, the receipts fell only 4.7 per cent. short of the expenditures. In 1865 alone, as before indicated, there was a small surplus of receipts. The restoration of service in the Southern States again increased the burden on the Treasury, so that in 1868 28.3 per cent. of the expenditures were supplied from that source. From this point the tendency was generally towards lower deficiencies, but still in 1875 the Treasury contributed 20.2 per cent. of the expenditures. In 1879 the deficiency was 10.1 per cent., and for 1881 the receipts fell 7 per cent. short of the expenditures. This deficiency was not only wiped out during the last year but a surplus of 3.6 per cent. of the receipts will remain after extinguishing all the liabilities for the year. * * *

While the idea that the postal service should be self-supporting has ever been a favorite one with the American people, no claim has ever been seriously entertained that it should be a source of revenue to the General Government. The utmost that has been expected was that its earnings should be sufficient to defray its expenditures. It would scarcely be good policy to permit the earnings of the Department to exceed its outlays in any considerable amount. A large credit balance would tend to encourage lavishness in expenditure and to promote selfish schemes in the name of the public interests. Nothing induces economy so much as a difficulty in making both ends meet. A small mortgage on the homestead is the best incentive to frugality in the domestic habits of the household.

The Department is now on a surely paying business, and as the receipts are increasing at a much greater rate than the expenditures the general Treasury will at an early day, unless there should be a change in the present condition, be a large gainer from the profits of the postal service. If, however, the theory be correct that the earnings should not be permitted to exceed the outlays of the service, the question is squarely presented as to how the balance shall be maintained. If the present profits could be used advantageously to extend facilities and to afford conveniences to the public not now enjoyed, there can be scarcely a doubt of the popular willingness to have them applied in this direction.

Popular as has been the idea of a self-sustaining service, public opinion has ever sanctioned the granting of needful sums from the Treasury rather than the usefulness of the service should be impaired by a lack of means from the postal revenues. But the expenditures for the coming year have been estimated upon the full measure of the public requirements, as well as the same can now be anticipated, and yet they fall considerably short of the estimated revenues. The result promises to be a large increase on the present profits. The time would seem to be auspicious therefore for a reduction in the rates of postage. As to where the reduction should begin is worthy of serious consideration.

For a long series of years past domestic letters have received the least favor in the postal legislation of the country. The present 3-cent rate was fixed in 1851, though letter-writers have been offered a cheaper, if not altogether a satisfactory substitute, by the introduction of the postal-card. On letters addressed to foreign countries the present uniform rate is 5 cents to the countries within the Postal Union, while the average rate to the same countries in 1851 was several times that amount. On newspapers and periodicals to regular subscribers (second-class matter) the present uniform rate of 2 cents per pound is less than one-half of the average of the complex rates existing in 1851.

The reductions on transient newspapers, circulars, and other printed matter have been equally great since that year, being now 1 cent for each 2 ounces. Parcels of merchandise, not exceeding 4 pounds in weight, first admitted into the mails in 1850, are carried at the rate of 1 cent for each ounce. Moreover, many articles now carried at the cheap rates for third and fourth class matter in 1851 were either subject to letter rates of postage or else were excluded from the mails.

Domestic letters transmitted from one post-office to another now yield a minimum revenue of 96 cents per pound (assuming that each letter is up to the full standard of a half ounce in weight); second-class matter 2 cents per pound; third-class matter, 8 cents per pound, and fourth-class matter, 16 cents per pound. Nearly all the official mail matter of the several Executive Departments of the Government is carried in "penalty" envelopes, yielding no revenue to the Post-Office Department. These are the several classes of matter admitted into the mails, and these the charges upon which the Department realizes its revenues. The principal item of cost is for transportation, and the same rates are paid alike for all classes of matter. The cost of handling one class does not differ materially from the cost of handling another class by the employés in post-offices or on the lines of transportation.

It must be obvious, therefore, that the burden of maintaining the service falls most unequally upon letters. Upon what principle of justice this should be so is not easy of comprehension. Following the example of the oldest and best established governments of the world, the founders of the Constitution delegated to the Government a monopoly in the carriage of letters, and the wisdom of their action has gone unquestioned by the people to this day. Competition by private carriers is, however, allowed for all the other classes of matter permitted to go in the mails. So strictly has the monopoly been maintained that, though by act of Congress letters may be carried outside the mails they must be inclosed in Government stamped envelopes, the Government thus exacting its lawful revenue even when not performing any service in connection with the letters. Common fairness would appear to demand, since the Government maintain the exclusive right to do the work, that the charge should be somewhat proportioned to the cost of doing it and that the loss on merchandise, for example, should not be made a tax on correspondence. So, too, it would seem to be just as fair to tax the letter writers of the country, through the medium of their postages, for supplying commissary stores for the Army as for carrying the official mail matter of the War Department.

With reference to the effect of a reduction in the rates of postage the experience of the past may be found instructive. The changes in the rates were comparatively unimportant up to the 1st July, 1845. The rates on letters existing prior to that date were as follows:

For every letter composed of a single sheet of paper conveyed—	Cents.
Not exceeding 30 miles	6
Over 30 and not exceeding 80 miles	10
Over 80 and not exceeding 150 miles	12½
Over 150 and not exceeding 400 miles	18¾
Over 400 miles	25

And for every double letter, or letter composed of two pieces of paper, double these rates, and for every triple letter, or one composed of three pieces of paper, triple these rates; and for every packet composed of four or more pieces of paper, or one or more other articles, and weighing 1 ounce avoirdupois, quadruple these rates, and in that proportion for all greater weights.

The following were the rates fixed to take effect on the 1st July, 1845, namely:

"For every single letter in manuscript, or paper of any kind, by and upon which information shall be asked for or communicated in writing, or by marks or signs conveyed in the mail, for any distance under 300 miles, 5 cents, and for any distance over 300 miles, 10 cents. For a double letter, double these rates; and for a treble letter, treble these rates; and for a quadruple letter, quadruple these rates; and every letter or parcel not exceeding half an ounce in weight shall be deemed a single letter, and every additional weight of half an ounce, or less than half an ounce, shall be charged with an additional single postage."

Taking distance into account it will be observed that the reduction in the charges was very great. The next important reduction was under the act of March 3, 1851, which established the following rates for domestic letters:

"Every single letter, in writing, marks, or signs, by mail, not exceeding 3,000 miles, prepaid postage, 3 cents; not prepaid, 5 cents; for any greater distance, double these rates."

Although a temporary loss of revenue followed these two reductions it was speedily followed in both cases by a large increase.

For several years prior to 1845 the revenues were almost stationary in amount. Indeed, for the four years ended June 30, 1845, the total amount was $304,433.64 less than for the four years immediately preceding that period. For the year ended June 30, 1845, the revenue was $4,249,841.80, and for the next year, under the reduced rates, it was $3,487,199.35, showing a falling off of $802,642.45. For the year 1847 it increased to $3,880,309.23, and for the year 1848 to $4,535,211.10, or $265,369.30 more than for the year 1845, the entire recovery of the loss of revenue from the reduction in the rates having thus occurred within three years. The increase continued at a rapid pace, so that for the year ended June 30, 1851, the revenue was $6,410,604.33, being $2,120,762.53, or 49.4 per cent. more than for the last year (1845) under the old rates, and $2,923,404.98, or 83.8 per cent. more than for the first year (1846) of the new rates.

The immediate loss of revenue by the act of March 3, 1851, was still greater; but this, too, was speedily recovered. The falling off in the first year of the change was $1,226,077.49, the entire receipts for the year ended June 30, 1852, having been $5,184,526.84. For the year ended June 30, 1854, the revenue amounted to $6,255,586.22, or only $155,018.11 less than for the year 1851, the loss by the reduction of the rates having been nearly recovered in three years. For the year 1855 the revenue was $231,531.80 more than for 1851. The increase steadily continued, and for the year ended June 30, 1860, the revenue was swelled to $8,518,067.40, being $2,107,463.07, or 32.8 per cent., more than for the year 1851, and $3,333,540.56, or 64.2 per cent., more than for 1852.

Again: During the eight years from 1837 to 1845 there were no material changes in the rates of postage, and yet the revenue for 1845 was $655,826.41, or 13.2 per cent. less than for 1837, while the revenue for the year ended June 30, 1853, was $660,882.90, or 22.1 per cent. over that of 1845, notwithstanding that both of the great reductions in the rates of postage had occurred during the intermediate eight years.

For the year 1882 the receipts were more than eight times as much as for 1852, and the increase alone for 1882 over 1881 was only $93,514.66 short of the entire receipts for the year ended June 30, 1852, the first year of the 3-cent rate.

Some idea of the immediate loss by a reduction from 3 cents to 2 cents in the rate of letter-postage may be obtained from the issue of the ordinary 3-cent adhesive stamps and stamped envelopes. It is true that many letters calling for more than one rate of postage bear the higher denominations of stamps, but it is also true that many 3-cent stamps are used for parcels of merchandise and other matter not belonging to the first class. The amount of 3-cent stamps used in this way will probably exceed that of the larger stamps used on letters, so that a diminution of 33⅓ per cent. in the value of the 3-cent stamps would represent the maximum loss on an equal volume of business. The number of the ordinary 3-cent stamps and stamped envelopes issued during the fiscal year ended June 30, 1882, was 849,159,950. An increase of 10 per cent. on these would give 934,075,945 as the issue for the current year. This latter number increased by 10 per cent. would give 1,027,483,539 for the next fiscal year. One cent taken from the value of each of these would amount to $10,274,835.39.

This would be the maximum loss for the first year if a reduction in the rate should be made to take effect on the 1st of July next. But there are good reasons for believing that the actual loss would be much less than that amount. In the first place, the issues of stamps were very considerably in excess of the actual sales during the year 1882. This was occasioned in part by the increased number and importance of the post-offices, requiring a heavier stock to be kept on hand, but more largely by the fact that towards the close of 1881 the requisitions from postmasters were greatly curtailed because of insufficient appropriations for the manufacture of stamps and envelopes. The depletion of stock in post-offices in 1881 was accordingly left to be filled up in 1882, making the issues for the latter year unduly excessive. Thus the sales for the year were $39,703,357, while the issues amounted to $40,978,053.42. The 3-cent stamps issued in 1882 must therefore be regarded as an extravagant basis on which to found the present calculation.

The stimulus of a lower rate would be likely to lead at once to a large increase in the number of letters mailed, and it is probable that a cheaper letter rate would tend in a measure to dispense with the use of postal-cards for written correspondence. In view also of the fact that sealed communications invite closer attention by the recipients than do open ones it is not improbable that to some extent circulars would be inclosed under seal at a 2-cent rate.

Taking these special reasons into account the loss of revenue for the first year may be safely put at $8,000,000, leaving the revenue for the year at $42,670,456.27 instead of $50,670,456.27, as already estimated upon the basis of existing rates. The estimate of $42,670,456.27 for 1884 on a 2-cent rate is $3,393,594.89, or 7.3 per cent. less than the estimated revenue for 1883, and it is $794,046.12 more than the actual revenue for 1882.

The estimated expenditures for the coming year aggregate $46,741,111.25, but the actual expenditures will fall considerably short of this sum, because the requirements at best can only be approximated, and common prudence demands that the appropriations recommended should be sufficiently large to prevent possible deficiencies in any of the thirty-eight distinct items covered by the estimates. If these margins should amount to $1,000,000, the actual expenditures would be left at $45,741,111.25, or $3,070,654.98 more than the estimated receipts on the basis of a 2-cent domestic letter rate. The deficiency required from the Treasury for the first year would therefore be about $3,000,000, or less than 7 per cent. of the expenditures.

This deficiency would be fully offset, and the Department placed on a paying basis at once by a fair allowance for the official mail matter of the Government, and by increasing the charge on merchandise to a proper compensation for carrying it. If the reduction should be made to take effect on the 1st January, 1884, there would be no deficiency for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1884, as the profits for the first six months of the year would offset the loss for the last six months.

The estimated deficiency for the year ending June 30, 1884, based on a reduction from the 1st July, 1883, is not a large one, being relatively a little smaller than the deficiency for the year 1881.

The deficiency for the first year, after the reduction of 1845, was 14.4 per cent., and for the first year after the reduction of 1851 it was 27 per cent. The reduction of 1845 was made in the face of the fact that there was a deficiency of $30,890.19, or seven-tenths of 1 per cent., in the revenue for the last year of the old rates. For the last year before the reduction of 1851 the receipts were only $132,202.65, or a little more than 2 per cent., more than the expenditures. The surplus of $1,508,224.94, or 3.6 per cent., shown for 1882, will, without doubt, be fully doubled during the present year, and the proposed reduction in the rate may therefore be made in the light of existing profits of no mean dimensions.

The reduction in the letter rate from 3 to 2 cents would not be proportionately as great as either of the reductions of 1845 or 1851. True, by the reduction of 1845 letters carried less than 30 miles were reduced only from 6 cents to 5 cents; but the 5-cent rate was also made to carry a letter 300 miles, for which the charge was previously 18¾ cents, and the maximum charge was reduced from 25 cents to 10 cents. The act of 1851 reduced the minimum charge from 5 cents to 3 cents, nearly one-half, and enlarged the distance from 300 to 3,000 miles.

Not only is the proposed reduction in the rate much less than the reductions of 1845 and 1851, but a reduction of the letter-rate now would not affect as large a proportion of the revenue as the reductions did then. This is because in 1851 and prior thereto the functions of the mail service were confined to the carriage of letters and printed matter, the latter not even including bound books. Many articles then charged at letter-rates, or not admitted into the mails at all, are now carried as third or fourth class matter, and new sources of revenue have been added by the introduction of the registry and money-order system. Hence letters contribute a much less proportion of the revenue than they did in 1851. Besides, the present recommendation does not contemplate a change in the rates on printed matter, while considerable reductions on this class of matter were effected by the acts of 1845 and 1851, the free circulation of newspapers within the county of publication having been first admitted in 1845.

Unless the experience of past reductions in this and other countries should be at fault in this instance, the reduction now proposed in the letter-rate will be speedily followed by a very large augmentation of business, and it will at no distant day prove to have been an economic measure of the highest importance to the postal service as well as to the public. Although a comparatively small deficit will be encountered at the start, I am fully persuaded that unless there should be unexpected reverses in the prosperity of the country the Department will again be found upon a paying basis within three years from the time of the reduction, even with the burdens imposed by merchandise and the free mail matter of the Government. To prevent too great a loss at once it would perhaps be wise to confine the present reduction to the 3-cent domestic letter-rate; but as soon as the recovery from this reduction shall have taken place the rate on drop-letters will next be entitled to a reduction.

If the proposed reduction should be made at the forthcoming session of Congress, it would be of advantage to the Department not to have it go into operation before the 1st of January, 1884. Not only would this prevent a deficiency during the fiscal year ending June 30 of that year, but it affords sufficient time in which to reduce to a minimum the stock of 3-cent stamps and stamped envelopes in the hands of postmasters. Under the operations of a sudden change a large quantity of these would have to be returned to the Department for destruction. The labor of handling the stock and of adjusting the accounts with postmasters would be no inconsiderable one, to say nothing of the loss in the cost of manufacturing the articles.

I move the reference of the bill to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. SAWYER. I move that Order of Business 161, being a resolution directing the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads to inquire into the advisability of reducing the rate of postage on first-class mail matter, be recommitted to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads.

The motion was agreed to.

MARGARET KENNEDY.

Mr. SPOONER. I present the report of the committee of conference on the bill (S. 307) for the relief of Margaret Kennedy.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The report will be read.

The Secretary read as follows:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 307) for the relief of Margaret Kennedy, having met, after full and free conference have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its amendment.

WM. M. STEWART,
JOHN C. SPOONER,
JAMES K. JONES,
Managers on the part of the Senate.

W. J. STONE,
FRANK LAWLER,
Managers on the part of the House.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The report will be filed. It requires no action on the part of the Senate.

WITHDRAWAL OF PAPERS.

On motion of Mr. WILSON, of Maryland, it was

Ordered, That the heirs and legal representatives of Capt. Lambert Wickes, United States Navy, have leave to withdraw from the files of the Senate all papers filed by them connected with the bill for their relief, on account of pay and prize-money due said Wickes, there having been no adverse report upon said bill.

COOSA RIVER BRIDGE AT GADSDEN, ALA.

Mr. VEST. I move to reconsider the vote by which the Senate yesterday passed the bill (H. R. 11338) to authorize the construction of a bridge across the Coosa River at Gadsden, in the State of Alabama, in order that a mistake may be corrected.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. If there be no objection, the votes by which the bill was passed and ordered to a third reading will be reconsidered.

Mr. VEST. I move to strike out, in line 16 of section 4, the words "said bridge shall not be built."

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The amendment will be stated.

The SECRETARY. In section 4, line 16, after the word "requirements," it is proposed to strike out "said bridge shall not be built;" so as to read:

If the Secretary of War, upon an examination of the papers to him submitted, shall require any change in the location or plans of said bridge, or its entire removal, the company shall, at its own expense, comply with such requirements; and if any change be made in the plan of said bridge such change shall be subject to the approval of the Secretary of War.

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed, and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time, and passed.

Mr. VEST. I move that the Senate insist on its amendments and ask for a conference with the House of Representatives.

The motion was agreed to.

By unanimous consent, the President *pro tempore* was authorized to appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate; and Mr. VEST, Mr. SAWYER, and Mr. CULLOM were appointed.

LIGHT AT CEDAR RIVER POINT.

Mr. SAWYER. I move that the bill (S. 3229) to establish a light at or near Cedar River Point, at the mouth of Cedar River, Green Bay, Michigan, be recommitted to the Committee on Commerce. The appropriation in the bill has gone into the sundry civil bill, so that it is not necessary to pass it.

The motion was agreed to.

CONDITION OF THE CIVIL SERVICE.

Mr. HALE submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Printing:

Resolved by the Senate, That there be printed 10,000 copies of the report of the Select Committee to Investigate the Operations of the Civil Service, and 1,000 copies of the report and testimony, one-half for the use of the committee and one-half for the Senate.

THE REVENUE LAWS.

Mr. ALLISON. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House bill 9051.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 9051) to reduce taxation and simplify the laws in relation to the collection of the revenue.

Mr. CULLOM. Mr. President, the question before the Senate and also before the country is, whether the American system of protection to American labor and our American industries shall be continued or whether the Government shall adopt a policy of free trade, or, what is the same thing in effect, a tariff for revenue only.

I desire to say in the outset that the remarks I shall make will not be confined to a discussion of the items either of the House bill at length or of the Senate Finance Committee's bill, for the reason that I have had but very little time for the consideration of the latter, and for the further reason, I think proper to state, that in my judgment it is utterly impracticable for the Congress of the United States to consider those bills item by item with a view of securing the adoption of either at the present session. Therefore my remarks will be somewhat general, as I have already indicated.

There are three ways by which the necessary revenues for the support of the Government may be raised. By direct taxation, by internal or excise taxes, or by customs duties, or by all three if necessary. Before the late civil war the nation had no internal-tax system. It relied entirely on import duties, except as it received money from the sales of public lands and other small miscellaneous sources. The war made it necessary to resort to every means known to the Constitution for raising revenue. Vast sums of money were raised for the prosecution of the war and the maintenance of the Union. When the struggle for national life ended, the financial emergency soon began to pass away, and in the period which has elapsed since the war the Government has paid much the larger part of the debt thereby incurred, taxes both internal and external have been greatly reduced, and to-day we as a nation are in the extraordinary situation of having a surplus in the Treasury. I will say here by way of remark that it seems to be tolerably difficult to find out just how much that is, and there is some question whether there is any; but it is stated that we have a surplus in the Treasury, no more debt due, and the executive and legislative departments of the Government and the people of the country are also debating the question, what is the best mode of stopping the accumulation of the surplus? Not how to get money in, but how to keep it from coming in too fast. There is no need of temper or excitement in the discussion of this question; it is a question of political economy. It is a question about which good men differ. The thing for the American people to do is to reason together, and in the light of all the facts decide it. The people will decide it at the polls in November, whether we do here or not, and, as I believe, in favor of the Republican party and policy.

The Republican party has always believed in the doctrine of protection. The Democratic party does not believe in a protective tariff, though of late, since the issue has been made, that party has begun by its leaders—Mr. MILLS and others—to talk about the amount of protection their bantling, the so-called Mills bill, gives to the various industries.

The Republican party declares in favor of so framing any act for the collection of duties on imports as to give reasonable protection to our industries and the labor to carry them on, and that the revenue should mainly be collected from imports. The Democratic party does not believe in such doctrine, but insists that the true policy is to look alone to the collection of sufficient revenue, and by whatever tariff laws we have collect the duties from such imports as will produce the most revenue, having no regard to the principle of protection.

The Democracy deny that the protective policy is in the interest of American labor, American industry, or in harmony with the national Constitution.

The Republican party asserts that the tariff policy is in harmony with the Constitution, in harmony with the views of the fathers who made it, and with the views of the statesmen of the first sixty years of the nation's history, with rare exceptions, and that it has resulted in developing the nation's resources, adding immensely to its wealth and vastly benefiting the wage-workers of the country.

Mr. President, in my judgment the adoption of the Cleveland-Mills free-trade policy and the passage of the Mills bill, which is stated to be the President's views crystallized into the form of a statute, would for a time not reduce the surplus, but would put more money into the Treasury from import duties, but finally, by bankrupting the people so that they could not buy either imported or domestic goods, the surplus would disappear, and the nation would commence a system of borrowing money, the business in which the last Democratic administration was engaged before the late war—selling bonds at a discount to pay the current expenses.

Such a magnificent puzzle to other nations as the United States Government, in a quarter of a century after the greatest and most expensive civil war known to modern history, having a great surplus in its Treasury, and having difficulty in stopping its accumulation, would not be heard of again for some time; surely not under the administration of the Government in accord with British ideas on the tariff question. The Republican party discriminates in making a revenue statute for the collection of duties by placing a duty upon articles or property imported the like of which is produced in this country; the theory of a tariff for revenue adhered to by the Democracy is against this. We can not raise coffee or tea in this country, hence we allow coffee and tea to come to our ports and markets free. We can raise wheat and wool, hence we do not allow wheat and wool to be brought into this country without paying a duty.

The Democratic theory, if adhered to, requires that a tax should be collected on importations of coffee, tea, and every other article which we use and do not make or produce, and allow the articles or products the like of which we do produce to come in free, or with as small a duty as can be levied for revenue purposes. The Democratic party, as reflected in its ideas and purposes by the President's message and by the so-called Mills bill, approached as near to the theory of the party as in their judgment they dared and avoid defeat.

Mr. President, the Republican tariff policy is American. The Democratic policy (opposition to protection) is English. The Republican party insists on keeping alive American industries; the Democratic doctrine is that that subject is not to be considered in the consideration and enactment of customs laws. The Republican party seeks to secure good wages to American labor; the Democratic party, in pressing for a tariff for revenue only, insists that laborers will fare as well under its policy of revenue reform as under a protective system.

The Republican party believes in good wages, good living, good homes, good schools, and comfort to the toiling masses, and that a protective tariff will go far in securing such blessings, and points with pride to the facts as proof. How any man can believe in a policy of free trade in this country I confess I am unable to comprehend. The theory of free trade, free seas, buy where you can buy cheapest and sell where you can get the best price, is all very beautiful, but does not work in the practice of nations. The teaching that all the world's akin, and that we should regard the interest of the world outside of our own nation equally with the interests of our own, is pleasant, but nations do not practice it.

The time has not come yet when wars and rumors of wars are not heard, or when the lion and the lamb shall lie down together with the consent of the lamb, or that the world is making much progress toward a condition that will justify the expectation of the millennium very soon. As citizens we look first to our families, to the community in which we live, to our country and flag, last to the great world outside of our own land. We are not called upon to pass by home and country and the welfare of our own people and expend our sympathy and aid and comfort on strangers in other lands, when other nations with which we deal are seeking only the welfare of their own people at the expense of our own.

But if any provide not for his own, and especially for those of his own house, he has denied the faith, and is worse than an infidel.

May not this be borne in mind in enacting laws for our great national household?

Mr. President, let us see what the early history of the country has been on the tariff question. It has been often said that in the very first Congress after Washington became President a law was passed embodying the principles of a protective tariff. The act recited that it was necessary for the support of the Government, for the discharge of its debts, and for the encouragement of manufactures that duties be laid on goods and merchandise imported. "For the encouragement of manufactures" is the language of the first tariff act enacted by the fathers of the Republic and approved and enforced by Washington. It recognized the principles of protection, and the discussion of the subject then has been the foundation of everything that has been said pertinent to the question since; yet in the face of the fact that Washington and other men who aided in framing our great national Constitution enacted the first law incorporating the doctrine of protection, we are told by modern Democracy that a tariff for protection is unconstitutional and robbery.

The early Presidents successively recommended and advocated the doctrine of protection.

Mr. Madison in one of his messages called attention to the expediency of a revision of the tariff, giving reasons why home industry should be protected, declaring that the tariff had hitherto only been of

secondary importance and that in view of the development of the manufacturing and cotton-growing interest it had become a matter of primary consideration.

Mr. Monroe advocated the doctrine of protection, and under his administration the tariff act of 1824 was adopted, which was opposed by the representatives from the Southern States in Congress, but was championed by that great commoner Henry Clay, of Kentucky, whose name will live in history as the powerful advocate of American industry and American labor.

John Quincy Adams advocated a protective tariff, and during his administration the tariff act of 1828 was passed, which brought to the surface the deadly doctrine of secession, or nullification, which at last culminated in rebellion in 1860. Before 1828 Webster had not favored the protective system, but at that time came out for it, and gave as a reason that it had become the established policy of the nation, and he therefore supported it.

So, Mr. President, I might go on giving the views of the earlier statesmen favoring a protective tariff or the American policy.

The Whig platform of 1840, when William Henry Harrison was the candidate for that party and was elected, contained the following declaration:

A tariff for revenue to defray the necessary expenses of the Government and discriminating with special reference to the protection of the domestic labor of the country.

The Whig platform of 1852 declared—

That revenue sufficient for the expenses of the Government in time of peace ought to be derived mainly from a duty on imports and not from direct taxes, and on laying such duties sound policy requires a just discrimination, and when practicable, by specific duties, whereby suitable encouragement may be afforded American industry equally to all classes and to all portions of the country.

This was the doctrine of the statesmen irrespective of party in the nation's early history, especially of Washington, Madison, Monroe, John Quincy Adams, and Jackson among the Presidents, supported by the leading statesmen of their time; so it was the doctrine of Harrison, Taylor, Lincoln, Grant, Hayes, Garfield, and Arthur. In 1832–'33 there was a struggle over the tariff, and from that time the Democratic party, under the lead of the South, began to assert its free-trade ideas more freely, as occasion offered.

The Democratic national convention of 1856 announced that the time had come when the Democratic party should declare itself in favor "of free seas and progressive free trade throughout the world." The party carried the election. A Pennsylvania Democrat was elected; the South controlled him, and the country had free trade and free bankruptcy to its heart's content for the succeeding four years. Every man, woman, and child almost is familiar with the condition of the country when Buchanan surrendered and Lincoln took charge of the executive department of the Government. The nation was bankrupt, discredited, and disgraced, the people were poor, the mills and factories were closed, mechanics and laborers were idle, and the farmers had no market for their products—either grain, hogs, horses, or cattle—except at the merest nominal price.

The Republican party in 1860, in national convention, declared—

That while providing for revenue for the support of the General Government by duties on imports, sound policy requires such an adjustment of these imports as to encourage the development of the industrial interests of the whole country.

The policy of the Republican party to-day, by its platform and by its legislation, is to encourage the development of the industrial interests of the whole country. The platform of the Republican party in 1872 declared—

That the law for raising revenue by duties on importations should be so adjusted in its details as to aid in securing remunerative wages to labor and promote the industries, prosperity, and growth of the whole country.

The platform of 1876 of the Republican party provided—

That the revenue necessary for the current expenditures and the obligations of the public debt must be largely derived from duties upon importations, which, so far as possible, should be adjusted to promote the interests of American labor and advance the prosperity of the whole country.

The tariff provisions of the platforms of 1872 and 1876 sounded the right note on the protection question; they announced the doctrine of the party, and it is the doctrine of the party now, and, in my judgment, is believed in by a vast majority of the American people.

The Democratic party in 1876, in its convention, after denouncing the then existing tariff and reciting the alleged evils which resulted from it to the people, closed its assault in the following language:

We demand that all custom-house taxation shall be only for revenue.

Democracy began to assert itself more strongly in favor of free trade, or as near it as is consistent with the collection of import duties at all.

In 1880 the Republican national convention—

Affirmed the belief avowed in 1876, that the duties levied for the purpose of revenue should so discriminate as to favor American labor.

Mr. President, the prominent idea of late years in the Republican party has been the protection of American labor, it being well understood that without protection American wages would inevitably be reduced.

The Democratic convention of 1880 resolved in favor of "a tariff for revenue only."

The Republican party of 1884 declared that—

It is the first duty of a good government to protect the rights and promote the interest of its own people. The largest diversity of industry is the most productive of general prosperity and of the comfort and independence of the people. We therefore demand that the imposition of duties on foreign imports shall be made not "for revenue only," but that in raising the requisite revenues for the Government such duties shall be so levied as to afford security to our diversified industries and protection to the rights and wages of the laborer, to the end that active and intelligent labor as well as capital may have its just reward and the laboring man his full share in the national prosperity. Against the so-called economic system of the Democratic party, which would degrade our labor to the foreign standard, we enter our solemn protest.

This is a splendid declaration of Republican doctrine on the tariff question.

The Democratic platform of 1884 was cooked up to confuse and fool the people on the tariff question; it was a straddle, and so denounced then by Republicans and denounced since by Democrats, Henry Watterson and others. I will not stop to quote it. It was denunciatory of the existing tariff and greatly concerned about the laboring men, and, among other things, declared the internal tax a war tax; and in that they were right, because it had not been imposed before.

The Republican platform for this year upon the tariff question declares in favor of the American system of protection, protests against its destruction by the Democratic party in the interest of Europe, favors the reduction of the national revenue by repealing the taxes on tobacco, the tax on spirits for the arts and mechanical purposes, and by such a revision of the tariff laws as will tend to check imports of such articles as are produced by our people, the production of which gives employment to our labor, and release from import duties those articles (except luxuries) of foreign production the like of which can not be produced at home. Finally, if such a revision does not sufficiently reduce the revenue, repeal the internal taxes rather than surrender the protective system to the behests of whisky trusts. The above, Mr. President, is the substance of the tariff plank of the Republican platform of 1888, and is in harmony with the provisions and declarations of the previous platforms of the party.

The Democratic platform of this year, 1888, contains the astounding declaration that "all unnecessary taxation is unjust taxation," followed by the same declaration in different forms of expression, apparently supposing that somebody did not believe that unnecessary taxation is unjust taxation. Nobody ever disputed the proposition, and nobody desires unnecessary taxation. The platform indorses the platform of the party of 1884, which has been admitted to be a juggle on the tariff question; it indorsed the President's December message, which the British press lauded as a free-trade document; it indorsed the Mills bill, which was prepared in the supposed interest of the cotton States of the South, and which was at first declared to be a great reform measure looking only to the question of revenue, but which the leaders of the party now are laboring to show is a very good protection measure.

Mr. President, the Democratic party is a free-trade party if it is anything, and has been for fifty years. The people of the Southern States have regarded cotton as king, and have harbored the mistaken idea that their interest lay in the direction of free trade; they have believed that it was their interest to export their cotton to be manufactured in Europe and encourage its importation in manufactures to this country to supply our markets. A market for our products far away, instead of one at home, seems to be the Democratic idea. How much better for the people, how much more American and patriotic, and in the interest of the development of our own resources, and how much more in the interest of American labor, that our looms and mills and factories should be cared for, and how much more profitable to the planter who raises the cotton that it should be spun and woven at home, and placed upon the market in our own land as well as elsewhere. Mr. CARLISLE, in a speech in his district at Covington, recently made the announcement that it is declared in the Democratic platform that "unnecessary taxation is unjust taxation," and by that declaration he says his party "will stand or fall in this contest." He, too, seems to desire to make the people believe that the Republicans are for letting the surplus continue to accumulate. He knows better, for he is an intelligent man.

He says when Mr. Cleveland came into office, March 4, 1885—

He found upon the statute-book laws passed by Republican Congresses under which there was being annually collected from the people $100,000,000 in excess of the actual necessities of the Government. * * * Year after year some of us have struggled in Congress to secure a reduction of this enormous burden upon the people.

Whose fault is it that the reduction has not been made? The House of Representatives, whose duty it is under the Constitution to originate revenue bills, has been Democratic nearly all the time for sixteen years, that gentleman much of the time its presiding officer. There has been a large Democratic majority in that body part of the time, and a fair majority all the time, except two years of the sixteen. Why has not the reduction been made? Democracy is responsible and not the Republicans.

The venerable candidate for Vice-President on the Democratic ticket in his speech at Cheltenham, I believe, said:

The issue, then, is fairly made up between us. It is between high taxation on the one hand and reasonable taxation on the other. It is between taking

the money out of the people, out of their own control, out of their own pockets and burying it in the cellar of the Treasury Department, or it is between that and leaving the money where it belongs, in the pockets of the people, to be used by them as their wants require and as their intelligence and honesty direct.

I ask Mr. Thurman what his party has done to reduce taxation if taxes are too high.

It is known to this country that every effort has been made by the Republican party in the Senate in endeavoring to secure action on the part of the Administration in reducing the surplus, first in taking up bonds that it had a right to take up, and, secondly, to buy bonds which it had not the right to redeem, and yet it has stubbornly refused to do either to the extent that the law authorized it to do.

Why has not a bill to reduce taxation, to revise the tariff and the internal-tax laws, long years ago come to this Senate? That body having power to send to us revenue bills has never done it when the Democrats controlled it since the war until within the last three months. And yet we are to be held responsible for the accumulation of the surplus, whatever it may be, because they, having a majority in the House of Representatives, and having the power under the Constitution, and they alone, have failed to do their duty.

When the Republicans had the control of Congress in 1883, the tariff was revised and the taxes were reduced. We finally have a bill, and so far as this Senate is concerned, we will revise the tariff, will reduce the surplus, and will at the same time protect labor and the industries of the country.

I charge that the Democratic party is responsible for the unnecessary flow of money into the Treasury. That party has not desired to stop it, unless by the adoption of a policy which would reduce the laboring man's wages or close up the mills and factories of the country.

The Secretary of the Treasury said in his last annual report that the receipts for the year ending June 30, 1888, actual and estimated, were $383,000,000, and that the expenditures were $316,817,785.48, showing a surplus of $66,182,214.52. The bill reported to the Senate by the Finance Committee, of which my honorable friend here [Mr. ALLISON] was chairman of the subcommittee that made the bill, as a substitute for the so-called Mills bill, makes a reduction of more than that amount, and if the present Administration should be continued, which I trust and believe will not be done, the reduction would be too great, but if General Harrison, the gallant soldier and able and experienced statesman, the standard-bearer of the Republican party, shall be the choice of the country for its President, the popular branch of Congress will doubtless be Republican also, and then the expenses of the Government will be curtailed, economy will be again enforced, and the administration of affairs will cost the people about the amount of the last Republican administration.

Mr. President, I have given the substance of the provisions of the platforms of the two great parties on the tariff question to show that the Republican party has, in line with the fathers of the Republic, been steadily in favor of the protective policy, and that the Democratic party has for years—since the days of Jackson—been against it. The Republican party is solidly for the protective system to-day, and we appeal to the people to listen and beware of the danger which surely will follow the success of the policy urged upon the country by the President and his followers. The Democracy has, as I have said, practically been for free trade for years, but they have managed by their platforms and plans of campaign to avoid the issue by facing both ways as in 1884, when the orators of that party made protective speeches in one section and free-trade speeches in another.

The President forced his renomination by his December message, and at the same time made the issue for this campaign, which neither he nor his party can now shirk or throw off. The issue is made up and must be decided at the polls.

The December message was an announcement that the free-traders were ready for the contest; the Republican party at once accepted the challenge.

The solid South is practically solid for free trade. It is a solid fact that the solid South, with the aid of Northern Democrats with Southern principles, mean if they can to dictate the financial policy of the nation. Since the beginning of this Congress we have had abundant evidence, not only of a determination on the part of the South to dictate the financial policy of the country, but also upon all important questions. If it were in order for me to refer to the other branch of Congress I would say that that body is organized with a Southern man for Speaker and with chairmen of committees from the States south of Mason and Dixon's line, of Elections, Ways and Means, Judiciary, Commerce, Naval Affairs, Rivers and Harbors, Agriculture, Coinage, Weights and Measures, Post-Office and Post-Roads, Indian Affairs, Railroads and Canals, Mines and Mining, Improvement of the Mississippi River, Education, Claims, Labor, War Claims, Private Land Claims, Revision of the Laws, District of Columbia, and many others of perhaps less consequence.

Mr. President, I do not make this somewhat startling showing for the purpose of exciting sectional feeling or jealousy, but to show that in another body the representatives of that portion of the Union which struggled for four years to destroy it have control of the important legislation of the country. I have no unkind words to utter against any man, but I do not believe in Texas statesmanship. I believe that if the policy as expressed in the so-called Mills bill, and as expressed by the honorable Senators from that State on this floor, were to prevail it would result in ruin to the business of the country.

The senior Senator from Texas, on the 12th of September, in talking about the murders in Washington County, in his State, said that—

> If there is any one thing in this world the average Texan would go any number of miles out of his way to kick and kill and destroy it is a protective tariff.

As the Senator made that statement with an apparent feeling of satisfaction and pride, I am bound to assume that he would go any number of miles with his devoted constituents and join them in their effort to destroy a protective tariff. Then the junior Senator from Texas comes forward and defines the boundary between a tariff for revenue and a tariff for protection. He says:

> That as long as the increase of the tax secures an increase of revenue it is a revenue tariff, but when we reach the point in any commodity where the increase of the tax reduces the revenue by excluding imports we then have a tariff for protection.

And then the Senator proceeds to show that the protective policy is wrong. Mr. President, the Senator says that as long as an increase of tax secures an increase of revenue it is a revenue tariff. A revenue tariff is what our Democratic friends are in favor of, the effect of which is they are in favor of a tariff to secure to Great Britain and other countries the certainty of exporting to this country whatever they please to the fullest extent without regard to the effect such exportations may have on the industries or labor of America.

The position of the Democracy results in protection to foreign manufactures and foreign labor, and ruin and death to home labor and industry. So, Mr. President, the American people are being educated by the distinguished gentleman from Texas on the subject of political economy since they (the people) have had the misfortune of having a Democratic House of Representatives and the greater misfortune of having a gentleman for President whose training in statesmanship began after he was elected President, in the Southern school, the teachers mainly coming from Texas.

Mr. President, in the Northwest every year about this time the agricultural people, the farmers, are alarmed by the announcement that Texas cattle have been brought in from that State and the Texas fever has come with them, spreading among the native herds for miles around, resulting in great loss and injury to the agricultural interests of the section. The proposed tariff legislation, the author of which is said to be a gentleman from Texas, if allowed to be enacted would be worse than the Texas fever among cattle; it would be Texas fever in the business of the country and paralyze the business of the whole country, followed by poverty and distress.

Immediately after the President's message in December, the Ways and Means Committee of the House began its work of framing a tariff bill in accordance with it. After about seven months a bill revising the tariff and to reduce the surplus as alleged, passed; not the same bill reported, but with such modifications as it became necessary to make to secure the requisite votes of Northern Democrats to pass it. While it is urged now that the bill affords ample protection to American industry and labor, yet no Democrat has been heard to utter one sentence in favor of protection. When in the discussion of the Mills bill a Republican asked the question, "Has any friend of this bill (referring to the Mills bill) in this debate uttered one sentence in favor of the American tariff system which discriminates in favor of the home producer and laborer?" the answer came from a Democrat, "No; there was none and you will not hear any Democrat utter one." Neither have we. The Democratic party is opposed to the protective principle.

Mr. President, let us see how much truth there is in the declaration of the President that duties on imports raise the price to the consumers of all articles imported and subject to duty by precisely the sum paid for such duties. Let us take a few examples and see whether that is the operation of a tariff law. Theories are of no account, neither are statements even when made by Presidents when they are in opposition to facts. Take the familiar instance of steel rails. They were first manufactured in this country in 1868, at which time imported steel rails were sold at the sum of $158.50 per ton; they were manufactured in great quantities from that time in this country, and the price ran down with a duty of $28 per ton part of the time and finally reduced to $17, until in 1885 they sold at $28.50, only 50 cents above the duty when we began to make them, and in 1886 the manufacture was 1,763,667 tons and the importation was only 46,500 tons. Protection increases production and lessens the price. Where natural advantages exist for the production of the article protected the encouragement of home manufactures tends to stop importation, home competition begins, and the price decreases to the consumer.

Take the article of soda-ash, which is largely used in certain manufactures; it has not been long that it has been manufactured in this country. It was imported and sold to our people at $48 per ton; finally its manufacture began here, the price went down from $48 to $45, then to $36, and then to $30, falling $18 per ton less than when we used the imported article and did not manufacture it.

Take the article of nails, used by the people. Nails cost 25 cents

per pound—imported wrought nails. The tariff of 1824 imposed a duty of 5 cents a pound, which rate was retained until 1833. According to Democratic doctrine, nails ought to have sold at 30 cents a pound, but instead the price of nails went down to 8 and 9 cents a pound. The tariff duty was lowered to 1¼ cents per pound in 1883, and the price is now from 2 to 3 cents per pound.

Axes are a useful article in this and all countries. Before the American people began to manufacture axes in this country the price of English axes was from $2 to $4 apiece. A tariff duty was imposed on English axes; soon axes, American and English, were selling at $1.25 to $1.50; the price ran down still lower, our American manufacturers began to export their axes, and at the World's Fair at Philadelphia in 1876 the English commissioners said, in their report to their government, that—

For years Sheffield supplied not only our own country but nearly all the world. * * * This monopoly remains with us no longer. * * * The American ax has for many years displaced the axes imported from Great Britain; they are now imported into this country (meaning England).

Such is the testimony of the English commissioners to our Centennial Exposition.

Take the article of files. Up to the time the Government passed into the control of the Republican party in 1861, files were nearly all imported and cost our people from $6 to $7 per dozen. Establishments for the manufacture of files were constructed in this country and put in operation. Congress imposed a duty on files; the price of files went down from $6 to $7 per dozen to $2 and $2.30 per dozen, and the importation of files practically ceased. So, Mr. President, I might go on and give almost numberless instances showing the absurdity of the position of the President and his followers. The effect of a protective tariff is the encouragement of home industry, the building of factories and mills and their operation. Competition follows, and reduced prices are assured.

Our Democratic friends seem to be greatly concerned about the duty on blankets and attempt to create the belief in the minds of the people that they are being robbed on account of the duty on imported blankets. Let us see how that is. Reports from responsible manufacturers in this country show that blankets that cost in 1860 $13 now cost $6.80. Blankets that cost $10, $8, $7.50, $5, $3.75, $3.50, $2.25, $2.50, and $2, now cost $5.85, $4.50, $4.35, $3.03, $2.58, $1.90, $1.31, $1.45, and $1.01.

Mr. DAWES. Each pair?

Mr. CULLOM. Each pair.

According to the grade or quality, very little over one-half in price now what it was when the Republican party came into power in 1861. The policy of the Republican party has given the people cheap blankets, and in doing it it has enforced a policy which has given good wages to tens of thousands of our own people—work at good wages by day and rest under cheap blankets by night.

Take another item. Take the article of binding-twine, in which our farmers are interested in connection with cutting grain, etc. The rate of duty on twine, as I understand, is in both bills alike, one being an ad valorem and the other a specific duty, but I understand that under the tariff laws as they are now binding-twine is sold at exactly the same price in this country that it is in the other countries of the world. I desire to ask the honorable Senator from Iowa, who knows more about this bill perhaps than almost anybody else here, to tell me whether I am right in stating that the duty is the same in both bills and whether the price is the same in this country as it is in others.

Mr. ALLISON. The duty is practically the same in both bills. The duty in the House bill is 15 per cent. ad valorem and in the Senate bill 7½ cents per pound.

Mr. VEST. Does the Senator say that it is the same?

Mr. ALLISON. I do. The price in the United States and in foreign countries is precisely the same now.

Mr. CULLOM. I so understood, but I desired to be made sure by the statement of the chairman of the subcommittee, who I knew was well advised.

Mr. ALLISON. There is no doubt about it.

Mr. CULLOM. Take another article. Take watches as another example of the operation of a protective tariff. It has not been a great many years since watches began to be manufactured in this country. As probably the country knows, we had a small duty on watches for quite a time, and an effort was made to manufacture them, but it failed, and finally the tariff was increased to such an extent that our manufacturers could run and we commenced the manufacture of watches.

The imports of watches from 1825 to 1858 amounted to $45,800,000. The tariff laws finally gave sufficient duty on imported watches to enable Americans to make watches and compete. We now have, I believe, fifty or sixty watch factories, or establishments engaged in the manufacture of watches proper or their cases, etc., employing many thousands of skilled workmen and other persons, men, women, boys, and girls, at good wages, and watches of American manufacture, good as are made anywhere, are so cheap that everybody has a watch, whereas thirty years ago a watch was a rare article in any country community. Take the article of borax. It is produced in California and Nevada. It used to sell at 32 cents. It now sells at 8, just one-fourth the amount, as a result of a duty upon it and competition in its production and sale. The Mills bill puts it on the free-list, and if the labor of producing it shall be interfered with after awhile we shall hear that the industry in this country is broken down, and the price of the article will then go up. Take chloroform. The duty on that article is 50 cents per pound. It is now selling at 40 cents. Home competition brought the price down and the tariff on the article is prohibitory. Take the article of salt, about which we hear so much. If you will listen to the appeals of Democrats for free salt, you will have difficulty in resisting the conclusion that the people are in distress for want of cheap salt. But let us see how the duty on salt of 12 cents per hundred pounds in barrels affects the price. I use here a statement compiled by Hon. JEHU BAKER from a memorial of the Saginaw Board of Trade of 1888:

Salt product of Michigan, 1860, 4,000 barrels; in 1887, 4,200,000; cost of salt along the Great Lakes, including a barrel worth 20 cents, in 1860, $2.25; in 1866, $1.80; in 1871, $1.46; in 1876, $1.05; in 1881, 95 cents; in 1886, 65 cents; in 1887, 58 cents.

Mr. FARWELL. Including the barrel.

Mr. CULLOM. Including the barrel, which costs 20 cents, literally about as cheap as dirt. Yet there is not a speaker in either branch of Congress on the other side or anywhere else who does not deal with the tax on salt as if it was just going to ruin the business of this country and starve the people for want of that prime necessity.

Mr. President, Sir Charles Tupper, the Canadian minister of finance, knew what he was doing when he congratulated the Canadian Parliament on the fact that if the Mills bill should become a law it would make free articles that Canada sends into the United States, on which last year the people of that country paid as customs to our Government $1,800,000. They know who pays the duty. Mr. Tupper knew that the $1,800,000 which they pay yearly comes out of their pockets and not the pockets of our people. The so-called Mills bill would help Canada a little as well as Great Britain a great deal.

The duties upon importations "raise the price to consumers of all articles imported and subject to duty by precisely the sum paid for such duties," says the President. Democrats all along the line echo the declaration. If they believe such statements and are anxious to put an end to such robbery, as they term it, why do they not take the duty off wheat and give to consumers cheap bread? The consumers are robbed, according to the modern apostles of free trade, for the benefit of the farmer.

There are only between seven and eight millions of farmers. They raise wheat to eat and sell, seldom buy it. There are over fifty millions of American people who buy bread and consume it. If the free-trade theory is sound, these fifty millions are taxed 20 cents on every bushel of wheat, 15 cents on every bushel of potatoes which they consume for the benefit of the seven or eight million farmers according to free-trade or revenue-reform theories. This is a most unjust and oppressive tax upon the masses, put upon them by "our vicious, inequitable, and illogical" tariff laws, simply for the enrichment of the farmer. And yet our Democratic friends do their best to make the agriculturist believe that the present tariff system fails to give any protection to the farmer. When the facts are found it is discovered that the farmer is protected as well as the manufacturer by the present law.

Why is it proposed by the Mills bill to protect wheat and not wool? If wool is to be placed on the free-list why not wheat? Everybody must eat whether well or poorly clothed; wheat can be purchased in India or in Canada for a less price than in the United States. Why not remove the duty and let wheat come in and force our farmers to take less price for their wheat? If cheap woolen clothing would be so great a blessing, why would not cheap bread be a greater one? Mr. President, the Democratic party dare not disturb the duty on wheat, and they know it; and while they do not do that they interfere with the tariff on wool for the purpose of making a discrimination, and only such a one as they think they can carry through when they know they would fail if they would undertake the other.

The Senator from Tennessee [Mr. BATE] yesterday used the expression "These advance taxes," as I caught it from his lips, "are felt at every meal." On that theory, why does he not take the tax off wheat while taking it off other things?

"The mills of the gods grind slowly," but Democracy would be ground to powder if that party should extend its doctrine so far. No, Mr. President, the doctrine of free trade or revenue reform will not do in this country.

The agriculturist is told that he of all men should stand for free trade, or oppose protection. The mechanic is promised cheap food and cheap clothing when free trade comes, and according to the declaration of the Senator from Missouri in his somewhat famous letter it will surely come if the Democratic party succeeds, for the Senator says:

The President has challenged the protected industries of the country to a fight of extermination. The fight is to the death.

I take it that our manufacturing industries are to be wiped out, to be exterminated, if the policy he states to have been enunciated by the President is to be carried out.

Mr. VEST. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PALMER in the chair). Does the Senator from Illinois yield?

Mr. CULLOM. Yes, sir.

Mr. VEST. I had occasion once to make a statement in regard to this matter, and if the Senator from Illinois will indulge me I should like to make another, not that I think it is necessary, but because he has alluded to it again.

Mr. CULLOM. I do not hear the Senator.

Mr. VEST. I said that I had occasion once before to allude to this matter, and I expected that no such necessity, after what I stated then, would arise; but as the Senator has alluded to it again I want to make a statement now in justice to myself.

This was a private letter, as I stated then, written by me upon my desk here in the Senate during a debate. It is my custom, as that of other Senators, when my morning mail comes in to answer very frequently upon soft paper with a pencil the letters which I receive, either by full reply, as is sometimes the case, or by making memoranda which are afterwards type-written by my secretary. I wrote this reply to a friend, an intimate personal and political friend. I want the Secretary to read that reply exactly as it was sent; and its intent and meaning, I repeat to-day, absolutely and without any sort of qualification. If I had been under the impression or had the slightest suspicion that it would have been made public I should certainly have been more particular in framing the sentences and in the verbiage that I used; but to any fair man, to any fair-minded disputant, the letter shows my meaning plainly and unequivocally. I ask the Secretary to read it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will read the letter.

The Secretary read as follows:

UNITED STATES SENATE, *Washington, D. C., June* 23, 1883.

MY DEAR CHARLEY: Yours of the 21st instant has been received.

I did not see the item in the Republican to which you allude, but would not have believed it if I had seen it. I know you too well to believe any such thing.

I sincerely hope that the club may be made permanent and that its membership may be largely increased. Whilst there is no possibility that Missouri will fail to give her electoral vote for Cleveland and Thurman, it is important, both for campaign purposes and as an educational instrumentality, that the organization should be continued.

We are entering upon the most fearful Presidential contest and the most important since that of 1860. Mr. Cleveland by his message, for which I sincerely honor him, has challenged the protected industries of the country to a fight of extermination.

The men who are accumulating immense fortunes under the present tariff laws are determined to defeat Cleveland if money and industry will accomplish it. It is the personal duty of every Democrat in this country to do everything in his power to sustain the President. Every agency which can possibly be used in this direction must be put actively to work.

It is useless for us to disguise the fact that the fight is to the death, and we would be idiots to ignore this fact.

Your friend,

G. G. VEST.

C. M. NAPTON, Esq.,
St. Louis, Mo.

Mr. VEST. I simply wish to state that any man who does not appreciate the difference between a letter written under the circumstances I wrote that to a political and personal friend who was assumed to understand my opinions and the position of the Democratic party, and a letter written to be submitted to the fierce criticism of political opponents and of a public canvass, will have no further explanation from me.

What I meant to say, and what that letter fairly construed does say, is that between the principles of absolute and unlimited protection, which I understand the Republican party to-day to advocate, and the position of the Democratic party, which is the raising of revenue for the support of the Government economically administered, and the proper adjustment of the revenue so to be raised with the taxes necessary to raise it, it is a fight to the death. I meant, and I repeat it, that we intend to wage a war of extermination upon the present system of taxation by which enormous fortunes are given to a few at the expense of the many.

Now, Mr. President, one single word, and I shall not interrupt the Senator further. One sentence in that letter without its context would seem to indicate that I put the President in the attitude of attacking all the industries of the country. It was carelessly written, but it was the system of unlimited protection which I meant and that alone. I have received from a friend——

Mr. TELLER (to Mr. CULLOM). He seems to favor a limited protection.

Mr. VEST. What does the Senator from Colorado say?

Mr. TELLER. I did not mean to interrupt the Senator.

Mr. CULLOM. I wish the Senator from Missouri would confine himself to the reading of the letter and to the explanation.

Mr. TELLER. Allow me to explain. I said according to the Senator's theory protection was right, provided it was a limited protection. I do not know that that is his theory.

Mr. VEST. I mean to say that every tariff, even if it be a revenue tariff, has incidental protection, and that protection and the tariff taxes ought to be justly distributed throughout the country.

If the Senator will permit me a further explanation, I shall not interrupt him further or allude to this matter again. A friend has sent me within the last few days the following garbled extract from this letter. I shall not use the language here which I would use outside of the Senate in regard to the man who has prepared this or the men who have put it upon the country. It would be absolutely indecent under parliamentary rules for me to denounce this infamy as it deserves:

A DEMOCRATIC SENATOR ON CLEVELAND AND FREE TRADE.

Many sincere men who do not desire to vote for free trade and against protection are deceived by the Democratic claim that Mr. Cleveland is not opposed to the industrial interests of the country. Read the following and judge for yourselves:

Now comes what purports to be my letter.

Mr. Cleveland by his message, for which I sincerely honor him, has challenged the protected industries of the country to a war of extermination. The fight is to the death.

GEORGE G. VEST.

In other words, they take two entirely distinct and separate portions of the letter, put them together, leave out the intermediate and explanatory sentences, and put it to the country as a genuine document. The man who did that would disgrace the striped clothes of a penitentiary.

Mr. CULLOM. I had never heard the Senator's explanation of his letter. I do not think that the explanation is much better than the letter itself. There is no mistaking the fact that he did say the President of the United States had challenged the protected industries of the country to a fight of extermination.

Mr. VEST. The President has made his own statement. Why does not the Senator criticise that?

Mr. CULLOM. I have, but I happened to see the Senator's letter, and I thought that was a very good explanation of the President's course and purpose, and that it perhaps ought to be criticised, too.

I do not desire to take issue in any way with the Senator or get into any controversy with him, but the Senator fails to say that he is in favor of protection of any kind to our American industries and American labor. In other words, he and his party stand upon the platform of a tariff for revenue only, without any reference to whether it gives protection to American labor or American industries.

I shall not refer to his letter further, but I have some other quotations which have been furnished me which I think will turn out to be correctly stated and to be genuine.

We demand tariff reform, and we set our faces in the direction of free trade.

That is one.

The Democrat who is not a free-trader should go elsewhere.

If the Senator from Missouri is not a free-trader, he had better come over and join the Republican party.

The conflict between free trade and protection is irrepressible and must be fought out to the bitter end.

The Democratic party, except in the person of imbeciles hardly worth mentioning, is not upon the fence. It is a free-trade party or it is nothing—

As I said almost in the beginning—

The black flag is up; no quarter will be asked and no quarter given.

The above extracts were taken from one of the great organs of the Democratic party, and doubtless penned by its chief editor, Mr. Watterson, who, I believe, is a member of the National Democratic Committee.

Mr. President, when the St. Louis convention was held it was the determination of that party to plant itself upon the doctrine of free trade, and when a member of that convention undertook to control it and to prevent its announcing extreme revenue-reform positions he was substantially sat upon by the convention.

So we are sure of free trade, if Democracy shall succeed at the approaching election. The black flag is up, and no quarter is to be given; it is to be a war of extermination against the protected industries of the country. The manufacturer is told that when the change takes place from protection to free trade the world's markets will be open to him; that his wares will find a ready market and wealth will fill his coffers. In the first place, under such a condition, his factory or mill would be idle and he would have no wares for sale. Mr. President, the world's markets are open now, and whether our wares are sold in them depends on the quality and cheapness of the article where it is wanted. We sell more to Great Britain now than does any other foreign country. And yet we are told by the Democratic party that we do not get into the foreign markets because we have a protective system here, while in competition with Great Britain, which announces itself in favor of free trade, we go into the markets and sell our wares to a greater amount than does any other country in the world.

The value of our manufactures amounts to eight billions of dollars, 98¼ per cent. of which is consumed at home, and 1¾ per cent. is exported, amounting to $135,000,000.

The agricultural product of this country amounts to $7,500,000,000, five hundred million less than the manufactures, and 92 per cent. of it is consumed at home and 8 per cent. exported, and yet our Democratic friends seem more concerned about the little surplus we have to send away than to maintain our home industries. The idea seems to be that trading among ourselves does nobody any good. Mr. President, if the people of Illinois have corn and wheat and beef to sell to the people of New England, and they have cotton and woolen goods and boots and shoes and blankets to sell to the people of Illinois, why is not the Massachusetts manufacturer and the Illinois agriculturist each doing as well and enriching the country as much as if each sent his product out of the country? I expect the day to soon come when the

agriculturist of Illinois will find a market for every bushel of wheat and corn and every pound of beef and pork at home to supply the vast multitudes of that State who will be engaged in the stores, the factories, the mills of the great cities and the shops and the mines. The important market, Mr. President, for Americans is a home market.

Mr. President, the farmer has as much interest in maintaining the protective system in this country as any other class of our citizens. What we want and must have is diversified industry. We can not be and ought not to be all farmers, or all mechanics, or all engaged in any one pursuit. The desire of England always was from the early period of the colonies until now that the American people should be hewers of wood and drawers of water for Great Britain, that the American people should be an agricultural people and furnish Great Britain the breadstuffs, the beef, the pork, the lard, etc., and they furnish America with manufactures. The American people never consented to this programme, but insisted on doing as they pleased, and developing the resources of their own country in its manufactures, its commerce, its shipping, and generally securing independence as a people. The weakest nations are those with the least diversified industry.

America occupies a middle ground in regard to diversity of industry. Many of the weaker nations, as South America, Turkey, India, are more exclusively agricultural. In Great Britain the proportion of the population engaged in agriculture is much less than in America. But let us see further what the farmer's interest is in this contest. More than 90 per cent. of our agricultural product is consumed here. The cost of transportation is a great item to be taken into consideration, by farmers especially. In 1865 my own State was more largely a corn-growing State than it is now; it then had fewer mills and factories and mines and machine-shops being operated than it has to-day. She depended largely on consumers east of the Alleghanies for the disposal of her surplus either in the Eastern States or in Europe. It had to be moved from 800 to 3,000 miles, hence the cost of transportation came out of the price which the producer near the market received.

Illinois produced over 117,000,000 bushels of corn and received on an average that year only 29½ cents per bushel, while corn in Connecticut averaged $1.22½, showing that on the total 117,000,000 bushels the Illinois farmers lost nearly $105,000,000. How much more prosperous would the Illinois farmers have been with a market at their door, as it soon will be if the policy of encouraging the development of diversified industry is continued and stimulated.

It is said that "the base of all industry is agriculture—a foundation interest," but that fact does not justify everybody in turning his attention to farming. The interest of the farmer is that other business should be carried on with it and beside it in the interest of the best development of agriculture. The Democrat says we protect manufacturing and the farmer has to pay for it, and if the farmer believed the halt that is told him he would believe himself robbed and ruined by the tariff daily. In the first place the farmer's wheat is protected. There is an import duty upon corn, potatoes, wool, flax, meats, vegetables, and about everything that needs protection which the farmer produces; but if there were not it is the interest of the farmer that other industries should be prosecuted in this country.

John Quincy Adams advocated the harmony of industries. He said:

> The great interests of an agricultural, commercial, and manufacturing nation are so locked in union together that no permanent cause of prosperity to one of them can operate without extending its influence to all the others.

In Great Britain in 1881 the proportion of the population engaged in what are called industrial pursuits as distinguished from what are designated as commercial, agricultural, domestic, or professional, was 57 per cent., while those engaged in agricultural pursuits were 12.4 per cent.; while in this country the proportion of those engaged in industrial pursuits was only 22.1 per cent., and those engaged in agricultural pursuits was 44.1 per cent. The proportion engaged in agriculture will be reduced as the nation grows older if we encourage diversified industry.

As population increases in any community the value of the lands increases. In this country the States have been divided into classes, the first class having less than 30 per cent. engaged in agriculture; the second, with 30 and less than 50 per cent.; the third, those States with 50 and less than 70 per cent., and the fourth class, those States having 70 per cent. and over. Without going into a detail of figures, the facts show that in the first class of States, having less than 30 per cent. of those engaged in agriculture, the land is worth $38.68 per acre, while in the second class it is worth $30.55, in the third only $13.53, and in the fourth class, where 70 per cent. and over are engaged in agriculture, the land is valued at $5.18 per acre.

The statistics show that the value of lands increases as population not engaged in agriculture increases in the vicinity, and the reason for the increase in the value of land is because its produce finds a home market and better price. Illinois, the State which I have the honor in part to represent, according to the census of 1880 had about one million persons engaged in agriculture. The income from their labors was greatly enlarged by the great mills and factories and meat markets and grain markets of Chicago and other cities of the State. In Chicago to-day we have nearly or quite a million people consuming the product of the agriculturist. Such great industries and great cities scattered over our great country furnish a surer and better market than foreign markets sustained by the pauper labor of Europe.

The protective system is in line with the highest law of nature, namely, self-preservation. A man has a right to defend himself against assault, to preserve himself from bodily injury or to save his own life, to defend his home, his castle, his property against lawless attacks or intruders. So a nation or the people of a nation have the right—it is their duty—to protect, preserve, defend their own interests before looking to the welfare of other nations, especially when other nations are struggling to procure the adoption of a policy for the sole interest of their own producers who want to sell their wares in our market and do nothing to develop the resources of this country. They have nothing in common with us. They pay no taxes. They simply want the benefit of our markets.

Nations and cities alike make this principle of permitting outsiders to sell goods only on condition that they comply with such regulations as are made for a reasonable protection of the interests and rights of the citizens who pay taxes, and in every way assist in bearing the burdens of the community or government in which they live.

Now, Mr. President, I desire to have read by the Secretary an article from the London Morning Post, which I think will be found interesting and germane to the subject under consideration.

The Secretary read as follows:

AS AN ENGLISHMAN SEES IT—A LONDON PROTECTION PAPER SAYS THEY CAN NOT UNDERSTAND US.

[From the London Morning Post.]

According to our friends of the Cobden school, American commerce and American manufactures ought to be declining rapidly under the "withering influence" of a protective tariff. Instead of this, the statistics to which we refer show that in twenty years the population of the States has increased by 69 per cent., the hay crop has increased 106 per cent., the cotton crop 194 per cent., and the production of pig-iron over 386 per cent. Railway construction to the extent of over 21,000 miles was projected last year, and over 15,000 miles of it were actually constructed in the twelve months. What this means will be better understood when it is pointed out that the total mileage of railroads existing in the United Kingdom last year was under the 21,000 planned as a single season's addition to the tracks in the United States. New rails were required for nearly 20,000 miles of road, and upward of 3,000,000 tons of steel rails were turned out for the new lines in course of construction. This quantity is three times the entire turnout of rail of all descriptions, iron and steel, of all the mills of the United States in the year 1880.

Immigration last year was on an exceptionally large scale. On one day the number landed at Castle Garden depot exceeded eleven thousand—the highest figure ever recorded in the annals of the New York immigration bureau. In fact, the stream of new arrivals poured in so densely as to tax to the utmost the resources both of the numerous Atlantic steam-ship lines and the immigration authorities of the Eastern ports. Many of the lines were obliged to order their agents to cease booking "steerage" for a time. A feature, too, of last year's immigration was the unusual number of mechanics, brick-layers, plasterers, and masons, from Scotland, Wales, and the north of England, and who went out to the States in response to advices from the other side stating there were good openings there for such handicraftsmen. And yet there are scores of politicians here so blind to what is going on in the world as to stick to the old fetish formula that protection is more injurious to the country that adopts it than to the country against which the hostile tariffs are aimed.

But for the serious consequences entailed upon our British working classes, that feel every day more and more the pinch of foreign competition, it would be decidedly amusing to note how completely every one of the principles assumed by the one-sided free-trade school of this country is negatived by facts and falsified by the experience of common-place business men. We are constantly told that protection raises the cost of commodities; that a hostile tariff—as Mr. John Bright said but a few days back in a published letter to one of his correspondents—is only a tax which the community pays to support the particular industry benefited by it. As a matter of fact, what do we find in America? Why, the r manufacturers can actually beat us out of the field on the score of mere cheapness only. So far from protection enhancing the cost of their goods, they can turn them out at rates at which we, with all our free trade, can not manage to compete.

The Yale lock-makers can afford to pay the carriage of their goods to England and yet undersell the Wolverhampton masters in the very heart of the lock trade, just as the Belgians can quote lower rates for angle-iron delivered in Derby than the local iron-masters of the Midlands. The Philadelphia engine-makers can turn out as serviceable locomotive as any English firm, and ship it all the way to New Zealand for £600 less than the English tenders. In South Russia the agricultural implement trade is said to be passing entirely into the hands of American exporters, in spite of English and German competitors, though the latter are nearer by 3,000 miles to the local market. With the exception of made-up clothing, which is dear because labor is highly paid, and not because the duty on stuffs is so heavy, there is not a single manufactured article produced in the United States, from carpets to cotton, from locomotive engines to steel axes, from agricultural implements to cutlery, and Yankee notions, as many little domestic appliances are called, which is not as cheap or even cheaper there than in this country.

Mr. CULLOM. Mr. President, I have yet said very little on the importance of maintaining our protective system to the laboring classes, or, as they are sometimes termed, the wage-workers of our country. After all, if one class of our citizens have more at stake in maintaining a protective tariff than any other, it is the class upon whom the nation depends for the development of its resources, the men who open up the country, who build the cities, who build and operate the factories, the mills, the railroads, develop and operate the mines; they, above all others, should be protected in good wages as against the cheap labor of other lands.

No man can gainsay the fact that the laborers of America are better paid than are the laborers of the Old World. No policy should be allowed to prevail in this country that by any possibility would operate to lessen the price of labor; rather a policy should be inaugurated to raise the price of wages. The people of this country are the Government. It should be the constant aim and effort of the men charged

with official duty to do that which will tend to lift up (instead of let down) the great body of the people into an atmosphere of higher enjoyment and higher civilization, and no policy should prevail which would require a sober, industrious laboring man to toil daily and still be unable to keep the wolf from the door; rather should such a wise policy prevail as would secure to every toiler a home, rest, advantages of schools for his children, society and churches for himself and family. The good of humanity requires this; the well-being of society and government demands it.

The mechanic and laborer are told by Democratic Senators and speakers in the States that they would do better under their revenue or free-trade policy than they do now. Let us see how wages in this country and in Great Britain compare.

FACTS AND FIGURES FOR WAGE-EARNERS.

The following tables, compiled from volume 20, United States Census, and from British official statements, give the average weekly wages in one hundred and two kinds of work, including manufactures, mechanical trades, and unskilled labor:

Weekly wages in one hundred and two employments.

Occupations.	Great Britain.	United States.
Boots and shoes:		
Cutters	$5.08	$13.85
Finishers	7.26	14.50
Gas, stokers	7.86	11.70
Hats:		
Finishers	6.29	10.60
Trimmers, women	3.15	8.65
Trimmers, girls	1.87	5.25
Dyers	4.96	13.50
Dyers, boys	2.66	4.25
Iron furnaces:		
Keepers	9.66	11.67
Keepers' helpers	4.86	8.82
Fillers	5.53	8.29
Enginemen	6.78	12.82
Iron foundries:		
Molders	7.66	13.76
Machinists	7.19	13.34
Machinery:		
Molders	7.23	13.67
Pattern-makers	7.46	15.46
Rolling mills:		
Puddlers	7.26	20.64
Helpers	4.35	11.02
Hammer men	14.52	27.00
Rollers	7.26	13.38
Roll turners	7.26	19.50
Rollers and bloomers	14.52	28.86
Hoppers	4.60	8.34
Roughers	6.05	13.44
Calciners	2.42	11.44
Wheelers	4.84	7.20
Wheelers, coal	4.84	9.60
Stock-takers	4.84	9.60
Laborers	4.11	7.80
Coal mining:		
Miners	5.75	11.45
Drivers	3.32	10.00
Engineers	6.78	13.84
Blacksmiths	6.41	11.00
Iron miners	5.52	11.70
Paper:		
Rag-sorters	2.54	4.75
Finishers	6.05	10.93
Finishers, women	2.90	4.65
Mechanics	7.38	13.88
Potteries:		
Plate-makers	7.70	20.30
Dish-makers	9.62	19.43
Cup-makers	9.92	19.67
Saucer-makers	7.93	18.58
Basin-makers	9.66	19.73
Hollow-ware jiggers	11.62	21.89
Hollow-ware pressers	8.14	17.90
Kilnmen	6.86	13.18
Sagger-makers	8.46	19.33
Mold-makers	10.23	20.79
Turners	8.00	16.97
Handlers	8.39	16.62
Printers	6.55	13.56
Carpets:		
Weavers	7.26	12.00
Winders, women	2.78	5.28
Dyers	8.87	11.50
Mechanics	6.90	12.00
Cotton goods:		
Printers	12.10	28.02
Apprentices	5.08	15.30
Boys	.85	3.90
Grinders	5.20	8.40
Strippers	4.45	6.37
Drawers, women	3.50	4.62
Mule spinners	6.96	9.21
Doffers, boys	2.18	4.14
Dyers	4.96	6.51
Dyers, boys	2.18	3.90
Finishers	6.29	9.36
Finishers, boys	2.90	4.26
Mechanics	6.78	12.54
Carpenters	6.41	11.66
Laborers	3.87	7.03

Weekly wages in one hundred and two employments—Continued.

Occupations.	Great Britain.	United States.
Silks:		
Winders	$2.96	$5.34
Weavers, power	5.40	11.50
Weavers, women	4.38	7.94
Designers	12.00	24.71
Lace-machine operators, male	9.11	14.75
Lace-machine operators, female	3.09	5.00
Dyers	7.00	12.77
Woolens:		
Sorters	6.47	10.40
Warpers, male	5.52	10.63
Warpers, female	2.90	5.76
Spinners, male	7.05	10.39
Spinners, female	2.72	5.13
Weavers, male	5.38	10.00
Weavers, female	3.78	5.80
Fullers	5.87	8.96
Dyers	4.90	7.52
Car-works:		
Makers	7.50	10.93
Coach-makers	8.11	12.05
Wood machinists	7.74	11.58
Smiths	8.11	12.47
Painters, coach	7.26	11.21
Painters, wagon	4.84	10.93
Laborers	4.36	6.90
Total, 93 occupations	578.49	1,106.83
Average weekly	6.22	11.90
Trades, general:		
Carpenters	6.94	11.84
Smiths	6.98	16.48
Masons	7.45	16.33
Tinners	7.32	14.76
Engineers	7.47	15.24
Mechanics	6.95	13.85
Painters	6.33	11.71
Copper-smiths	7.74	15.00
Laborers	4.37	7.70
Total, 102 occupations	640.04	1,229.74
Average weekly	6.27	12.05

These figures represent a wide range of occupations, from the rudest to the most highly skilled.

WAGES HERE AND IN GREAT BRITAIN.

In the Sixteenth Annual Report of Labor, by Mr. Carroll D. Wright, of Boston, at page 107 he says:

In the fall of 1883 we started upon an original investigation through personal agents of the bureau in Massachusetts and Great Britain, and through these agents we have gathered from original sources (meaning by "original sources" the pay-rolls of great manufacturing establishments, the official wage-lists agreed upon in England, so far as England is concerned, between trade societies and employers, and from other reliable sources) the rate of wages paid in the following twenty-four industries, which are common to Massachusetts and Great Britain:

Industries—1884.	Average weekly wages paid employés.	
	Massachusetts.	Great Britain.
Agricultural implements	$10.25	$8.85
Artisans' tools	11.80	4.89
Boots and shoes	11.63	4.37
Brick	8.63	4.16
Building trades	14.99	7.21
Carpetings	6.08	4.11
Carriages and wagons	13.80	4.89
Clothing	10.01	6.71
Cotton goods	6.45	4.66
Flax and jute goods	6.46	2.84
Food preparations	9.81	2.72
Furniture	11.04	7.96
Glass	12.28	6.94
Hats—fur, wool, and silk	11.01	5.51
Hosiery	6.49	4.67
Liquors—malt and distilled	12.87	12.66
Machines and machinery	11.75	6.93
Metals and metallic goods	11.25	7.40
Printing and publishing	11.37	5.52
Printing, dyeing, and bleaching cotton textiles	8.67	4.94
Stone	14.39	8.58
Wooden goods	12.19	5.67
Woolen goods	6.90	4.86
Worsted goods	7.32	3.60
All industries	10.31	5.86

Showing that wages in Massachusetts are almost double those in Great Britain, the schedule of prices of labor in Massachusetts and Great Britain speaks for itself and is doubtless according to the facts. I will not dwell longer on the subject of difference in the wages of the laborer in this country and in Great Britain. Every man is familiar with the fact that the wages of the skilled mechanic and the common laborer of

this country are nearly twice what they are in the countries of Europe or England. It can not be that the laborer is not in better condition in this country than he would be under a system of free trade or tariff for revenue only.

The history of our own country proves our position, the history of Ireland proves the correctness of our protective system. England, with its free trade and cheap labor and its hundreds of thousands of paupers, is a warning to the people of America against the policy which will soon and inevitably produce a similar condition here. England wants our doors opened that her manufacturers and merchants may bring their goods in free, so that she may give her people work and wages and let American laborers do the walking. Shall we open the doors to British goods free, or so near it, that they may fill our markets? I say no, if it shall interfere with our industries. Keep out foreign production sufficiently to enable us to keep up the price of labor and run our factories and mills and mines and build up our own people and country.

Mr. President, much has been said by our Democratic friends against the tariff plank of the Republican platform because it declared that—

Rather than surrender any part of our protective system at the joint behest of the whisky trusts and the agents of foreign manufactures we would favor the entire repeal of internal taxes.

There is no occasion at present for an entire repeal of internal taxes in order to preserve our protective system, and it will not be done. But what does the so-called Mills bill propose? It contains provisions the very purpose of which is to turn loose the little moonshine distillers of the South, which, so far as they have been able from the passage of the internal-revenue law to this hour, have violated law and have destroyed the lives of many brave men engaged in the enforcement of the law. The passage of the Mills bill would, as some one has said—

Leave Uncle Sam, like a blind beggar with a contribution-box, waiting for the distillers to chip in whatever they desired for the support of the Government.

The proposed amendments were designed to benefit the Southern States, where the little distilleries were found up the hollows. The regulation of distilleries of certain capacity allowing them to be operated without storekeepers or gaugers, modifying the law in relation to arrests, and many other provisions which can not be otherwise than in the interest of the manufacture of spirits without the payment of the tax. The provisions of the Mills bill in relation to internal taxes are constructed to enable the moonshine distillers to manufacture without the payment of the tax all the whisky they choose, while the great establishments in the North, which are running according to law, are surrounded by all the agents of the Government needed to secure it in the payment of the tax on every gallon manufactured according to law.

Mr. President, the bill reported as a substitute for the Mills bill by the Senate Finance Committee will reduce the duty on imported sugar one-half. I am inclined to believe it ought to be put upon the free-list, but a reduction of one-half the present duty will, I trust, be of value to the country. The production of sugar from cane in this country has seemed to have been almost a failure with all the protection that has been given it. The quantity produced in the United States has not increased, but seems rather to be decreasing.

If it can not be produced in reasonable quantities in this country with protection, it would seem contrary to public policy or the policy of a protective tariff to impose heavy import duties upon the article here to supply the demand of our people; there is but a small per cent. of the amount used in this country produced here. The amount consumed in 1887 was 3,130,077,440 pounds, while of the amount consumed we only produced 6.11 per cent. I will ask to insert in the RECORD as part of my remarks a table showing the amount produced in this country since the beginning of 1865 up to and including 1887, the amount imported in same period, and the total amount of duty paid on imported sugar, which would seem to be an extraordinary amount, yet the statistics doubtless give the amount correctly. The amount of duties paid on sugar brought in to supply our markets in twenty-three years beginning with 1865 and ending with 1887 was $860,226,531.46—a vast sum of money to pay for protecting an article produced here in so small quantities, and which so far has not prospered even with a heavy duty on imported sugar as a protection to this industry.

EXHIBIT A.

Year ending June 30.	Production in Louisiana.	Other Southern States.	Imports of sugar.			Average cost per pound in foreign countries.
			Quantity.	Average specific rate of duty.	Duty collected.	
	Pounds.	*Pounds.*	*Pounds.*	*Cents.*		*Cents.*
1865	10,800,000	400,000	651,936,494	3.05	$17,642,987.88	4.39
1866	19,900,000	780,000	1,000,055,024	3.08	37,312,967.65	4.02
1867	42,900,000	7,500,000	849,094,206	3.04	28,570,492.23	4.09
1868	41,400,000	10,120,000	1,121,189,415	3.04	30,447,970.80	4.33
1869	95,051,225	5,550,000	1,247,833,430	3.04	39,923,907.06	4.74
1870	99,452,940	5,380,000	1,196,773,569	3.03	36,819,041.26	4.95

EXHIBIT A—Continued.

Year ending June 30.	Production in Louisiana.	Other Southern States.	Imports of sugar.			Average cost per pound in foreign countries.
			Quantity.	Average specific rate of duty.	Duty collected.	
	Pounds.	*Pounds.*	*Pounds.*	*Cents.*		*Cents.*
1871	168,878,592	9,420,000	1,277,473,653	2.50	$30,751,497.34	4.91
1872	146,906,125	9,446,000	1,509,185,674	2.04	28,865,447.02	5.37
1873	125,346,493	9,486,000	1,568,304,593	2.01	29,382,579.43	5.35
1874	103,241,119	5,399,000	1,701,297,869	1.98	32,491,318.70	4.95
1875	134,504,691	7,736,000	1,797,509,990	2.10	34,650,084.66	4.35
1876	163,418,070	9,062,000	1,493,977,472	2.38	39,438,417.55	4.04
1877	190,672,570	8,688,000	1,654,556,831	2.34	35,268,294.48	4.91
1878	147,101,941	11,949,000	1,537,451,934	2.33	37,075,426.96	5.06
1879	239,478,753	11,402,000	1,834,365,836	2.32	38,065,803.76	4.10
1880	198,962,278	8,915,000	1,829,291,684	2.44	39,739,306.49	4.18
1881	272,982,899	12,320,000	1,946,745,205	2.45	46,318,073.49	4.41
1882	159,874,950	11,200,000	1,990,152,374	2.44	46,711,795.14	4.41
1883	303,066,258	13,680,000	2,137,667,865	2.31	44,591,448.98	4.37
1884	287,742,239	15,232,000	2,756,416,896	1.95	47,500,749.79	2.61
1885	211,402,963	14,590,000	2,717,884,633	1.97	50,885,915.89	2.67
1886	286,626,486	16,128,000	2,639,881,765	2.00	50,265,538.24	2.84
1887	181,123,872	10,158,400	2,781,159,645	2.03	56,507,495.57	2.84
Total	3,630,804,455	216,702,400	39,290,166,076	.....	860,226,531.46	.....

EXHIBIT B.

Total duties collected on sugar in twenty years (Statistical Abstract, 1887)		$860,226,531.46
Sugar consumed in the United States in 1887	pounds...	3,130,077,440
Sugar produced (1887) in Louisiana	pounds... 181,123,872	
Other Southern States	do..... 10,158,400	
		191,282,272
Addition to cost of sugar consumed in 1887 as proposed by the Mills bill		$45,217,282.41
Value of entire sugar crop of the United States in 1887 (191,282,272 pounds), at 5 cents per pound on plantation		$9,564,113.60
Percentage of total consumption of sugar in the United States, produced in the United States, 1887		6.11

Mr. President, the Mills bill places on the free-list a large number of articles chiefly products of the Northern and Western industries which are protected by the present law. If the bill as passed by the House should pass the Senate, many of the industries would probably be destroyed. It provides an ad valorem duty in many instances where it should be specific in the interest of an honest enforcement of the law. We hear much about the frauds in the custom-houses of the country, and many industries since this Administration came into power have been broken down and many others seriously injured in their business by fraudulent invoices which have practically established free trade in this country on some articles of like kind manufactured here. Better have no tariff laws for protection than to have them so framed as that they may be easily evaded by the importer, so that the producer of this country can not know what to rely upon in his business in competition with importations.

I desire to say, in connection with this, that I see by an examination of the two bills, that in the Mills bill, as it is called, there seems to have been an effort to place everything dutiable upon an ad valorem basis, while the other side of the question is taken by the committee on the part of the Senate, making every duty specific, so far as it could consistent with what information it had, so that we may know and the business man may know exactly the amount to be paid upon every article.

The Mills bill makes but slight reduction of the duty upon rice, while vegetables (including potatoes) are put upon the free-list. I ought to say here, perhaps, that there seems to be a doubt in the minds of Senators and others whether or not the Mills bill actually places potatoes upon the free-list. There certainly is a doubt about it. If I am mistaken, I ask the Senator from Iowa [Mr. ALLISON] to correct me. They do not seem to be mentioned as being upon the protected lists, so far as I can see.

The Mills bill touches lightly the duty upon sugar, which had a protective duty of over 80 per cent., while the sugar trade of the country is in the hands of a trust or combine which is forcing the people to pay enormous prices for the article, and have been in the last few days, by order of Havemeyer, the president of the trust, closing up refineries to prevent overproduction and keep up the price, and turning away thousands of working people in pitiable poverty upon the charities of the public. While sugar and the sugar trust are tenderly cared for, the great wool interest of the North, aggregating in this country 300,000,000 pounds annually, and valued at $100,000,000, which, as stated in the report of the Committee on Finance of the Senate upon the tariff bill, "supplies nine-tenths of the clothing wool used by American manufacturers, and has raised the United States to the first rank among the wool-producing nations of the world—this great and important industry or product is put upon the free-list to struggle on in competition with wool importations from South America or Australia, or perish and

he remembered as one of the elements of wealth in America, killed off by the Mills tariff bill, if it should become a law.

Mr. President, I have seen it charged that our manufacturers of reapers and other agricultural implements are selling their manufactures abroad at less price than they sell the same articles at home. I have made some inquiries to ascertain whether the charge is true and find that it is not, so far as I have made inquiry. In proof that such is not the fact, I will read the testimony of Col. A. L. Conger, a manufacturer of reapers in Ohio, as to the sale of reapers on the subject of wages, etc.

ANOTHER LIE NAILED—THE AMERICAN REAPER TRADE AS COMPARED WITH THE FOREIGN.

The Chicago Daily News and several Western papers having published a statement that American manufacturers are selling reapers at $50 each less to the foreign trade than to American farmers, the question was referred to Col. A. L. Conger, of Akron, Ohio. Colonel Conger is a prominent manufacturer of Ohio and president of the Whitman & Barnes Manufacturing Company, which has large business connections with every State and Territory in the Union, as well as a large foreign trade. He is intimately connected with the reaper business of the United States and knows whereof he speaks. In reply to the inquiry Colonel Conger said:

"The statements contained in the articles, so far as the reaper trade is concerned, are absolutely and unqualifiedly false. There is no reaper establishment in the United States that could afford to entertain such a proposition. On the other hand, as a rule, the manufacturers of agricultural implements in the United States are able to get very satisfactory prices for their goods abroad, and generally in excess of prices received in our home market, and in most cases they get cash before the goods leave New York City, while in this country reapers are usually sold on one, two, and in some instances three years' time. The reason why American manufacturers are enabled to get higher prices for their goods over those manufactured abroad is because of the superiority of our implements. The free-trader is slow to admit this, but nevertheless it is true.

"We pay twice as much for labor in this country as is paid abroad, therefore we get twice as good results from that labor. Labor which receives poor pay brings poor results. Our principal competition in farm machinery for the foreign trade comes from England. In South America, Australia, as well as France, Germany, and Russia, the American manufacturers are building up a splendid trade in farm machinery. If we can do this under our present system of protection, how foolish it would be to break down this system and reduce American labor to the level of the pauper labor of Europe, and at the same time reduce the standard of our manufactured goods, which must necessarily follow. I do not know how this story originated, but I think it was set afloat by English manufacturers, with whom we have to compete. They are very jealous of American manufacturers, and especially of the superiority of our goods.

"We have a million men in this country whose brains are occupied night and day in making improvements in farm machinery, and the wonderful progress and improvements they are constantly bringing forth challenge the admiration of all other countries, and they are looking to America to supply their wants. Let me give you another illustration. I met a gentleman from London a short time since who came in possession of a famous drill made in this country, known as the Morse twist drill, which is known to every American machinist. He had come to this country to get the exclusive agency for the sale of this tool in the English market. This is only one of hundreds of instances which go to show how we can maintain our own manufactories without giving up the great advantage we now hold over all other countries with our laws of protection, which now bring such great prosperity to the American laborer and to our country."

I have also received a letter from the secretary of Messrs. Deere & Co., of Moline, in Illinois, on the question of foreign trade; also the extent and character of the manufacturing interests of that growing city, which I will submit to the Senate:

OFFICE DEERE & CO., *Moline, Ill., September* 7, 1888.

DEAR SIR: Your esteemed favor of the 2d instant to Mr. C. H. Deere finds him absent, and therefore I take occasion to answer your inquiries as to the character and extent of the manufacturing interests of Moline.

Kinds of goods.	Hands employed.	Volume of business.
(Number of establishments, 2.)		
Steel plows and cultivators	1,200	$2,200,000
Wagons	300	700,000
Corn-planters, rakes, etc.	150	500,000
Flouring-mill machinery	150	300,000
Machinery	50	100,000
(Number of establishments, 2.)		
Malleable iron	150	100,000
Scales	25	50,000
Pipe-organs	25	50,000
Pumps	50	150,000
Saddlery hardware	50	150,000

In regard to the second point you make, the competition in the manufacture of plows is so great that the margin of profit has been reduced dangerously low, so that there is no object or opportunity to sell our goods to the foreign at less prices than we do to the home trade. We have done a considerable business with Canada in times past and are still doing some there, and our discounts have been so large, or in other words, our prices so low, that in one instance the Canadian authorities refused to accept our invoice as the true one, but raised the price. We convinced them, however, that the price was the same that we were selling our goods in like quantities to our home trade; but nevertheless it seemed entirely too low to our Canadian neighbors. We have some trade with Australia, New Zealand, South Africa, and the Argentine Republic, but our prices to all our foreign trade are always the same as to our home jobbing trade, never any lower.

I might remark that our foreign trade could be extended indefinitely if we had regular lines of steamers to South American ports and to Australia and New Zealand. As it is now, the only way we can reach the Argentine Republic is by chartering sailing vessels, which occupy on a voyage ninety days on the average from New York to Buenos Ayres. Our plows, United States harvesting machinery, and various other kinds of tools are preferred by the English colonists in the countries named, and also by the South American people, to those of European manufacture. At the little town of Grinnell, in Iowa, there is a small harvester manufactory whose trade in the Argentine Republic increased from ten in 1884 to eight hundred in 1888, they having shipped 80 car-loads of their harvesting machines called headers from Grinnell to the Argentine Republic by the way of New York during this past year.

The eastern plow manufacturers have done a large business with the Argentine Republic for many years in cheap, low-priced plows, and we are just getting a foot-hold there with our better class of American plows. These facts are positive proofs that American farmers are furnished with the tools necessary for carrying on farming operations at a very much less price than any other agricultural country in the world. I mentioned the Grinnell harvester factory because the extent of their foreign trade has come immediately under our notice, but in addition to this there are half a dozen other manufacturers of harvester machinery who are also doing large foreign trade. I think it would be a good idea for you to get the statistics of exports of farm machinery for the past few years from G. W. Silcox, No. 60 Barclay street, New York, as these statistics are open to the public. I mentioned George W. Silcox because he is the agent for our export trade, and might be able to procure them for you as well as anybody else.

The charge that American farm machinery is being furnished to foreign countries at a less price than to our own farming community is a "bald assertion," probably founded on the assumption that all manufacturers make lower prices to their foreign trade than they do to their home. But this is impossible to be true where competition has reduced prices to the lowest possible point consistent with safety, and then all countries that have a tariff protect their own people from undervaluation by stringent rules and regulations.

Yours, truly,

S. H. VELIE, *Secretary Deere & Co.*

Hon. S. M. CULLOM,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

Mr. President, the letter just referred to shows how under our protective system our manufacturing interests are growing, the manufactures are carried to foreign countries and placed on the market and sold in competition with like manufactures of other countries, and at the same time furnishing our own people the cheapest and best agricultural implements, especially, in the world. How weak and absurd is the policy that would change this condition. These manufacturing cities in our prairie State give life and vigor to our trade and commerce, and all interests are benefited. The success of one business depends in a measure upon other business around it. Business interests in a community are mutual.

I desire also to present another letter received from a business man in Peoria, Ill., upon the same subject, the selling of agricultural implements abroad:

[Letter from M. Kingman of the firm of M. Kingman & Co., of Peoria.]

PEORIA, ILL., *September* 5, 1888.

Senator S. M. CULLOM, *Washington, D. C.:*

Yours of the 2d received, inclosing slip, which I herewith return. In answer to this will state that I am a stockholder in the Moline Plow Company, also in the Marseilles Manufacturing Company. Both of these concerns have an export and foreign trade, and the contracts for this foreign trade I am fully posted in, and I desire to say to you that this foreign trade pays the same price for their goods at wholesale as the American dealer does, and instead of giving them two, four, and six months' time, they pay the cash on receipt of bill of lading. This is also true of the business done by Kingman & Co. in Mexico for the last three years in the sale of various lines of goods in that republic.

What I stated above, applying to the Moline Plow Company, Marseilles Manufacturing Company, and Kingman & Co., is also true of all the agricultural manufacturers of the West.

We handle goods made at the following cities in Ohio: Dayton, Massilon, Tiffin, Springfield, Cincinnati, and Columbus. All of which sell largely abroad, and the managers of these different factories also have stated a number of times that they were making exactly the same terms that they were selling to these foreign countries, and hence the statement set forth in this slip is untrue in every particular.

If you desire to have a personal letter from the different factories showing these facts, I can obtain them for you.

Mr. President, it is often charged that the Republican party has been unwilling to reduce the tariff duties, and that the party favors retaining the war tariff. The war tariff has long since been modified; it was modified by the act of July, 1870. It was modified by the revision of March 3, 1883, so that the country has no war tariff. If the tariff laws which were in force from 1861 to 1870 had remained in force until now, the Government would have collected for 1887 $139,596,693.25 more than it did under the present law, according to the report of the Finance Committee of the Senate.

The tariff bill reported to the Senate as a substitute for the House bill disposes of the surplus and at the same time protects American labor and industries. If it shall become a law its honest enforcement will neither reduce wages nor will it close our mills, factories, and mines. It will aid in keeping them all open, and will strengthen our home market by retaining the money of the country at home by paying good wages for labor, thereby enabling the masses to buy more and live better than they could if times were hard and wages were reduced. The Senate bill is a complete revision of the revenue laws, reducing and increasing duties when and where in the judgment of the committee the facts demanded it should be done. It should become a law with such amendments as a full discussion may indicate should be made.

It should be so framed as the judgment of Congress shall deem for the best interests of the country, "free from Executive interference or dictation." We have had much dictation by the Executive for the last three years, notably in dealing with pension bills for the relief of disabled veterans of the Union Army in the late war and for widows and children of deceased Union soldiers. Many a brave soldier's heart has been stricken with grief to hear that the President of the nation, he, the veteran, fought four years to save, had vetoed a bill for his relief in his declining years.

One word more on the subject of pension vetoes. The present occu-

pant of the White House has exercised his doubtful power in such cases with an apparent delight, and in doing so, in vetoing two hundred and six cases, he has saved to the Government, according to an estimate made, the sum of $28,116 per annum.

I desire here to say that the Senator from Colorado [Mr. TELLER] furnishes me this information, and says he has made a careful estimate of the fact. In saving this little sum how many broken-down veterans of the Union Army have been turned away hungry, how many of the number are in the poor-houses of the country I do not know.

I want to relate an incident that occurred in connection with a pension case which was in charge of my honorable friend behind me, the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. SAWYER], who we all know has been vigilant in season and out trying to protect the widows and the veteran soldiers of the late war in giving them the little pensions to which they are entitled. Through his efforts we passed a bill in the Senate and it passed the House and went to the President and was vetoed. After it was vetoed, the honorable Senator wrote a letter to the lady who was the beneficiary, and this is the language used in her family when she received the letter, containing in it a small remittance from that liberal-hearted Senator. The statement is, that when the mother opened the letter the little children were around her, and her little boy exclaimed, "Oh, mamma, let us go and get something to eat, now that we have got some money."

Those are the people, Mr. President, that the veto power has been exercised with reference to.

But, Mr. President, my purpose is simply, in view of the course of the President of the United States on this great question of the tariff, which has been one of interference and dictation from the time he gave us his December message until now, to call the attention of the Senate and the country to a provision in the Democratic platform of 1872, which declared in favor of remitting—

The discussion of the subject (the tariff) to the people in their Congressional districts, and to the decision of Congress thereon, wholly free from Executive interference or dictation.

How consistent. In 1872 condemning Executive interference, in 1888 the same great party following Executive dictation like an army of slaves.

Mr. President, the national Democratic convention at St. Louis adopted its platform and declared "that chief among its principles of party faith are the maintenance of an indissoluble Union of free and indestructible States," and a little further on it declares that "the Democratic party welcomes an exacting scrutiny of the administration of the executive power which, four years ago, was committed to its trust in the election of Grover Cleveland, and it challenges the most searching inquiry concerning its fidelity and devotion to the pledges which then invited the suffrages of the people." It is not my purpose to discuss the question of the sincerity of that declaration in the platform.

Chief among its principles are the maintenance of an indissoluble union of free and indestructible States.

It is fortunate that the Union is indissoluble; if it had not been the dominant element of the Democratic party would have destroyed it long ago. In the light of history that declaration as an introduction to a Democratic platform is really refreshing, and if the public could regard it as a serious announcement by that party, it would give confidence, at least, that we would have no more rebellions or civil wars in this country; but let us accept the welcome to an exact scrutiny for a moment.

You know, Mr. President, how the charge of extravagance was made all over the country against the Republican party four years ago. It was constant and denunciatory. On account of it some Republicans voted for Cleveland and reform, civil-service reform. Mr. Cleveland was declared elected. We have had a trial of reform, and the result is before the country. How delightful it has been for reformers to behold demoralized and unsatisfactory public service everywhere, the people who pay the taxes not satisfied, and the reform Administration costing them more than any of the administrations before it since the Government was founded.

The total of Mr. Arthur's administration for the years from 1882 to 1885, inclusive	$943,173,130.63
Mr. Cleveland's from 1886 to 1889, inclusive	1,038,476,184.20
Increase 1886 to 1889 over 1882 to 1885	95,303,053.57

Showing that this Jeffersonian simplicity civil-service Administration that welcomes an exacting scrutiny, cost the people nearly a hundred millions more, or will at its close, than the Republican administration just before it. There is another statement which I wish to make in pursuance of the invitation to make an exact scrutiny of the conduct of this Administration. It is this: The Administration admits that it has $60,000,000 loaned without interest to certain national banks. Perhaps the word "deposited" is used.

The money is in the banks, and to take it out might seriously affect the business of the country. But what has been the doctrine of the party? One of the most uncompromising convictions of the Democratic party has been in favor of a subtreasury and against the old national banking system. So thoroughly imbued with a spirit of opposition to the old national banking system was the Democratic party that when the war came on and it became necessary to establish the present national banking system the Democratic party opposed that, and much of the stock in trade of that party has been opposition to the national banks ever since. But now what do we witness? The subtreasury plan abandoned and a Democratic Administration filling the national banks with sixty millions of Government money, when the record shows that in 1840, in national convention, the Democracy declared—

That the separation of the moneys of the Government from banking institutions is indispensable for the safety of the funds of the Government and the rights of the people.

And this doctrine or declaration was reaffirmed by that party in 1844, 1848, 1852, and 1856.

The party has given up at last the only old doctrine it had left. It favored slavery, but says now it is delighted that it is gone. It favored secession, but says that the war killed that. It opposed the internal-improvement system, but it now favors that. It was against Executive dictation, but takes to that now with amazing unanimity. It was against national banks, but now, by the favor of this Administration, certain named national banks are plethoric with money which ought to be where the law requires it should be, either in the Treasury at the capital, or in some of the subtreasuries of the country.

Mr. President, I shall not pursue this fruitful theme further.

Mr. PLATT. Mr. President, the conspiracy against labor fills not a chapter merely, but pervades the whole volume of American history. Often it has seemed on the eve of victory, often it has apparently triumphed, but in the hour of its seeming victory it has been beaten down and baffled and overthrown, now by the ballots of laboring men aroused to a sense of their peril, and again by their bullets on fiercely contested fields. Sometimes this conspiracy has cloaked and disguised its purposes, sometimes it has boldly avowed them, but never since its first organization has it abandoned them for an hour. Whenever temporarily defeated, it has taken advantage of the security felt in its supposed overthrow to renew its plottings. The chief enemies of the country have been among its chief promoters. Early conspirators have perished; new ones have taken their places. The conspirators die, but the conspiracy lives.

This conspiracy against labor obtained early control of the Democratic party. Through the success of that party it hopes for the accomplishment of its purposes, and now but seemingly awaits the reelection of Grover Cleveland to carry out its ruinous designs. It is and always has been a sectional conspiracy, and its name is free trade.

Two systems of labor were established contemporaneously in this country. About a year before the Mayflower touched the Massachusetts shore, a ship landed at Jamestown, Va., loaded with slaves. From that time these two labor systems have been antagonistic forces in the country, and all our woes and troubles and conflicts have been occasioned by "the irrepressible conflict" between these two labor systems. One system involved the idea that labor should be unpaid and ignorant. At first it involved the idea that capital should own the laborer, but always to this day the idea that labor shall be poorly paid and ignorant. The other system involved the idea that labor should be well paid and should be intelligent.

The Southern system, if I may so call it without disrespect, was based upon the idea that the laborer should have no status in society, that he should have no political rights, no civil rights, no "inalienable rights." The other was based upon the idea that the laborer should have an equal status in society with every other man; that he should have political rights and civil rights; that he should be one of the citizens of the Government, responsible for its administration and responsible for its progress; that he should be in the broadest sense a freeman; and so in the States where this grand system of labor was domiciled the oath which an elector was required to take in order to cast his vote, to participate in governmental and State affairs, was called "the freeman's oath." Labor was dignified and the laborer was dignified by his participation in all the functions of government and society. There were indeed slaves in the North at first, but there was no room for them in the labor system which obtained there, and they went out, disappeared by the inevitable operation of the laws which governed that system. The Southern system, where the laborer was unpaid, where he was kept ignorant, where it was a criminal offense to teach him to read even the Scriptures, was adapted only to the rudest cultivation of the soil. The Northern system, where the laborer was well paid and intelligent and free to engage in the "pursuit of happiness," inevitably tended to the diversification of industries.

These two labor systems determined where manufactures should first be planted in the United States. It was not the enterprise of capitalists; it was solely and purely the character of labor which spread over these different sections of the United States which determined where manufacturing should spring up and flourish.

North Carolina by all its natural resources, and the same is true of the other Southern States, was just as much adapted to the establishment of manufacturing enterprises as was Rhode Island. The New England States, where this labor system was first planted, could but attempt to engage in manufacturing. The Southern States, where the ignorant and unpaid system of labor prevailed, could only engage in the raising of cotton, sugar, tobacco, and like agricultural products.

Skill, education, and aspiration in the laborer make agriculture not only more profitable, but are absolutely essential to even the rudimentary development of mechanical industries.

To have supposed that manufacturing could at that day have found a foothold in the Southern section of this country was to suppose that you could reverse a universal law of political economy. The one system involved caste; the other equality. The one involved the idea that man should go up, and the other involved the idea that he should go down. Those are two pregnant words in our language, Mr. President, those two little prepositions, "up" and "down." They belong to the language of the Aryan race. Their counterpart is to be found in no other language. We may trace them back through every migration to the home of the Aryan race in Central Asia.

First, they signified simply the measuring of an expanse upward or downward. Soon they came to have a meaning with regard to human character, with regard to human aspiration, with regard to human progress; and so in our language, when we speak of a man's going "up," we mean everything that is implied in the idea of human progress, and when we speak of a man's going "down," we mean everything that is implied in the idea of human degradation.

This labor system of the North could not but elevate man; could not but elevate the laborer. The labor system of the South could only drag him down until such time as the Northern idea of labor should permeate the South, and he should be in some degree emancipated, not from the actual fetters and manacles of slavery, but from the manacles of this labor system.

The necessities of the Government immediately after the adoption of the Constitution obtained the acquiescence of both sections of the country to the protective system, to the system which was to encourage and protect and to stimulate manufacturing in the United States. Until that time we were practically an agricultural community, both North and South, but immediately upon the adoption of the Constitution it was found necessary to raise money for the expenses of government, and coincident with the idea of revenue came the idea of the establishment, encouragement, and protection of manufacturing industries in this country. No one questioned the constitutionality, the morality, the expediency, or the beneficence of protection then.

So, at the first Congress after the adoption of the Constitution, on the first anniversary of our National Independence after the adoption of the Constitution, George Washington signed his name to the first protective tariff bill July 4, 1789. It was a second declaration of independence, a declaration of industrial independence for the United States; and in these later years when we are having centennial celebrations nothing could be more appropriate than that on the next 4th of July, when we have rounded out a full century of protection to American industries, we should celebrate that event.

There was no objection made in any quarter until after the war of 1812, when we still needed additional revenue, nor indeed was serious objection interposed until the really vigorous protective tariff of 1828 was adopted. Prior to that time the South had not discovered that it was impossible to establish manufactures in the South. It had not discovered that the labor system on which it had undertaken to build its civilization was of a character which made manufactures an impossibility; but it had discovered about that time that the diversification of industries at the North, consequent upon protection and the status of the Northern laborer, impossible to the South by reason of the status of its laborers, had given the Northern States a growth in wealth, in power, in strength, in energy, by which they were entirely outstripping the Southern States.

Calhoun, who in the early history of the Government had been as strong a protectionist as any Northern man, was among one of the first to discover that under the diversification of industries consequent upon the enactment of protective tariffs the North was making great strides. Other South Carolinians, McDuffie notably, joined with Calhoun in raising the cry against protection. The conspiracy then was organized, and from that day to the present time it has existed. Its chief conspirators have always had their home in the same section of the country. It started in South Carolina. Its desire was twofold:

First. To extend the Southern labor system.

Second. To curtail the Northern labor system.

First. To extend that system where labor should be unpaid and ignorant.

Second. To circumscribe and limit that section where intelligent, virtuous, self-respecting, and respected labor should have its home.

One of three things was inevitable, either the Southern labor must be freed, educated, and elevated; or, second, that Northern labor must be degraded, checked in its onward progress; or, third, that the Northern States would become more powerful in wealth, numbers, and political power.

So men came to talk earnestly in the South and constantly about preserving the "balance of power." It was thought, indeed, at that time by superficial observers that this phrase meant preserving the balance of power between slavery and freedom, but slavery was only an incident of the contest. It was to preserve the "balance of power" between the labor system of the South and the labor system of the North. It was to prevent the Northern growth under its labor system and to keep it checked, so that the South should, with its labor conditions, progress equally with the North.

The means by which this was to be accomplished was free trade. The idea of protection was abandoned in the South. It was supposed that it was against the interest of the cotton-grower, and cotton suddenly assumed immense importance in the Southern mind. It was elevated to Kingship. It was felt that free trade would help cotton-growing, and therefore the Southern leaders became free-traders.

What do I mean by free trade? Let us have no difference of understanding upon this subject. There is no difference of understanding among commercial men upon the meaning of this term. Among honest political economists and honest politicians it means only one thing.

Free trade does not mean the abolition of custom-houses. Free trade does not mean that no revenue is to be collected by customs duties. If it meant that, it would have no place in the language of the civilized world, for there is not a civilized country upon the globe that does not have its custom-houses and its collected revenue from customs duties. The man who says that the Democratic party is not in favor of free trade, meaning thereby that it is not in favor of abolishing custom-houses and abolishing customs duties, attempts willfully to mislead. The term has no such significance anywhere. Nobody claims that the Democratic party does not intend to raise revenue by the collection of customs duties. I mean by free trade just what all commercial nations mean by it. I mean what Lord Salisbury means by it, who defines a free-trader as one who is opposed to protection. I mean what Mr. David A. Wells means by it, who said recently—I quote his language as used in the report of the Finance Committee:

> Free trade, as an economic principle or politico-commercial system, is the direct opposite to the so-called principle or system of protection.

That is all any Republican means when he charges the Democratic party with being a free-trade party. There is not a leading Democrat in the United States to day in full communion with his party, enjoying the confidence of this Administration, who dare say that he is a protectionist. Whatever of protection sentiment and courage there was in any leading Democrat in this country has been crushed under the iron heel of this Administration.

In 1832 this free trade or anti-protection—I shall use the two terms synonymously—sought to destroy the Union. It passed the nullification act of South Carolina, and whatever may have been subsequently claimed to be the grievances of the South, it claimed no grievance then except the tariff-protection act of 1828. It proposed to set up a government for itself because the Congress of the United States had enacted a law which protected and encouraged manufactures, and which tended to the greater diversification of industries and the greater prosperity of the country. That demonstration against the Union was checked. Nullification did not become an accomplished fact. Actual secession and the actual erection of a government independent of and hostile to the United States did not take place. But what was it that prevented it? It was the courage and firmness of Andrew Jackson, doing what a President should do, maintaining and executing the laws of the United States.

But there was another cause, and that was the promise of other Southern leaders who had thereto been protectionists that the scheme of protection should be gradually abandoned. It was the knowledge that the tariff compromise of 1833 was to be enacted, quite as much as the firmness of Andrew Jackson, which prevented that early attempt at secession.

Free trade scored a victory then through the cowardice of the friends of protection. Free trade scored a victory then by the demonstration which it had made towards the overthrow and destruction of the Union; and the compromise measure of 1833 providing for a gradual reduction of protection until there should be no longer protection, was incorporated into a law. The year 1837 brought retribution for that cowardice—brought such disaster as has always followed the abandonment of the protective principle in the United States.

Whenever protection has been abandoned at the instance or at the threats of the men representing the Southern system of cheap and ignorant labor, ruin and bankruptcy have followed.

I wish to quote the words of one who will be regarded as good authority by all the laboring men of the country, whom they will believe, however much they may distrust the statement of politicians. The venerable Peter Cooper, the friend of labor during his long life, rising to eminence and wealth as the result of his own hard labor, in his later years used this language:

> I have noticed in my own business life, extending over a period of nearly seventy years, that every reduction of the tariff (or the tariff-for-revenue-only plan) has brought wretchedness and ruin. It is the natural effect from such a cause. Nothing is more certain than that the advocacy of free trade comes from foreigners who want to break up our industries. They have done it several times already and they want to do it again. The laborers of the Old World get barely enough to keep body and soul together, and that is the condition in which the advocates of free trade are trying to place our laborers, and it behooves every man to do all he can to deter Congress from the endeavor.

The widespread ruin and desolation, the bankruptcy, the suffering of labor, the hunger and wretchedness and despair of laborers wrought a change. They caused the abandonment of the free-trade idea of 1833. They always will when labor asserts itself; and I say to the

Democrats in this Chamber, and to the Democrats throughout the land, that if by the means which they are now employing, if by the deception which they are now practicing, if by the imposture which they are now attempting, they secure the votes of laboringmen, workingmen in the North, and re-elect Grover Cleveland, when those men see the consequences of that they will rise in their might once more and put down free trade and demand protection. But it will be a sad experience for them to go through.

But in 1842 protection triumphed again and prosperity returned. Up to that time the conspirators had not fully obtained control of the Democratic party. In the campaign of 1844 they did obtain entire control of the Democratic party. They resorted to the same tactics which they are now employing. The situation was not vastly different then from what it is now. The Presidential election turned on Pennsylvania, a protection State. The Senate was a tie. To-day the Presidential election will turn, it is supposed, on New York, or Connecticut, or New Jersey, and the Senate will be a tie. The Democrats went into that campaign in Pennsylvania with the rallying cry "Polk, Dallas, and the tariff of '12." The result of it was that the tariff of 1846, which I think the most unblushing of Democrats can not say was not a free-trade tariff, was enacted through the casting vote of the Vice-President, George M. Dallas, thus elected. That tariff brought ruin to the country, ruin delayed for some years by the discovery of gold in California, but though not swift, sure, as every failure to maintain the protective principle will surely, soon or late, bring disaster and ruin.

In 1857, the low tariff having produced a redundant revenue, it was still further reduced; and the parallel between that day and the present may be, I think, instructive. In December, 1855, and in December, 1856, the Secretary of the Treasury, Mr. Guthrie, a Southern free-trader, reported to Congress that there was a surplus in the Treasury which must be disposed of. He recommended still further reductions of the tariff duties for the purpose of reducing the revenue. The surplus in the Treasury was then as large, considering the requirements of Government, its receipts and expenditures, as our present surplus. The Treasury Department had been buying bonds not due at a premium running all the way from 8 to 20 per cent. In 1856 there were $20,000,000 of surplus in the Treasury notwithstanding the purchase of bonds which had been going on.

The Secretary of the Treasury insisted upon still further reducing the free-trade tariff of 1846, and on the last day of the session, on the 3d of March, 1857, that reduction act was passed and Senators and Members of the other House went home. They came here again in December, 1857, to find that the result of that further reduction of the tariff was that the United States had no surplus in the Treasury, and had not money enough to pay members of Congress with, and the very first act passed in December, 1857, was to issue $20,000,000 of Government notes; and printing presses were set running as quickly as possible in order to print notes by which the members of Congress might be paid in time for the Christmas holidays.

This shows that it is not well to be too hasty in dealing with a surplus, certainly by the means proposed by the President and the Democratic party to-day. The first result of any such action is revulsion in business. I have no doubt that if it were possible to pass the bill of the House called the Mills bill, within the next six months importations would so fall off in consequence of depression in business, of a disturbance in business, of inability to purchase foreign goods, that we should have to resort to loans as the first result of such an act. If the country could recover from such disaster the subsequent effect of the bill would be to increase the revenue from customs duties.

I said that in 1844 these conspirators captured the Democratic party. The Democratic platform for 1840 declared for a tariff for revenue only. In 1844 that declaration was reaffirmed, and in 1848, after having passed the free-trade act of 1846, the Democratic National Convention congratulated itself in this way, after reaffirming a "tariff for revenue only:" "That the fruits of the great political triumph of 1844 which elected James K. Polk and George M. Dallas President and Vice-President of the United States have fulfilled the hopes of the Democracy of the Union * * * in the noble impulse given to the cause of free-trade by the repeal of the tariff of 1842."

This was a party declaration in favor of free-trade quite as notable as the later declaration by the National Democratic Convention of 1856, which boldly declared—

> The time has come for the people of the United States to declare themselves in favor of free seas and progressive free trade throughout the world.

In 1856 the South, united in its demand for free trade, was conspiring for disunion if free trade could not be forced upon the whole country. It was able to declare it to be one of the cardinal tenets of the Democratic party.

From 1857, of which I have spoken, to 1861, the real purpose of the conspiracy against labor was to superficial observers overshadowed by the prominence of the slavery agitation. Slavery *per se* was but an incident of the controversy. It was the old controversy between antagonistic labor systems that was going on; it was the attempt to extend the labor system of the South, to curtail the labor system of the North, to keep labor degraded all over the country; but more attention was given to the incident of the extension of slavery into the Territories than to the character of the labor which was involved in that proposition.

But the war was not for slavery alone. It was fought for that underlying system of labor which the cotton States determined to preserve. It was that which brought the South into rebellion. If any one thing is needed to prove that more than another, it is to be found in a clause of the Confederate constitution, article 1, section 8:

> The congress shall have power, first, to lay and collect taxes, duties, imposts, and excises, for revenue to pay the debts, provide for the common defense and carry on the government of the Confederate States. But no bounty shall be paid from the treasury; nor shall any duties or taxes on importations from foreign nations be laid to promote or foster any branch of industry; and all duties, imposts, and excises shall be uniform throughout the Confederate States.

It shows that the leaders in establishing the Confederate constitution understood perfectly well what "the irrepressible conflict" was; that it was not an irrepressible conflict between races, between black men and white men, between slavery and freedom alone, but that it was an irrepressible conflict between two labor systems.

Alexander H. Stephens, speaking of the Confederate constitution in his "Constitutional View of the War between the States," on page 336, says:

> The question of a "protective policy," as it was called under the old constitution, was put to rest under the new by the express declaration that no duties or taxes on importations from foreign nations should be laid to promote or foster any branch of industry.

Let me refer to what Jefferson Davis, the President of that Confederacy, said in his work entitled the "Rise and Fall of the Confederate Government." Speaking of the Confederate constitution, he says:

> Protective duties for the benefit of special branches of industry, which have been so fruitful a source of trouble under the Government of the United States, were altogether prohibited.

Mr. President, I may refer to another authority. I refer to the opening sentences in a work entitled "Destruction and Reconstruction," by Richard Taylor, lieutenant-general in the Confederate army, familiarly known as General "Dick" Taylor. I ask the Secretary to read it.

The Secretary read as follows:

> The history of the United States, as yet unwritten, will show the causes of the "civil war" to have been in existence during the Colonial era and to have cropped out into full view in the debates of the several State assemblies on the adoption of the Federal Constitution, in which instrument Luther Martin, Patrick Henry, and others insisted that they were implanted. African slavery at that time was universal, and its extinction in the North, as well as its extension in the South, was due to economic reasons alone.
>
> The first serious difficulty of the Federal Government arose from the attempt to lay an excise on distilled spirits. The second arose from the hostility of New England traders to the policy of the Government in the war of 1812, by which their special interests were menaced; and there is now evidence to prove that but for the unexpected peace an attempt to disrupt the Union would then have been made.
>
> The "Missouri compromise" of 1820 was in reality a truce between antagonistic revenue systems, each seeking to gain the balance of power. For many years subsequently slaves, as domestic servants, were taken to the Territories without exciting remark, and the "nullification" movement in South Carolina was directed entirely against the tariff.

Mr. PLATT. "Antagonistic revenue systems" were the result of antagonistic systems of labor, "each seeking to gain the balance of power."

To show more clearly and distinctly what the author last quoted means, let me refer to something which he has recently said, for which General Butler is authority, in his late Boston speech. He quotes General Taylor as saying, and it has never been denied that I have heard of:

> We made two great mistakes. Had we avoided them we should have conquered you. The first was that we did not substantially destroy the protective features of the tariff in the winter session of 1857 and 1858, by an act which provided a rapid sliding scale to free trade. * * * We could have passed such a law and held it tight on you till it closed the furnaces, workshops, woolen and cotton mills, and steel and bar-iron works of the whole North and West, and scattered your workmen over the prairies and Territories. When the war was ready for you, you would not have been ready for the war. You could not have armed and equipped and put into the field a large army nor built a large navy. You would have been without supplies, machinery, and workmen, and you would have been without money and credit.

I cite these extracts to show that the war itself, the attempt to overthrow the Union, was to establish free trade as much as to preserve slavery.

And now I wish to quote from the Charleston Mercury of May 15, 1861, its views on the Confederate constitution, as follows:

> And first and foremost let us congratulate the people of this great Confederacy that this constitution contains the first acknowledgment in the fundamental law of any people of the great principle of equal and just taxation.

In the light of that I think we may understand what is meant when we are told that our present tariff system is "unjust and unequal taxation."

> That system of partial legislation in the imposition of the taxes which has been the prime cause of all the corruption and sectionalism which have finally overthrown the Union of the United States, is repudiated by this constitution.
>
> Protective tariffs are at an end if this constitution is rightfully administered with all the villainies they spawned upon the country.

The New York Herald, then as now, a Democratic free-trade paper, was in ecstacies over the insertion of this clause in the Confederate constitution. I read some extracts from an editorial article in the New

York Herald of March 19, 1861, in which, speaking of the constitution of the Confederate States, it is said:

The ultimatum of the seceded States is now before the Government at Washington, in this new constitution, adopted by the congress at Montgomery, Ala.

* * * * * * *

In their unrestricted discretion to shape a Federal Constitution for themselves, the seceded States have unquestionably provided all those securities, checks, and balances which they regard essential for the maintenance of their peculiar institutions. Thus our Northern politicians and the administration at Washington are furnished the conditions upon which the Union may be re-established or definitely divided, without war and without trouble.

This new Southern constitution is the Constitution of the United States, with various modifications, and some very important and most desirable improvements.

And then it goes on to state what is provided on the question of slavery, which I will omit in order not to encumber my speech, and then it says:

Such are the provisions of this Southern constitution, which we may accept as the ultimatum of the seceded States on the subject of slavery. Upon some other questions, however, there are certain stringent provisions in said constitution which it would be extremely difficult to persuade our Northern fishermen, manufacturers, and lobby corruptionists to swallow, even to re-establish the Union. These provisions include—

1. The absolute prohibition of all bounties from the Federal Treasury, and all duties or taxes on imported goods intended to promote or foster any branch of home industry.

Then it speaks of the prohibition of federal appropriations for internal improvements, the restriction by Congress of a majority vote to certain appropriations, the holding of contractors to the strict letter of their contracts, and the Post-Office Department to pay its own expenses, and then goes on to say:

These are excellent constitutional provisions. If they had been in force in Washington during the last ten years they would have prevented the wasteful squandering in swindling lobby jobs, contracts, etc., of three, four, or five hundred millions of public money and public property that have been squandered to the enriching of the lobby-jobbers, and the general demoralization of our Northern political parties and politicians to the lowest level of moral debasement and corruption.

The two classes of amendments indicated upon slavery and upon these other important subjects comprehend the peace offering of the seceded States to the border slave States, to the Government at Washington, and to the Northern States. They are radical propositions of change and reform. They inaugurate a revolution upon the questions involved, whether the final result shall be two confederacies or one.

Now, I beg attention to this:

We are free to say also that the invaluable reforms we have enumerated should be adopted by the United States with or without a reunion with the seceded States, and as soon as possible. But why not accept them with the propositions of the Confederate States on slavery as a basis of reunion? Practically to the North these slavery abstractions amount to nothing, while the reforms indicated are indispensable to the existence of our Government for any length of time, with or without the seceded States.

But, Mr. President, in further support of my proposition that the South in this war upon the labor system of the North had captured the Democratic party, I propose to read at length from another editorial article in the New York Herald of March 19, 1861, as I said before, then and now a Democratic free-trade paper. It is headed "The Two Tariffs, North and South:"

THE TWO TARIFFS, NORTH AND SOUTH.

We publish to-day the tariff recently adopted by the Northern Congress at Washington, and the one virtually agreed upon by the Southern Congress at Montgomery, both *in extenso*, and they present, we think, a fair contrast between the legislative capacity of these two bodies. It is impossible to deny to the Southern tariff an exemplification of statesmanship, enlightenment, wisdom, and a knowledge of governing a great and enterprising people which are wholly wanting in the other document.

The two measures, in fact, differ as much in spirit as the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries; they are as widely different as the legislation of the Mountain in revolutionary France, or the Puritan legislation of the old Commonwealth of England, and the legislation of these two countries at the present day, as any commercial man who understands the subject may see by comparing the one with the other.

The tariff of the Washington Congress—

Meaning the Morrill tariff—

is the most ignorant, useless, plundering, and pernicious enactment that ever was concocted for the avowed purpose of bettering the interests of the country. On the contrary, the tariff of the Montgomery congress—

Adopted, as we observed, under that provision of the constitution which prohibited the fostering of any branch of industry—

is a sound, practical, and intelligible measure, and as such it will command the admiration of the statesmen of England and France and all the commercial nations of Europe. They will discover from the comparison that the art of government is with the South and not with the North, and they will be guided by that conviction in their policy as regards the two sections.

For the last forty years a set of stockjobbers and speculators in the North, and especially in New York, New England, and Pennsylvania, have been using Congress on this question of tariff and revenue for their own benefit and for purely stockjobbing operations, just precisely as they operate in their corner gatherings in Wall street, and they have readily found such men as MORRILL, who represents some grogshop hole and corner interest in Vermont to do the business for them in Washington. The country has suffered many times from ill-judged tariffs got up to suit the stockjobbing and other individual interests, as, for example, from the tariff of 1828, which was settled in 1832, but not before it almost drove South Carolina into nullification and secession; and now that the negro agitation had driven intelligent and practical Southern members out of Congress, the abolitionists and stockjobbers got affairs into their own hands and we see the result in this most iniquitous measure, the Morrill tariff.

I think there is where the phrase "iniquitous measure," applied to the Morrill tariff, came from. I do not recollect that it was ever used before.

The combined effects of these two tariffs must be to desolate the entire North, to stop its importations, cripple its commerce, and turn its capital into another channel; for, although there is specie now lying idle in New York to the amount of nearly forty millions of dollars, and as much more in the other large cities, waiting for an opportunity of investment, it will soon be scattered all over the country wherever the most available means of using it are presented, and it will be lost to the trade of this city and the other Northern States. There is nothing to be predicted of the combination of results produced by the Northern and Southern tariffs, but general ruin to the commerce of the Northern confederacy. France and England, in view of these two measures, will find but little difficulty now in recognizing the independence of the Confederate States of the South. The statesmen of these nations care nothing for our eternal nigger question. Their own commercial interests abroad are all in all to them; and, indeed, upon the subject of negroes, both the American Governments stand now upon an equal footing, inasmuch as the Southern as well as the Northern constitution prohibits the African slave trade.

The tariff of the South opens its ports upon fair and equitable terms to the manufacturers of foreign countries which it were folly to suppose will not be eagerly availed of; while the stupid and suicidal tariff, just adopted by the Northern Congress, imposes excessive and almost prohibitory duties upon the same articles. Thus the combination of abolition fanatics and stock-jobbers in Washington has reduced the whole North to the verge of ruin, which nothing can avert unless the Administration recognizes the necessity of at once calling an extra session of Congress to repeal the Morrill tariff and enact such measures as may bring back the seceded States and reconstruct the Union upon terms of conciliation, justice, and right.

I have read this extract from the New York Herald, Mr. President, in proof, if any proof were needed, of my assertion that the thing in controversy between the South and the North was the question of free trade and protection, it being deemed necessary to have free trade in order to protect the Southern system of labor and protection in order to uphold and benefit the Northern system of labor.

Then came the struggle. Men were arrayed in arms. The Democratic party divided in 1860 in its national convention, but the South consolidated under its Southern wing. It was a conspiracy against Northern labor, I repeat, which made war upon the Union, and it was the Northern labor system which, in defending itself, preserved the Union intact. Wherever met the contending parties, there met these two antagonistic labor systems, and there met these two antagonistic revenue systems. Whoever had eyes to see might have read upon the bars of the Confederate flag, as it was seen in the smoke of battle, these words: "Slavery and free trade;" and whoever had eyes to see might have read between the stripes of the Union flag, these words: "Freedom and protection."

Those were the issues involved in that contest. We had a right to suppose that free trade surrendered at Appomattox, but it did not.

During reconstruction times the conspirators were silent, but they showed their hand again in 1876–'77. The South had then practically become solid. It had acquiesced in the abolition of slavery, it had acquiesced in striking off the visible fetters which had encircled the ankles and wrists of the slave, but it had not acquiesced in the idea of his emancipation from the industrial system of the South.

As soon as reconstruction was over and the excitement of the electoral count had subsided, they began anew their plottings to force free trade upon the country. The laborer was still despised, caste was still maintained, labor was still a badge of inferiority. From that day to this they have talked about a race issue in the South, but the only issue is the issue of labor. It is the question of whether the laborer shall be a man and have the rights of a man, to grow and develop, to be respected, and to take part in government. It is not because the man is black that he is not accorded his place in the government, his right to vote; it is because the South is determined to keep that labor system which was introduced when the ship with its cargo of slaves landed at Jamestown.

They have found two kinds of sympathizers at the North who agree with them in their free-trade "crusade." They are the *doctrinaires*, the professors of the colleges, who know nothing whatever of practical statesmanship, of practical business, or of practical political economy; and the spoilsmen of the North who seek, by adhesion to the free-trade fortunes of the solid South, to get office for their friends and to maintain themselves in a triumphant party. "Northern men with Southern principles."

The essentials of success now are the deception of the masses of Northern Democrats, for if you draw this line in Connecticut as you draw it here in the Senate, if you will avow in Connecticut as you avow here in the Senate that you are opposed to the principle of protection, Connecticut will vote 20,000 majority against the Democratic party. The laboringmen of Connecticut understand the benefits of protection. It is only when they are deceived by the pretense that it is not free trade which is aimed at by the Democratic party, that they stand by that party.

To return to history, and recent history at that. In the Congress which met in October, 1877, in extra session, towards the close of the session there was an overt act of the conspiracy well to be remembered. The present author, sponsor, and father of the House tariff bill of this session, Mr. MILLS, of Texas, on the 1st day of December, 1877, asked for a suspension of the rules of the House to enable him to submit the following resolution for passage:

Resolved, That the Committee on Ways and Means be instructed to so revise the tariff as to make it purely and solely a tariff for revenue and not for protecting one class of citizens by plundering another.

And yet he is making speeches up in Connecticut in this campaign in defense of the "Mills bill," in which by indirection he denies that he is a free-trader. He is endeavoring to secure votes in Connecticut

to help elect Grover Cleveland by making the laboringmen of Connecticut, who believe in protection, think that he does not intend to destroy it and has not endeavored to destroy it in the bill which he has passed through the House of Representatives.

In 1878, at the next session of the same Congress, came the Wood tariff bill, a bill which the late lamented President of the United States, James A. Garfield, denominated a "horrible monster." It was a Democratic measure in that House. It did not receive the support of all the Democratic members. The enacting clause was struck out by a vote of 134 to 120, 18 Democrats voting with the Republicans to strike out the enacting clause—18 protection Democrats in 1878 in the House of Representatives. All honor to them!

That proposition gave us the Forty-seventh Congress, during which we passed the tariff-revision act of 1883, after which came one of the saddest incidents in the history of American politics. It became necessary as a part of this conspiracy to ostracize, crush, and destroy SAMUEL J. RANDALL, who stood with the protectionists. He had been elected Speaker at the second session of the Forty-fourth Congress on the death of Mr. Kerr, and also Speaker of the Forty-fifth and Forty-sixth Congresses.

In the Forty-seventh Congress he was the head of the minority of the Ways and Means Committee. That entitled him, if the Democrats again obtained control of the House, to go to the head of the committee as its chairman. In the Forty-eighth Congress there came the question of who should be elected Speaker. Mr. RANDALL was a protectionist; Mr. CARLISLE was a free-trader. The result might have been foreseen when the Democratic party was in control of the House. A protectionist can no more be elected Speaker of the House of Representatives when the Democratic party has control of the House than he can be translated to heaven; and just as long as the Democratic party controls the House of Representatives, just so long there will be a free-trade Democrat in the Chair to control the organization of the committees and to recognize whomever he pleases to move for the consideration of bills in the House. The Northern protection Democrats supported Mr. RANDALL; but there were not enough of them.

Mr. CARLISLE became Speaker, and he was re-elected in the Forty-ninth and the Fiftieth Congress, when this unique spectacle was presented—the necessities of the free-trade conspirators requiring it—the election of a Speaker whose seat was contested, and whom every laboring man in this country at that time believed from the bottom of his heart was never elected to this Congress.

How did Mr. CARLISLE, the Speaker, constitute his Committee on Ways and Means? When first elected, all the rule of the House required that Mr. RANDALL, a protectionist, should be made the chairman of that committee if he desired it. It had been given out that he did not desire it, that he desired the chairmanship of the Committee on Appropriations, but no one who has read the doings of those times but knows that he was left off from the Committee on Ways and Means and was not permitted to be its chairman because it was understood that he was to some extent a protection Democrat.

How was that committee constituted? Five Southern and two Northern free-traders, together with Abram S. Hewitt, who, I think I do no injustice in saying, was either a protectionist or a free-trader according to his idea of individual revenue, constituted the majority of that committee. Four Republican protectionists were put upon it. There were eight Democrats, not one of whom, unless it was Abram S. Hewitt, could be supposed to be a protectionist, and there were four Northern Republican protectionists put upon that committee. The Democratic members were Morrison, chairman; Mills, of Texas; Blount, of Georgia; Blackburn, of Kentucky; Herbert, of Alabama; Jones, of Arkansas; Hewitt, of New York, and Hurd, of Ohio; and the Republicans were Kelley, of Pennsylvania; Kasson, of Iowa; Hiscock, of New York, and Russell, of Massachusetts. That committee gave the House what was known as the "horizontal reduction bill," voted upon April 15, 1884. The first test vote was on consideration. The objection to consideration was made by William W. Eaton, of Connecticut, who was to some extent a Democratic protectionist. The vote was for consideration 140 to 138 against. It was carried by two majority. Mr. RANDALL and thirty-eight Democrats with him voted "nay."

Then Mr. Converse, of Ohio, moved to strike out the enacting clause. That was carried by 159 to 155, Mr. RANDALL and 37 Democrats with him voting "yea" to strike out the enacting clause. That was in 1884.

In the fall of that year Mr. RANDALL was pressed into the service of the Democratic party to go on the stump, as was Mr. Eaton. They were both in Connecticut, saying, "We are protectionists, we are as good protectionists as any Republicans, and we are Democrats, and you can safely elect Grover Cleveland; you can trust us to prevent the free-trade portion of the Democrats from passing any free-trade bill through the House of Representatives;" and those professions elected Grover Cleveland—I do not call them professions—those statements elected Grover Cleveland.

I have not heard that Mr. RANDALL, or Mr. Converse, or Mr. Eaton is on the stump this year asking Democratic protection laboringmen to vote for Grover Cleveland. Indeed, from the best of my information and belief, I state that they are at present indulging in a good deal of silent meditation upon the compound ingratitude of Grover Cleveland and the Democratic party.

The platform of 1884 was made to appear a straddle. It became necessary now, in the effort to destroy Mr. RANDALL, to more fully capture the President of the United States and win him over to the plan of the free-trade conspirators. As long as Mr. RANDALL was a power in the House of Representatives there was no chance to pass a free-trade bill through that House.

I will not speak of the constitution of subsequent committees until I come to the committees of the Fiftieth Congress.

After the defeat of the Morrison horizontal bill there came the Morrison bill of 1886, which was very much like the Mills bill of 1888. It set out, if I remember, to put coal and iron ore and a variety of things of that sort upon the free-list. They found they had to abandon it in order to get votes to pass it. The result was to put wool and lumber on the free-list and a reduction of duties all along the protected articles. On the question of the consideration of that bill the yeas were 140, nays 157. Mr. RANDALL and 34 Democrats voting "nay." As I said a moment ago, the conspiracy halted. It had come against an obstacle which must be removed. That obstacle was SAMUEL J. RANDALL and his little faithful band of protection Democrats in the House of Representatives standing by him. Only RANDALL and his protection adherents were judged to prevent this cheap, ignorant labor system of the South from overthrowing the labor system of the North. It became necessary to win the President over to the plan of this conspiracy. He was won over, and the bait with which he was captured was the promise of a renomination, which he had pledged himself not to accept. The message which he had prepared for the information of Congress upon the state of the Union was thrown to the waste-basket and a message which gave what information he had on the subject of revenue reform and protection and free trade and unjust taxation and surplus was sent to Congress with the promise that possibly we might have something after that time, a promise which has not been fulfilled.

Mr. CARLISLE constituted his committee after that message was sent. No Northern man at the head of it any more, as Fernando Wood and William R. Morrison had been. A Northern free-trader would not do, and the ranking members on that committee are MILLS of Texas, MCMILLIN of Tennessee, BRECKINRIDGE of Arkansas, BRECKINRIDGE of Kentucky, TURNER of Georgia, and WILSON of West Virginia. The first five are from States where this cheap, ignorant labor is deemed essential for prosperity. Out of two billions of dollars, in round numbers, produced by the protected industries of this country, the States from which these six ranking members of that committee come, as has been shown to the Senate, produce only $56,000,000 annually. There was no representative from the great State of New York, to say nothing of New England.

I shall never expect a chairman of any important committee from New England while the Democrats have control of the other House. This seems to be as in olden times a raid on New England. We have it thrown in our faces here that protection is a New England theory; that it is for the benefit of New England, and against all the rest of the States. I want to tell those Senators who indulge in that talk that they are mistaken; that the line which separates New England from New York is obliterated; that the center of manufacturing in this country is west of the Alleghany Mountains, and that their taunt of manufacturers will be felt not so particularly in New England as in some other States of the Union.

Mr. RANDALL had power in Pennsylvania in the Democratic party. The control of the State Democratic Committee of Pennsylvania was favorable to Mr. RANDALL. A majority of its members were his friends. Mr. Saunders, a personal and political friend, was its chairman. The edict went forth that Mr. RANDALL had to be stripped of power in his own State. It was necessary to degrade him or the free-trade conspiracy could not prevail, and the President's "next friend" was deputed to destroy Mr. RANDALL'S influence with that committee. Mr. WILLIAM L. SCOTT, by means which, if the secret history of the transaction were written, would shock even the sensibilities of the Democratic party, persuaded the friends of Mr. RANDALL on that committee to depose Mr. Saunders from its chairmanship and to appoint Mr. Kisner as its chairman. What then occurred? Every follower of SAMUEL J. RANDALL in the House of Representatives was given to understand that the price of Presidential favor was a vote for the Mills bill. It was openly proclaimed that "for every SOWDEN there should be an Allentown."

Talk of iniquitous taxation! Look at this iniquitous Administration. The Mills bill was concocted by conspirators in the dark. It was caucused upon and made an administration measure. Votes were purchased for it by yielding partial protection to articles from which protection had been wholly withdrawn if it was necessary to do so in order to secure such votes. Men who had been elected by protection constituencies were cajoled, coaxed, threatened, and driven into its support by this Administration.

The vote was taken. Four Democrats only stood with SAMUEL J. RANDALL. Four only "faithful found among the faithless." Mr. SOWDEN was beaten for a renomination in his district by the influence exercised by the next friend of the Administration upon his constituency. Mr. HOGG, of West Virginia, paired with Mr. RANDALL, then stretched upon a bed of sickness, which it was feared might prove a bed of death. From that bed he wrote to Mr. HOGG, a friend

of the Mills bill, asking him to pair with him on that measure, and Mr. HOGG did so. Influences from the city of Washington defeated Mr. HOGG for a renomination in his district for that act.

Four Democrats only stood with SAMUEL J. RANDALL. The time which Republicans predicted had come: the time when Mr. RANDALL could no longer prevent the passage of a free-trade bill by the House of Representatives. Protection was vanquished and destroyed in the Democratic party the day that the Mills bill passed the House of Representatives.

Could political malignity go further than it has gone in the persecution of that honest friend of intelligent and enlightened labor? I said it was the saddest picture in American politics. The hounding of SAMUEL J. RANDALL to his political and almost to actual death presents the most shocking picture in American politics except that other companion picture, the ruin and death of John Roach, compassed by the Democratic Secretary of the Navy because he was a protectionist and a Republican.

Where do we stand, Mr. President? What is now essential to the complete triumph of these conspirators, to the complete passage of such a free-trade measure as has been sent to us from the House of Representatives? I have already stated what was considered essential, namely, the re-election of Grover Cleveland and the election of Allen G. Thurman to occupy that chair which, Mr. President, you now occupy, give the casting vote in the Senate to the passage of a bill in which the moderation of the present House bill spoken of by the President in his letter of acceptance will be discarded, and the purpose of the conspiracy will be, if possible, more completely incorporated.

There is one other thing that is essential to it, and that is to again deceive the laboringmen of the North who are in the Democratic party. That process is going on, or the attempt is made to secure that result. To this end the President says he is not engaged in a "free-trade crusade." To this end the free-traders on the Ways and Means Committee are trying to make Democratic workingmen believe them to be their best friends. The free-trade war-paint has been washed off as much as possible since the Oregon and Maine elections by these free-traders. It is about as difficult now to find a free-trader as it was for Diogenes to find an honest man in Athens although he hunted in daylight for him with a lantern.

Where are the members of the Ways and Means Committee? They are not in the House of Representatives, but, representing a labor system and a civilization which has neither a just conception of labor nor a respect for laborers, they are perambulating the North to try to make citizen laborers believe that they are their best champions. Since the day when Jacob put on his goat-skin mittens and stole away the birthright of Esau there has been no such imposture attempted. This masquerade in which free-traders promenade in protection costume, in which Democratic monopolists affect the workingman's blouse and carry the workingman's tin-can, is very striking and very suggestive. Like the Apostle Paul, they have determined to become all things to all men in the hope that thereby they may be able to gain some.

A feature of this system of deception, early resorted to, was the pretended antipathy and objection of the Democrats in Congress to what are known as trusts. We heard long and loud declamations here against trusts and upon the duty of Congress to prohibit and to punish all those engaged in them. Has any bill come to us from the House of Representatives dealing with trusts and combinations and syndicates? No. Since it has been ascertained that the gentleman whom the Senator from Tennessee yesterday denominated as a "Corsair" is for Grover Cleveland, and since it has been understood that the great sugar trust is a Democratic institution and is contributing liberally and munificently to the Democratic national campaign committee, and since it is understood that Jay Gould and the members of the National Democratic Committee are among the great railroad monopolists of this country and are all supporting Grover Cleveland and aiding his election, the war against trusts by the Democratic party has degenerated into a paper war. We hear nothing more about it. We shall hear nothing more about it except on the stump, where Democratic protection laboringmen will be told that the Republicans are the monopolists, and that all these trusts are the result of Republican combination and the terrible protective tariff!

Mr. President, many things which I had intended to say must be omitted on account of time. Although I had intended to speak of the necessity of protection to the laborer of this country, of the relation of protection to all that he holds dear in life, I am content to leave what I have to say upon the simple historical statement of this conspiracy. I tell the men who are engaged in it that they will not delude the Democratic laborer of the North. He loves his party, but he loves his country better. He loves the Democratic party, but he loves republican citizenship better. He will follow his party a long way, but into free trade never.

You are making the mistake now which you made in 1860–'61. When you had captured the Democratic party you counted upon the allegiance of the Northern Democratic laborer to that party to stand by and defend you in your supreme effort to force free trade upon this country, or to secede and set up a confederacy of which it should be the corner-stone. You counted without your host. The Democratic laborer of the North was true to his country then, was true to his labor system then, was true to his republicanism then; he enlisted in the army of National defenders. He went side by side with the Republican laborer to defend the system which had made him all he was, and by which alone he hoped for future progress and advancement. You will be disappointed now. He will not follow the Democratic party into free trade. He will stand by protection. He will defeat Grover Cleveland's re-election.

Mr. CHACE proceeded to address the Senate. [For the speech complete see the succeeding day's proceedings.] Having spoken for some time,

Mr. HOAR said: I should like to inquire of the Senator from Rhode Island if he desires to finish his speech to-night. It is getting very dark, and it is late.

Mr. CHACE. I find my throat getting somewhat sore, and if Senators will indulge me, I should prefer to conclude my remarks in the morning.

Mr. HOAR. With the leave of the Senator from Rhode Island, I move that the Senate do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 4 o'clock and 35 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until to-morrow, Friday, October 12, 1888, at 12 o'clock m.

SENATE.

FRIDAY, *October* 12, 1888.

Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. J. G. BUTLER, D. D.

The Journal of yesterday's proceedings was read and approved.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

Mr. WILSON, of Iowa, presented a petition of the Grand Army of the Republic, Department of Iowa, at Des Moines, Iowa, praying that an appropriation of $200,000 be made to furnish the number of headstones for marking the graves of Union soldiers that will be required to fill the requisitions of the coming year; which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES.

Mr. DAVIS, from the Committee on Pensions, to whom was referred the bill (S. 1311) granting an increase of pension to Samuel J. Murphy, of Marengo, Iowa, reported it without amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

He also, from the same committee, to whom were referred the following bills, reported adversely thereon; and they were postponed indefinitely:

A bill (S. 863) granting an increase of pension to Samuel J. Murphy, of Marengo, Iowa; and

A bill (S. 2035) granting an increase of pension to Samuel J. Murphy, of Marengo, Iowa.

Mr. WALTHALL (for Mr. HAWLEY), from the Committee on Military Affairs, to whom was referred the bill (S. 1455) for the relief of Mark Tomlinson, reported it with an amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

CONDITION OF THE CIVIL SERVICE.

Mr. MANDERSON. I am directed by the Committee on Printing to report back favorably with amendments the resolution for printing the report of the Select Committee to Investigate the Operations of the Civil Service. I ask for its present consideration.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The resolution will be read.

The Secretary read the resolution submitted by Mr. HALE October 11, 1888, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate, That there be printed 10,000 copies of the report of the Select Committee to Investigate the Operations of the Civil Service, and 1,000 copies of the report and testimony, one-half for the use of the committee and one-half for the Senate.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The amendments of the committee will be stated.

The SECRETARY. The Committee on Printing report to amend the resolution so as to make it read:

That there be printed 12,000 additional copies of the report of the Select Committee to Investigate the Operations of the Civil Service, and 500 additional copies of the report and testimony, one-half for the use of the committee and one-half for the Senate.

Mr. MANDERSON. The resolution is amended in order to bring it within the rule as to the cost not exceeding $500. Twelve thousand copies can be printed of the report and 500 of the report and the testimony.

The amendments were agreed to.

The resolution as amended was agreed to.

ANIMAL INDUSTRY REPORT.

Mr. MANDERSON, from the Committee on Printing, to whom was referred the concurrent resolution submitted by himself October 4, 1888, reported it without amendment, and it was considered, by unanimous consent, and agreed to:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring therein), That there be printed 50,000 copies of the fourth annual report of the Bureau of Animal Industry, for the year 1887, of which 13,000 copies shall be for the use of the mem-

bers of the Senate, 27,000 copies for the use of members of the House of Representatives, and 10,000 copies for the use of the Commissioner of Agriculture; the illustrations to be executed under the supervision of the Public Printer, in accordance with the directions of the Joint Committee on Printing, the work to be subject to the approval of the Commissioner of Agriculture.

NAVAL ASTRONOMICAL OBSERVATIONS.

Mr. MANDERSON, from the Committee on Printing, to whom was referred the following concurrent resolution, submitted by himself October 4, 1888, reported it without amendment, and it was considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the annual volumes of the astronomical observations of the Naval Observatory for 1886, 1887 and 1888 be printed, and that 1,800 additional copies of each report be printed, of which 300 copies shall be for the use of the Senate, 700 copies for the use of the House of Representatives, and 800 copies for the use of the Navy Department.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. CLARK, its Clerk, announced that the Speaker had appointed Mr. PENINGTON in the place of Mr. O'NEALL, of Indiana, as one of the managers on the part of the House on the bill (H. R. 6514) for the allowance of certain claims reported by the accounting officers of the United States Treasury Department.

The message also announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 2802) to fix the number of unbound and bound Journals of the Senate and House of Representatives, and to provide for their distribution.

The message further announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6514) making appropriations for certain claims reported by the accounting officers of the Treasury Department.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED.

The message also announced that the Speaker of the House had signed the following enrolled bills; and they were thereupon signed by the President *pro tempore:*

A bill (H. R. 4601) to amend the naval record of Nickolas Leuschen, Peter Leuschen, and Loth Possum;

A bill (H. R. 9447) to restore certain money to the fund for erecting a public building at the city of Detroit; and

A bill (H. R. 10606) to constitute Lincoln, Nebr., a port of delivery, and to extend the provisions of the act of June 10, 1880, entitled "An act to amend the statutes in relation to immediate transportation of dutiable goods, and for other purposes," to the said port of Lincoln.

BILLS INTRODUCED.

Mr. PLATT introduced a bill (S. 3630) granting increase of pension to William H. Dougal; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. HOAR (by request) introduced a bill (S. 3631) increasing the pensions of certain disabled veterans of the United States Navy; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. HAWLEY introduced a bill (S. 3632) for the relief of Mrs. Fannie Moore, widow of Maj. Gen. Marshall Frank Moore; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

MINERAL CLAIMS.

Mr. MITCHELL submitted the following resolution; which was considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to:

Whereas it is alleged the current uncontested business relating to the application for patents to mineral claims in the mineral division of the General Land Office is in arrears about thirty-three months: Therefore,

Resolved, That the Committee on Mines and Mining be, and are hereby, instructed to inquire into the cause of such arrears in such current business, and what legislation, if any, is necessary to correct the evil, and report at the next session of the present Congress.

FOURTH OF JULY CLAIMS.

Mr. SPOONER. I ask the Chair to lay before the Senate the action of the House of Representatives on House bill 6514.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The resolution of the House of Representatives will be read.

The Secretary read as follows:

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, *October* 12, 1888.

Resolved, That the House concur in the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6514) for the allowance of certain claims reported by the accounting officers of the United States Treasury.

Mr. SPOONER submitted the following report:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6514) making appropriations for certain claims reported by the accounting officers of the Treasury Department, having met, after full and free conference have agreed to the amendments made by the Senate, and do recommend to their respective Houses the bill as amended.

JNO. C. SPOONER,
GEO. F. HOAR,
JAMES K. JONES,
Managers on the part of the Senate.
W. J. STONE,
J. R. PENINGTON,
G. W. CROUSE,
Managers on the part of the House.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The question is on concurring in the report of the committee of conference.

The report was concurred in.

MARINE-HOSPITAL SERVICE.

Mr. DOLPH. The bill (S. 1786) to regulate appointments in the Marine-Hospital Service of the United States passed the other House with an amendment. The bill and amendment were referred to the Committee on Commerce and reported back by the Senator from Illinois [Mr. CULLOM], with a request for a conference. Some one suggested that it be placed on the Calendar. I wish to have a conference appointed. I think the Senate has already disagreed to the amendment.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The report of the Committee on Commerce was a recommendation that the Senate disagree to the amendment of the House of Representatives, and ask for a conference thereon. No action was taken and the bill went on the Calendar. If there be no objection, the recommendation of the committee will be agreed to. It is so ordered.

By unanimous consent, the President *pro tempore* was authorized to appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate; and Mr. DOLPH, Mr. SAWYER, and Mr. COCKRELL were appointed.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. CLARK, its Clerk, announced that the House had passed the following resolutions; in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

A resolution for the printing of the report of the Director of the Mint on the production of the precious metals in the United States for the year 1887 and 9,000 extra copies; and

A resolution for the printing of 5,000 copies each, in cloth binding, of the first and second annual reports of the Commissioner of Labor, for the use of the Department of Labor.

The message also announced that the House had appointed Mr. WHEELER, and Mr. HENDERSON of Iowa managers of the conference on the part of the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 2972) authorizing the President to appoint and retire Alfred Pleasonton with the rank and grade of colonel, instead of Mr. TOWNSHEND and Mr. GEAR.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED.

The message also announced that the Speaker of the House had signed the enrolled bill (H. R. 10896) making appropriations to supply deficiencies in the appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1888, and for prior years, and for other purposes; and it was thereupon signed by the President *pro tempore*.

IMPROVEMENT OF WILLAMETTE RIVER.

Mr. DOLPH submitted the following resolution; which was considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to:

Resolved, That the Secretary of War be directed to furnish the Senate as soon as practicable an estimate of the cost of the improvement of the Willamette River between Portland and Oswego, in Oregon, by the removal of bars and deepening the channel so as to admit of the navigation of the same by deep-draught vessels.

TESTIMONY IN LA ABRA SILVER MINING CLAIM.

Mr. MORGAN. I offer the following resolution, and ask for its present consideration:

Resolved, That in the taking of testimony in the matter of the claim known as the claim of La Abra Silver Mining Company before a subcommittee of the Committee on Foreign Relations, the depositions of witnesses who are physically unable to attend the meetings of the subcommittee or who live at so great a distance from Washington that their attendance would be unduly expensive to the Government may be taken when it is so ordered by such subcommittee.

Such depositions may be taken under oath before a notary public to be named by order of said committee, and may be certified under his official seal.

The examination of such witnesses shall be upon interrogatories in writing, propounded by the subcommittee or by either of the parties in interest, lodged with the clerk of the committee. And the counsel for the claimants and counsel opposing the claim shall be allowed ten days from the date of the service of copies of such interrogatories upon them to propound additional questions to such witnesses, and the testimony so taken shall be received and reported by such subcommittee in the same manner as if said witnesses had been in attendance and had testified before them, and subject to the same exceptions and obligations.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PASCO in the chair). Does the Senator from Alabama ask for the immediate consideration of the resolution?

Mr. MORGAN. Yes, sir.

Mr. HALE. I do not rise to object to the resolution but I did not catch the committee to which it refers.

Mr. MORGAN. The Committee on Foreign Relations.

The resolution was considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to.

COMMITTEE ON ADDITIONAL LIBRARY ACCOMMODATIONS.

Mr. COCKRELL. I asked the other day that the resolution reported, I believe, by the chairman of the Committee on Contingent Expenses in regard to the Senate Select Commiteee on Additional Accommodations for the Library of Congress might be laid over. I have since looked at it, and the Senate can take it up and act upon it; it will take but a moment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator ask to have the resolution taken up now?

Mr. COCKRELL. The Senator who reported it is absent, and I ask that it be now taken up. He wanted it considered at the time when it was reported, and asked that it might be adopted. I intended to call it up early this morning. Let it be acted on now.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be read.

The Secretary read as follows:

Resolved, That the Select Committee on Additional Accommodations for the Library of Congress be, and it is hereby, authorized to sit during the coming recess of Congress, and any necessary expenses shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the Senate, upon vouchers to be approved by the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate.

The resolution was considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. CLARK, its Clerk, announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 2972) authorizing the President to appoint and retire Alfred Pleasonton with the rank and grade of colonel.

ALFRED PLEASONTON.

Mr. COCKRELL submitted the following report:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate on the bill (H. R. 2972) authorizing the President to appoint and retire Alfred Pleasonton with the grade and rank of colonel having met, after full and free conference have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate and agree to the same.

C. K. DAVIS,
F. M. COCKRELL,
Managers on the part of the Senate.
CHAS. E. HOOKER,
D. B. HENDERSON,
JOS. WHEELER,
Managers on the part of the House.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The report requires no action on the part of the Senate.

THE REVENUE LAWS.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. Is there further morning business? If there be none, that order is closed, and the Calendar under Rule VIII is in order.

Mr. CHACE. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the House bill 9051, the unfinished business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 9051) to reduce taxation and simplify the laws in relation to the collection of the revenue.

Mr. CHACE. Mr. President, I hold in my hand a book entitled The Campaign Text-Book of the Democratic Party of the United States for the Presidential Election of 1888. On page 304 of that book, chapter 25, I find a very extended reference to the claim of what has been accomplished by Democratic administration of the Post-Office. In italicised heading to the chapter I find the following:

The railway mail, the star-route, and the steam-boat branches all show increased efficiency and extraordinary expansion. Decline in the number of depredations and defaulters among postmasters and other postal employés.

Further on they claim—

Expedition and accuracy have reached a degree of progress never before attained. The standard of competency of all employés is higher than ever before, and the complaints of the service are fewer than ever before.

Having served during this Congress as a member of the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads, and also as a member of the Special Committee to Investigate the Administration of the Civil Service by the present Administration, I think I am qualified to judge and to discuss the merits and the truthfulness of this claim. It strikes me as the most monstrous assumption that has ever come to my notice.

In regard to their claim that there has been less complaint, Senators will remember that the Senator from Kansas [Mr. PLUMB] and others some three months ago had read at the Clerk's desk a large number of extracts from Democratic newspapers in different parts of the country, particularly in the West and South, but also some from the East, making most strenuous complaints of the inefficiency of the administration of the postal and railway mail service of the country.

I shall not detain the Senate by rereading these newspaper extracts, but with the consent of the Senate print them with my remarks in order that they may show whether it is true that there have been any complaints made of deficiency in the postal service.

The postal service comes nearer to the people than any other branch of the Government. It visits every fireside in the land, and ministers to the social and business concerns of every citizen. The manner in which it is conducted for the time being readily impresses itself upon the people, and furnishes them with a criterion by which to a great extent they judge the capacity of the Government for dealing with public affairs. Recitals from the history of the service never fail to awaken public interest.

DEMOCRATIC ADMINISTRATION FROM 1853 TO 1861.

Upon the advent of the Republican party to power in 1861, after eight years of Democratic administration under Pierce and Buchanan, the postal service was in a wretchedly demoralized condition. Its facilities were meager and unsuited to the public wants; its machinery was inadequate, cumbersome, and inefficient. Official delinquencies were of constant occurrence, and the postal revenues were squandered with reckless prodigality. State laws claiming the right to examine and suppress the mails were sustained by Federal authority, and the Postmaster-General in 1859 not only permitted but instructed a postmaster within sight of the National Capitol to destroy newspapers and pamphlets arriving in the mails which were distasteful to the political sentiments of the community.

Though the rates of postage were high, nearly one-half of the postal expenditures were paid out of the general Treasury, and the deficiency in the postal revenue was constantly and rapidly growing. The departmental reports contained no suggestions for the improvement of the service, and the statute-books were left almost barren of postal legislation. The rates of postage on all classes of matter in 1861 were substantially the same as in 1851, when letter postage was reduced to 3 cents under the Whig administration of President Fillmore. Cheaper postages were not favored, but on the contrary there was a clamor from the Department for a return to higher rates. In his report for 1854 the Democratic Postmaster-General recommended a large increase in the charges for newspapers.

In 1856 he said it was—

fair to conclude that low rates of postage have ceased to stimulate the correspondence of the country.

In the report for 1858 he felt—

bound to say that the last reduction [of letter postage] below 5 cents, and the discount allowed on the greatly reduced rates on printed matter, have greatly curtailed the usefulness of the Department.

And he—

respectfully submitted to the superior wisdom of Congress whether one uniform rate of 5 cents for all distances would not enlarge the usefulness of the Department, diminish, if it did not entirely prevent, such heavy drafts upon the Treasury, and best promote the interests and convenience of the people.

The inefficiency of the service and the abuses to which it had been subjected were eloquently attested by the departmental reports. In 1859 the Democratic Postmaster-General made the following statement:

The expense attending the distribution of letters, even where honestly performed and the legitimate and proper commissions only charged, abstracts no inconsiderable sums from the postal revenues, and this is much swollen by the second and third process of the kind to which they are exposed, often by necessity, sometimes by accident and ignorance, and more frequently, it is feared, by design. * * * For the year ending June 30, 1859, the excess [of expenditures over receipts] amounted to $6,996,009.25. This unfortunate condition of things has involved the Department in imputations of extravagance as disparaging as they have been undeserved. Its present embarrassments which have so crippled its efficiency and clouded its reputation are not the fruit of its own voluntary action. * * * Without entering into the details of the delinquencies and depredations alleged to have occurred in connection with the postal service during the past year, it may suffice to state that its moral aspects are still unsatisfactory.

In concluding the report, the Postmaster-General says of the condition of the postal service:

The country has constantly manifested the most intense solicitude for the preservation of its purity and the prosperity of its administration, and it can not now be disguised that the guilty abuses of its administrations and the reckless waste of its hard-earned revenues, connected with the humiliations to which it has in consequence been exposed, have deeply and sadly impressed the public mind.

While admitting the faults of the Government, the Postmaster-General was disposed to lay a part of the blame to the public when he said:

If embarrassments ensue, it is but proper that they should fall upon those by whose willful or heedless conduct they have been superinduced. Ignorance so defiant at all attempts at its enlightenment, or indifference so insensible alike to duty and to interest, may well be permitted to suffer annoyance and even loss without even exciting any serious concern. Were the duty of the public in reference to its correspondence as faithfully performed as is that of the Post-Office Department, much of the complaint now heard of its irregularity and mismanagement would cease.

REPUBLICAN ADMINISTRATION, 1861 TO 1885.

A great civil war—the legacy of the Democratic party—did not furnish an auspicious period in which to inaugurate reforms in the methods of administering the Government. Nevertheless, the work of regeneration was not delayed, and the brilliant career of the postal service from 1861 to 1885 resulted with other great achievements from the patriotic, enlightened, and progressive spirit of the Republican party. The supremacy of the National over State authority in the control of the mails was immediately asserted and firmly established after four years of bloody war, and a repetition to-day by the Postmaster-General of the edict of his predecessor in 1859 would raise a storm of popular indignation that would drive him out of office within twenty-four hours.

Letters to soldiers were forwarded without prepayment of postage, and special provision was made for sending them clothing and other articles at low rates of postage. The mail-carrier visited every camp and followed upon every march.

The machinery for conducting the postal service was improved in all its details, and new facilities were introduced to increase its usefulness. It will be necessary to mention only the four great features of the postal service, features which specially distinguish it to-day: the registry, the free-delivery, the money-order, and the railway-mail systems.

The registry system was first put into operation in 1855. The receipts from this source had fallen from $31,000 in 1856 to $25,000 in 1860. In

the latter year the discontinuance of the system was recommended by the Democratic Postmaster-General for the reason—

That correspondents have become convinced that in registering their valuable letters they have been but holding a light for the depredator, instead of darkening his way or embarrassing him in the commission of his crime.

Fortunately the recommendation was not carried out, but instead the system was, a few years subsequently, under Republican administration, put upon a new and secure footing, and in 1885 it yielded a revenue of about $1,000,000. In 1885 the Treasury Department alone committed to the registered mails about $500,000,000 in currency, bonds, etc., not a dollar of which was lost. In 1878 the privileges of the registry system previously confined to letters were extended to all classes of mail-matter.

The free-delivery or letter-carrier system was introduced in 1863 under a Republican administration. In 1885 it was in operation in 178 cities with over 4,000 carriers, who handled nearly 1,750,000,000 pieces of mail-matter.

The money-order system, also a Republican improvement, was introduced in 1864. In 1885 it was in operation at more than 7,000 offices, which issued about 8,000,000 orders, amounting to nearly $125,000,000.

But the great innovation was the railway-mail service, which was inaugurated in 1864. By this system mail-matter is kept in continuous transit without going into post-offices for distribution, thus greatly facilitating the dispatch of matter and economizing the cost of handling it. In 1885 the system was in use on nearly 110,000 miles of railroad, over 4,000 clerks were employed, and they handled about 5,000,000,000 pieces of mail-matter. The "Fast Mails" probably had never even been dreamed of by a Democratic administration prior to 1861.

The methods of collecting and disbursing the postal revenues were radically changed, leading to greater simplicity, certainty, and security. Out of a total of nearly $400,000,000 collected for the seven years prior to 1885 at about 50,000 post-offices, less than $30,000, or say one dollar out of every ten thousand, was lost to the Government—a record that no private or corporate business establishment in the world can boast of. In 1860 the Government lost $170,947.67 by the defalcation of a single postmaster, Isaac V. Fowler, the Democratic postmaster at New York City, and not a single penny was ever recovered.

The great improvements in the service were attended by frequent and important reductions in the rates of postage and a greater liberality in the treatment of mail-matter. The extra charges for long distances were abolished in 1863, and uniform rates were established for all distances. In 1866 provision was made for forwarding letters without additional postage from one post-office to another at the request of the party addressed; also for the return to the writers free of charge of undelivered letters bearing a request to return. At the same time the charge for returning letters from the Dead-Letter Office and the penalty of double postage on partially prepaid letters were abolished.

In 1874 the postal-card was introduced, permitting a written message to be sent at a charge of 1 cent. The number of cards grew from about one hundred million the first year to nearly four hundred million in 1883. By the act of March 3, 1883, letter-postage was reduced from 3 cents to 2 cents per one-half ounce, and this was shortly followed by a reduction of 2 cents for a full ounce under the act of Congress of March 3, 1885, signed by President Arthur on the last day of Republican administration. The postage on an ounce of written matter sent from New York to San Francisco was 20 cents in 1861; in 1885 it was only 2 cents. Letters to foreign countries came in for a full share of the reductions. Postal-union arrangements were made fixing uniform rates, and the charge of 5 cents in 1885 was less than one-sixth of the average rates in 1861.

On newspapers and periodicals sent by publishers to subscribers the charges in 1861 were regulated by weight, distance, and frequency of issue, and they were collected of the subscriber. In 1863 the charges were reduced and made uniform for all distances. In 1874 the rates were fixed at 2 cents per pound for newspapers and 3 cents per pound for periodicals, to be paid by the publishers instead of by the subscribers. In 1878 the rate on periodicals was reduced to 2 cents a pound. By the Republican act of March 3, 1885, the charge on newspapers and periodicals was reduced from 2 cents to 1 cent per pound. This rate is less than one-sixth of the average charge in 1861 for like quantities of matter. On newspapers sent by others than publishers and news agents the charge since 1884 has been 1 cent for each 4 ounces. In 1861 under Democratic administration it was 1 cent for each ounce.

In 1861 the postage on books was 1 cent an ounce for 3,000 miles, and 2 cents an ounce for greater distances. In 1885 it was 1 cent for 2 ounces to all distances. In 1861 corrected proof-sheets and manuscript copy of the same passing between author and publisher were subject to letter postage; since 1863 they have been sent at printed rates, the charge in 1885 being 1 cent for each 2 ounces. In 1861 many articles, such as hand-bills, posters, lithographs, engravings, photographic views, etc., were also charged at letter rates. The present charge for all this matter is 1 cent for each 2 ounces. Much new matter was admitted to the mails. Provision was made for carrying unsealed parcels containing articles of every conceivable description not above 4 pounds in weight at a charge of 1 cent an ounce. The wide extension of postal facilities and the important reductions in the rates of postage from 1861 to 1885, though designed for the public benefit rather than to profit the postal revenue, were attended by the most excellent financial results, abundantly vindicating the liberal and progressive policy by which they had been prompted. All these improvements were by Republican administrations.

The immediate effect of the reduction of letter postage in 1851 was to leave a deficiency of revenue that was equal to nearly one-fourth of the amount of the postal expenditures. Instead of diminishing, the deficency continued on an ascending scale until 1861, when, as already stated, nearly one-half of the expenditures were paid out of the general Treasury. The suspension of mail service in the Southern States in 1861 removed a large share of the burden, so that in 1865 there was a small excess of receipts over expenditures. The restoration of mail facilities in the South at the close of the war again left the postal service with a deficiency of revenue, more than one-third of the expenditures in 1868 having been supplied from the Treasury. From this time the receipts gained steadily upon the expenditures, and in 1882 the postal service yielded a surplus of over $1,000,000. The reduction of letter postage to 2 cents followed in 1883. The revenue had grown from eight and one-third millions in 1861 to forty-five and one-half millions in 1883, and the increase in the volume of mail-matter was in a vastly greater proportion. What a wonderful growth do these figures represent in the development and prosperity of the country during twenty-two years of Republican control of the Government.

The immediate loss of revenue by the reduction of letter postage to 2 cents left the Treasury to bear about one-twelfth of the postal expenditures in 1884. A recovery was delayed by the severe depression of general business in the next year, the total revenue for 1885 being about half a million dollars less than for 1884, and it was reserved to the future to realize the benefits resulting from the stimulus of a lower rate of postage. Still the deficiency of the revenue in 1885 was not more than about one-seventh of the expenditure, and this deficiency was relatively not much more than one-third of that of 1861 at the close of Democratic administration.

While the credit of the great advances made in the postal service belongs to the Republican party, the official records show that the burdens of maintaining the service fall most unequally upon Republican shoulders. In the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of March 3, 1881, is published a table exhibiting in separate columns the postal receipts and expenditures for the year ending June 30, 1880, of the States that voted respectively for Garfield and for Hancock in the last-mentioned year. The table was compiled from the report of the Postmaster-General for 1880. It includes only the expenditures chargeable directly to each of the several States, omitting those of a general nature not apportionable by States and Territories.

Nineteen States cast their electoral votes for Garfield and nineteen States voted for Hancock. Of the nineteen States voting for Garfield, ten States yielded a surplus of revenue over expenditure. Of the nineteen States voting for Hancock, only two States—New Jersey and Delaware—had an excess of revenue over expense. The revenue in the nineteen Garfield States amounted to $24,245,790.74, and in the nineteen Hancock States it amounted to $7,914,245.14. The expenditures in the Garfield States amounted to $22,257,446.45, and in the Hancock States they amounted to $11,599,937.44. The net surplus of revenue in the Garfield States was $1,988,344.29, and the net deficiency in the Hancock States was $3,685,692.30. The Garfield States contributed 75.3 per cent. of the total revenue, and the Hancock States 24.6 per cent.

Of the total expenditure 65.7 per cent. was in the Garfield States and 34.2 per cent. in the Hancock States. For every dollar expended in the Garfield States $1.08 of revenue was returned. For each dollar expended in the Hancock States only 68 cents of revenue was returned. The Garfield States, which contributed 75.3 per cent. of the total revenue, had a proportionate share of only 57.7 per cent. in the electoral college. The Hancock States had a proportionate share of 42.2 per cent. in the electoral college, while contributing only 24.6 per cent. of the postal revenue. Thus it appears also that the political representation of the Republican States is not in a fair proportion to the intelligence and business needs of their people as manifested in the use of the mails.

Six Presidential terms intervened from 1861 to 1885, and every one of them left the impress of some highly beneficial measures upon the history of the postal service. The record of the last four years of Republican administration, from 1881 to 1885, includes the reduction of letter postage, first to 2 cents a half ounce, and then to 2 cents an ounce; the reduction of postage on newspapers and periodicals from publishers to subscribers from 2 cents to 1 cent a pound; the reduction on transient newspapers and periodicals from 1 cent for 2 ounces to 1 cent for 4 ounces; and the introduction of the postal-note and special-delivery systems. And notwithstanding all of these changes the deficiency in the postal revenue was not much greater in 1885 than in 1881.

THE POST-OFFICE UNDER MODERN DEMOCRACY.

On the 4th of March, 1885, the control of the Government again passed into the hands of the Democratic party. Nearly four years have passed, and President Cleveland's term is rapidly drawing to a close. For good or evil its doings will soon pass into history. What does the

chapter devoted to the postal service show? Not a single important feature added to facilitate the public convenience or to improve the workings of the service! Not a single effort towards lessening the burden of postal charges to the public! The Administration would be false to the traditions of the Democratic party in favoring a reduction of postages. The only change in this direction was a very recent one lowering the rate on seeds and plants, and that was brought about by the action of the Republican Senate.

The motives which inspired the policy of the Administration are transparent. The reduction of letter postage in 1883 had left some deficiency in the revenue. This might be overcome, and the glory gained of restoring the service to a self-sustaining basis. The gap could be closed from both directions. Without any reduction of the postal rates the revenue would naturally grow faster than the expenditure, and the growth of the expenditure might be restricted by withholding new accommodations and by curtailing those already enjoyed by the people. To the glory of a self-sustaining postal service might be added a shining reputation for economy. Was the public convenience to be allowed to stand in the way of such ambitions as these? The Treasury is, however, still left to bear a goodly share of the postal expenditures.

FALSE DEMOCRATIC CLAIMS.

The "Campaign Text-Book of the Democratic Party for 1888" devotes more than twenty pages to what is alleged to have been accomplished in the postal service during the first three years of the present Administration. The statements bear undoubted evidence of having been prepared in the Post-Office Department, and, without raising the question of the propriety of employing the time of public servants under a "Reform Administration" in the preparation of political literature, it may be well to examine some of the averments contained in the book. It is not claimed that there were any radical changes in the functions and methods of the service, but great credit is taken for an unusual growth in all the branches of business, for greater honesty among employés, and for a higher standard of efficiency in the conduct of the service.

It is not true that—

the service has been extended far beyond precedent in the history of the Department for any similar period of time, and, indeed, for any period of double the time—

And that—

the revenues have in like proportion increased, and the proportionate cost has in like manner decreased.

The actual revenue for 1885 is given at $42,560,843.83, and the estimated revenue for 1888 at $53,233,579.13, an increase of $10,672,735.30, or 25 per cent. The departmental reports show that the revenue for 1880 was $33,315,479.34, and for 1883, three years later, it was $45,508,692.61. This was an increase of $12,193,213.27, or nearly 40 per cent., 25 per cent. increase for three years of Democratic administration and 40 per cent. increase for three years of Republican administration.

The text-book gives the expenditures for 1885 at $49,782,619.09, and the estimated expenditure for 1888 at $55,250,000, an increase of $5,087,380.91, or 10.9 per cent. The report of the Auditor of the Treasury for the Post-Office Department gives the expenditure for 1880 at $36,542,803.68, and for 1883 at $43,282,944.43, an increase of $6,740,140.75, or about 18 per cent. If there was greater proportionate expenditure during this period it was recompensed by a much greater proportionate gain of revenue. The estimated gain of revenue over expenses from 1885 to 1888 was 14 per cent.; from 1880 to 1883 the actual gain was 22 per cent., being a net gain of 8 per cent. in favor of the last-mentioned period under Republican administration.

The increase in the number of pieces of registered matter handled for 1888 over 1885 is given in the text-book at 13.4 per cent.; the increase of the same matter shown by the official reports for 1883 over 1880 was 51.4 per cent. For the money-order service the statistics for 1888 are not given by the text-book in advance of the official report. An examination of the reports, however, shows that the increase in the amount of orders issued for 1887 over 1885 was at the rate of less than 1.5 per cent. The increase for 1882 over 1880 was 15.6 per cent.

The text-book claims an increase for 1888 over 1885 of a little over 19 per cent. in the length of railway-mail routes, and of 22 per cent. in the number of miles traveled. The official reports show that from 1880 to 1883 there was an increase of very nearly 30 per cent. in the length of railway-mail routes, and of about 34 per cent. in the number of miles traveled.

The text-book is silent as to the number of pieces of mail-matter handled by postal clerks; but from the official reports it appears that from 1885 to 1887 the increase was a little less than 18 per cent., while from 1880 to 1882 the increase was about 30 per cent.

One branch of the postal service will sustain the claim of an undue "expansion" since 1885, and that is the Dead-Letter Office. The increase in the number of pieces of dead mail-matter received at that office in 1885 over that received in 1882 was about 13 per cent., while the increase for 1888 over 1885 was nearly 27 per cent. Had the postal service become less efficient or had the public become less intelligent and careful?

With respect to the alleged greater honesty of employés, it will be sufficient to say that the Postmaster-General found it necessary in 1887 to ask for an increase in the appropriation for post-office inspectors from $200,000 to $300,000, to provide for overhauling the postmasters. The increase was granted. At the time fully two-thirds of all the postmasters in office had been appointed by the present Democratic Administration. Not a single uncharitable suggestion came from Republican sources that this great increase of inspectors might be wanted to provide traveling agents to assist in working up at the public expense the perpetuation of the Administration.

The claim of a greater efficiency in the service is not borne out by the facts. The proper and expeditious dispatch and delivery of mail-matter depend largely upon the accuracy of its distribution in post-offices and on the lines of the railway mail service. The work requires a degree of expertness and technical skill that comes only from special adaptation and long experience. The force employed up to 1885 had been carefully selected; it was well trained and highly efficient. Violent changes were sure to result in a serious derangement of the mails.

The departmental reports contain tabular "Statements of errors in the distribution and forwarding of the mails." The record includes in appropriate columns the "Number of incorrect slips returned," the "Number of errors on incorrect slips returned," the number of "missent" and "misdirected" packages of letters, pouches, and sacks, and the number of "errors checked" against other employés. Separate tables are given for the postal clerks and for postmasters at the Presidential post offices.

As to errors made by postal clerks, the footings are 429,373 incorrect slips, with 958,478 errors, in 1883; 396,746 incorrect slips, with 887,704 errors, in 1885, and 697,513 incorrect slips, with 1,734,617 errors, in 1887. For "missent" letter packages, pouches, and sacks, the number was 14,544 in 1883, 14,841 in 1885, and 27,275 in 1887. Is that increased accuracy? For "misdirected" letter packages, pouches, and sacks there were 2,420 in 1883, 2,558 in 1885, and 4,824 in 1887. For errors checked against other employés, the number reported was 1,861,534 in 1883, 1,742,540 in 1885, and 2,873,379 in 1887.

With regard to the errors by postmasters, the incorrect slips were 236,194, with 489,879 errors, in 1883; 215,352 slips, with 415,429 errors, in 1885, and 341,712 slips, with 669,034 errors, in 1887. The "missent" letter packages, pouches, and sacks were 4,623 in 1883; 4,700 in 1885, and 8,432 in 1887. The "misdirected" letter packages, pouches, and sacks were 2,723 in 1883; 2,543 in 1885, and 4,278 in 1887. Is that a degree of accuracy never reached before?

Of the total number of pieces of mail-matter handled by postal clerks there was one error to every 4,153 pieces during the year ending June 30, 1883; one error to every 5,574 pieces during the year ending June 30, 1885, and one error to every 3,373 pieces during the year ending June 30, 1887. A decrease of more than 25 per cent. in errors and a corresponding increase of efficiency from 1883 to 1885 during the last two years of Republican administration, and an increase of nearly 40 per cent. in errors and a proportionate decrease of efficiency from 1885 to 1887, during the first two years of Democratic administration! As the removal of Republican postal clerks has been greatly accelerated since the 1st of July, 1887, to satisfy the pressing political necessities of the Administration, what will the "record of errors" for 1888 and 1889, the last two years of Democratic administration, show?

These figures are not a part of "a general and widespread movement among Republican papers showing concert of action to attack the efficiency of the mail service;" but they are taken from the official reports of the Post-Office Department. They tell their own story. If, as alleged, there has been a decline of complaints, then there has certainly been a great increase of public forbearance with regard to the workings of the mail service. The fault, however, will be shown to be due to the condition to which the postal service had been reduced by the removal of old, tried, and good officials, and the appointment in their places of persons without regard to their fitness for the positions, but for partisan considerations.

DEMOCRACY USING THE POST-OFFICE TO FAVOR FOREIGNERS.

Great credit is claimed by the Democratic text-book for "initiating" parcels-post conventions with certain foreign countries for the exchange of parcels of merchandise. Upon examining this so-called reform it will be found that the Administration, pursuing the general policy and practices of the Democratic party, has been guilty of discriminating in favor of privileged classes in this country and of the citizens of foreign countries against our own people, for whose accommodation and at whose expense the postal service is maintained. One of the advanced steps of the Republican party was to throw open to the people the use of the mails for obtaining from the marts of trade the minor articles of necessity and comfort that enter so largely into life. This was of especial benefit to the country people and to the pioneers of civilization on our frontiers, who are not visited by the express companies and who are unable to procure the desired articles at home.

A great incidental advantage of the system was that it operated as a wholesome check upon the express companies in keeping down their charges to the people. The system was nurtured for the primary reason that it accommodated the people. If incidentally it benefited trade and manufactures, that was regarded of secondary importance in comparison with the convenience it affords the great masses. The law fixed the postage on unsealed parcels sent by domestic mail at 1

cent an ounce or 16 cents a pound and limited the weight of packages to 4 pounds. The idea crept into the head of the Democratic Postmaster-General that it would redound to the glory of his administration to extend this system to foreign countries. The first suggestion to this end apparently was made to him by Great Britain, whose Government is ever alive to advantages to be gained of other nations. On pages 22 and 23 of his report for 1885–'86 the Postmaster-General says of this suggestion:

> The postmaster-general of Great Britain has recently solicited the opening of negotiations with this Department looking to the establishment between the two countries of the convenient parcel-post system in general European use. No other answer was admissible except that our legislation has not yet authorized the employment of postal facilities for such objects.

The Postmaster-General, it will be observed, assigned no reason for not complying with the proposition of the British Government except that the law did not authorize him to do so. If he was influenced in his refusal by the reason that the system would facilitate the introduction of British products to compete with our own manufactures, he failed to give expression to any such reason. The pronounced tendencies of the Democratic party render it improbable that he was governed by motives looking to the protection of home industries.

The idea was not abandoned, however, for the lack of legal authority, the Postmaster-General stating, on page 62 of his report for 1887, that he had entered into a parcels-post convention with Jamaica and Barbadoes, both British colonies, it having been found "permissible to fix by such convention a higher limit of weight and size on articles to be admitted to such mails than that provided by law for domestic mails." The newly found authority did not come from express legislative enactment, but it had its origin in a legal opinion manufactured to order. For the first time in history the administrative branch of the Government assumed the right to fix the mailability of matter and vary the rates of postage—a right that Congress had ever jealously reserved to itself.

The swaddling-clothes of the infant prodigy were cut in dimensions of extraordinary generosity. While parcels to domestic address were restricted to 4 pounds in weight, the limit fixed for packages for *foreigners* was 11 pounds. While the rate on parcels exchanged between our own people, no matter how short the distance conveyed, is 16 cents per pound, goods intended for foreigners may be sent through the entire extent of the domestic mails and over a vast expanse of sea besides, at a charge of only 12 cents per pound. The domestic parcels are dumped into the mails without any formalities and left to take their chances of going safely to destination. The parcels sent abroad, on the contrary, are surrounded with unusual precautions. The sender is given a certificate of mailing and a customs declaration is attached to the parcel, which must also be accompanied by an invoice. There are three distinct blank-forms to be provided and filled out at the Government expense. To the cost of this special machinery is added the extra expense of sea transportation to swell the disproportion of revenue between foreign and domestic parcels.

The system has since been extended to Honduras and the Bahamas, both, like Jamaica and Barbadoes, British colonies. The principal exports of all these countries are sugar, cotton, salt, rum, molasses, rice, coffee, rubber, pine-apples, and oranges. Will our people make use of the mails to procure these articles? The merchants may be benefited and the foreigners may be accommodated by the system, but it furnishes no advantages to the people at large, for whose accommodation the postal service is provided. It would be vastly more to the advantage of our merchants and manufacturers to encourage the use of the mails for the conveyance of their products to our own people, and more in keeping with the objects for which the postal service was created.

The consumers in this country may now procure an article by mail from one of the British colonies named at a lower cost for postage than he could have it sent from any post-office near to his place of residence.

Foreign countries allow the use of the international mails for the promotion of their commerce, but they do so at a charge proportioned to the cost of service rendered; but the discriminations of the mails are made in favor of their own people. The German rate for parcels to the British colonies mentioned is about seven times the amount charged on domestic parcels, and the French rate to the same colonies is about four times the amount of the domestic rate. In using the domestic mails for parcels our people are compelled to pay a charge that is just a third more than the rate at which the mails may be used to send merchandise abroad. And while the charge on our domestic parcels is just one-half the rate for domestic letters, parcels are carried to foreign countries at about one-thirteenth of the rate charged on letters to the same addresses.

While dealing thus liberally with the citizens of foreign countries, has the Democratic Administration taken any steps to encourage the use of the domestic parcels-post? Let us see. Recognizing the discriminations made against our own people in the use of the mails for the carriage of parcels, and appreciating the public utility of an efficient domestic parcels-post, I had the honor on the 16th day of July to introduce a bill in the Senate proposing to merge the third and fourth classes of mail-matter into one class at a uniform charge of 1 cent for 2 ounces, or 8 cents a pound. This in effect would reduce the rate on domestic parcels one-half; and, besides the relief it would afford to the people, the proposition had many advantages in the way of simplifying the workings of the mail service and in saving annoyance and delay to the public. The bill was promptly referred to the Senate Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads. It was duly reported back to the Senate with a recommendation favorable to its passage. It is now on the Calendar awaiting a suitable time for action by the Senate. One attempt to secure its passage was antagonized by the senior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BECK].

A similar bill was introduced in the Democratic House of Representatives on the 11th day of June by Representative ALLEN, of Massachusetts, a Republican. The bill was smothered by the Democratic Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads, most probably at the inspiration of the Democratic Post-Office Department. Perhaps the Democratic opposition to the measure comes from something more potent than the lack of desire to benefit the people; and that is a wish not to interfere with the monopoly enjoyed by the express companies, the Postmaster-General stating on page 61 of his report for 1887 that—

> Parcels-post conventions have never been hitherto negotiated with other countries, nor have any domestic arrangements of the kind been set on foot. It has been our policy to leave to express companies and other carriers the transportation of all parcels above the mailable weight of 4 pounds, and no general demand for any change in this policy has ever arisen, such service by private hands having apparently been hitherto accepted as satisfactory. This, however, has little or no relation to the interchange of small parcels of merchandise with foreign countries. The restrictions of the tariff laws, not only in the duties imposed, but still more in the troublesome and expensive requirements attending the passage through the custom-house and the forwarding of articles, have to a great degree prevented the purchase here by persons residing abroad, or their sending hither, the smaller goods in retail, which within our borders are freely purchased, though long distances intervene between the buyer and seller.

The Democratic party while professing great opposition to corporations is ever tender in taking any action to interfere with their privileges.

The Post-Office Department is awaiting a demand from the people before doing anything to favor them in the transportation of parcels by mail. Was there ever any organized demand from the people for postal reforms? Was the reduction by the Republican party of letter postage to 2 cents demanded by the people? If the Democratic party wishes to test the public appreciation of that measure, let it propose to restore the letter rate from 2 cents for a full ounce to 3 cents for a half ounce. Then the people would be heard from, and in a way to make the Democratic ears tingle. It is the business of the postal administration and of Congress, and not of the people to devise measures of public relief and improvement in the postal service.

The desire of the Democratic administration to favor foreign interests, and particularly British interests, was further illustrated by its action with reference to the importation of merchandise from Canada. Under arrangements made by the Administration the articles could be mailed in Canada to any address in the United States at a charge of only 4 cents a pound, just one-fourth the rate of the charge when mailed in this country. So long as it benefited only the people of Canada the Administration was content, but when some of our seedsmen living on the frontier took advantage of the situation to freight their goods across the line and mail them at Canadian post-offices to their customers in this country the Administration awoke to its blunder through a manifestation of popular discontent.

Democratic legislators hastened to introduce bills to reduce the domestic rate on seeds to one-fourth or one-half the existing rate, but there were no signs that the Democratic Administration looked for a remedy through any reduction of postages. Instead of that the Post-Office Department posted an agent off to Ottawa, who succeeded, by the complaisance of the Canadian Government, in restoring the old arrangement by which parcels mailed in Canada to the United States were subject to the same charges as though mailed in this country. Then Democratic interest in the matter ceased in Congress, and it was left to the Republican Senate to secure an amendment to the Post-Office appropriation act making a reduction of one-half in the domestic rate on seeds, bulbs, and plants. Thus the Democratic party was extricated from its blunder, and it had preserved the consistency of its record in opposing all reductions of domestic postage.

DEMOCRATIC DISCRIMINATION AGAINST BUSINESS MEN.

The spirit which animated the Post-Office Department in dealing with the public was illustrated by a stroke of policy which entailed serious consequences to the business public. An act of Congress passed in 1879 defined the permissibility of the printing on the wrappers of unsealed parcels and on envelopes inclosing circulars. The statute was liberal and it had been liberally construed by the Department. The Postmaster-General stumbled upon this statute in the summer of 1887, and he questioned the generous interpretation which had been put upon it. The sanction of eight years of precedent and the interests and convenience of the public did not permit him to wait a short time and submit his doubt to Congress for decision; but instead he issued a peremptory mandate restricting the quantity of printing previously allowable on the matter in question, and imposing the penalty of a charge of letter-postage rate for violations of his order.

Business men were caught in an embarrassing dilemma. They had on hand ready for use greater or less quantities of the forbidden wrappers and envelopes, which were rendered unserviceable, and no time was afforded for obtaining a new supply. Worse than all, correspondents

were compelled to pay letter postage on matter which had been admitted at printed rates, and sent prior to or in ignorance of the order. A storm of indignation broke out through the public press, and the Postmaster-General realized, probably for the first time, the full extent of the mischief he had done. He insisted that his order was correct; but at the same time he suggested means for its evasion in special cases. He promised to ask Congress to restore the previous condition of things. This promise he kept in his annual report in December last; a special act was promptly passed, the evil was corrected, and once more "quiet reigned in Warsaw."

DEMOCRATIC CIVIL-SERVICE REFORM IN THE POST-OFFICE.

The President came into office with loud professions in favor of civil-service reform. All his public utterances pledged his devotion to that object, and they deluded many voters into casting their suffrages for him. Efficiency and fidelity in the discharge of their duties were to be the tests in the retention of the public servants, and vacancies were to be filled solely with reference to the fitness of the appointees. The manner in which he has carried out his pledges finds no better illustration than in the postal service, where least of all the branches of the Government could changes be made without serious impairment of the public welfare. Of all the tried and faithful subordinates who had aided in elevating the service to its high pedestal but very few, if any, of prominence are in the service to-day.

The first efforts of the Democratic Postmaster-General appear to have been directed to securing the most expeditious means of supplanting Republican office-holders with those of approved Democratic faith. To deceive the public with the belief that the Administration was not false to its civil-service reform pledges "offensive partisanship" was assigned as the cause for making the desired removals. The farce was enacted of requiring the guilt to be established by documentary proof. It was a "star-chamber" proceeding, the accused being afforded no hearing and no opportunity to furnish testimony in rebuttal, if indeed he was made aware of the existence of the charge. Discords were fomented in communities and the sordid motives of human nature were excited to lead neighbor to testify against neighbor. So long as the Administration sustained its pretensions of civil-service reform, and the rewards of political services were bestowed upon its adherents, what mattered it that innocent persons were forced to go out of office resting under the odium of charges which they had not been allowed to refute?

The difficulties and delays in making out a plausible showing were displeasing alike to the Postmaster-General and to the horde of hungry office-seekers knocking at his doors. Accordingly, within a few weeks after his induction into office the Postmaster-General addressed a "confidential" circular to the Democratic Senators and Representatives in Congress from certain of the States, seeking their aid in the accomplishment of his purposes, and saying, among other things, the following:

Am impatient to assist our people in securing relief to which they are justly entitled from partisan postmasters. Suggest method which if adopted will give substantial relief. I will require no more proof of partisanship than affirmation of a Representative or Senator, or affidavit of some person whom the Representative can affirm to be of unquestioned credibility.

The greater simplicity of the new method was not without its desired fruit, and changes proceeded with a greater rapidity. The reports of the Postmaster-General show that there were 51,252 post-offices in existence on the 30th of June, 1885. Of the incumbents of these offices 12,150, or nearly one-fourth of the whole number, were removed or suspended, and 15,975, or nearly a third of the whole number, were displaced by resignation, voluntary or involuntary, or by expiration of commissions between July 1, 1885, and June 30, 1887.

Nearly seven-twelfths, or somewhat more than one-half, of the whole number had been displaced within a period of two years. The removals and resignations (!) had exceeded in point of numbers all the post-offices at which the postal revenues were more than $100 annually. Death intervened to save 1,176 postmasters from the chances of removal. Six thousand five hundred and twenty-four newly created post-offices were filled with Mr. Vilas's selections. The official reports do not show how many changes were effected between March 4 and July 1, 1885. Civil-service reform had evidently been practiced with a vengeance in the Post-Office Department.

In the railway mail service, the most important branch of this Department, the general superintendent and every division superintendent have been removed. The last one, R. C. Jackson, at the head of the division including the Middle States, with headquarters in the city of New York, a man whose fitness, earnestness, and faithfulness to duty is unquestioned, and against whom no charge can be sustained, was removed about three weeks since to make a place for a partisan of the present Administration. The outcry which was raised against this removal simply called out the reply that the Post-Office Department were dissatisfied with his record. But what was his record? He commenced in 1874 as a clerk in the Department on a salary of $1,200 a year, and has worked his way up by honest promotion to the highest position in the railway mail service. And I challenge the Department, or any person, to show any ground for his removal, except the desire on the part of the Administration to put in his place a partisan who might be serviceable in promoting the re-election of the President. In the great scramble for office and the haste of this Administration to reward its partisans there have been a great number of bad appointments. The list includes drunkards, and keepers of drinking saloons, of gambling-houses, embezzlers, defaulters, and jail-birds; and as an evidence of this I print in connection with my remarks a list of such appointments, cut almost without exception from Democratic newspapers, or papers supporting the re-election of the President.

In order to be sure that no injustice may be done, I have stricken out the names and left a blank space.

I will begin the list with the head of the railway mail service, who has charge of all the postal clerks.

——— Appointed collector at Port Huron, Mich.; worker for "Boss" Dickinson (1885, June 19; The Tribune, 5). Brother-in-law of Senator Conger; charged with treachery to the Democratic party as chairman of the committee; called an outspoken Copperhead (1885, July 29; New York Sun, 2). Accused of dishonesty in building the Chicago and Port Huron Railroad and of bad record as collector under President Johnson (1886, May 5; The Tribune, 2). Charges filed in June, but no consideration from President (1885, April 16; New York Herald, 4). Adverse report; charges not met; rejected (1886, August 5; New York Sun, 7). Appointed Superintendent of the Railway Mail Service; first important appointment made by Postmaster-General Dickinson, though he had been rejected by Senate for cause, Democratic Representative having protested with charges affecting his integrity. How Dickinson found a way of rewarding a friend without the intervention of a Senate committee (1888, May 16; The Tribune, 3. Also, 1888, May 15; New York Times, 3).

——— Postmaster at Delaware City; defaulter in sum of $2,171 on sales; committed in default of bail (1885, August 1; New York Times, 5).

——— Postmaster at Shenandoah; shortage in accounts, $1,330; appointed two years ago (1887, April 22; New York Sun, 2).

——— Appointed postmaster, Springfield, Ill., Senate committee reports, because of services as the editor of the leading Democratic paper and manager of the Democratic State committee (1886, June 25; New York World, 4). Resolution adopted by Democratic State committee requesting Administration to investigate ——— connection with corrupt State printing, and that he be dismissed as unfit for trust or honor (1887, September 3; New York Sun, 2).

——— Appointed postmaster at McCook, Nebr., *vice* Scott, removed, but was in nine months dismissed as defaulter (1886, August 12; New York Times, 4).

——— Postmaster at Oconto, Wis.; arrested for robbing mails (1887, January 27; New York Sun, 1).

——— Post-office clerk at Waterbury; arrested for robbing the mails (1887, August 16; New York Times, 1).

——— Appointed clerk of railway mails. Under three indictments for forgery; was arrested three times at Cincinnati for getting money under false pretenses; once in Texas for robbery; twice for theft in Kentucky; recommended by Comptroller Durham. It was predicted he would steal something in a month; did steal money-order for $163; was traced to St. Louis, and was arrested at Santa Fé; awaiting trial (1885, September 2; New York Sun, 1).

——— Appointed postmaster at Vinson, Iowa, in place of one-legged Union soldier, S. A. Marine, who was turned out; ——— proved to have been indicted and convicted of violating pension laws, and was removed (1886, May 27; New York Sun, 2).

——— Appointed assistant postmaster at Indianapolis. Testimony of Foulke; reported to have been attached to gambling house Indianapolis, and said, "it was better for the boys to resign than to have us trump up charges against them" (1888, March 29; New York Times, 2).

A "CLEAN SWEEP" DEMORALIZES THE SERVICE.

——— Appointed postmaster at Indianapolis. "Generally believed that if ——— was appointed, Mrs. Hendricks's brother, S. W. Morgan would be really postmaster, thus providing a good place for a relative" (1885, March 23; New York Times, 1). Reward for party services rendered many years ago (1885, March 27; New York Times, 1). Disregards civil-service law and charges preferred, "facts President will hardly ignore;" ——— removed assistant postmaster and put in broken-down politician; replaced cashier with his own son; removed stamp clerk; removed chief of registry and put in Hendricks's nephew, a boy of twenty-two, clerk in drug store; replaces chief of repair department by pork inspector; discharged janitor and put another son of his own in that place; turned out four poor women engaged in repairing mail-sacks, and put in three male Democrats. Among persons discharged were one ex-general Union Army, one Union veteran, one soldier's widow, and a niece of General Burnside; no complaint save that they were Republicans. "I had promised their places to Democrats. I don't know what the last election meant if it did not mean that Republicans were to be turned out" (1885, July 27; New York Times, 4). Investigation by commission (1885, July 29; New York Times, 5). Appeals to President (1885, August 7; New York Times, 5). Investigation confined to violation of rules, had nothing to do with laborers and workmen or with declarations of postmaster; charges of merciless partisan proscription, outside the part of the service governed by rules, not investigated (1885, August 11; New York Times, 4). Letter of Swift Civil-Service Reform Association, "clear that spirit and intent of law violated in discharge employés classified service because Republicans, and in case of one Wilmington, the postmaster concocted a clumsy and easily exposed falsehood to justify his action" (1885, August 19; New York Times, 1). Demoralization postal service hard to realize; express money-orders have increased 40 per cent. because of postal inexperience; some appointees can hardly write their own names; one mail-carrier, Noe, caught rifling letters in his possession, pardoned by President; Democratic paper says "Congressman BYNUM kept busy appointing felons to office and obtaining pardon for their crimes" (1886, July 18; New York Times, 5). "Dismissed every man and woman in sack department, including four women who had others depending on them, with no charges against any; removed janitor, watchman, engineer, and elevator boy also, declaring because they were Republicans, and men appointed in their places were active political workers." Testimony Foulke, president Indiana Civil Service Reform Association (1888, March 29; New York Times, 2).

——— Appointed postmaster at Kearney, Nebr.; was intemperate; admitted had been twice roaring drunk since appointment; once when appointed (1886, May 29; New York Sun, 2).

——— Railway mail agent; recommended by Morrison; took much needed pledge; got tight at Chicago before starting on route; put flask of whisky into mail-bag, which broke, and whisky-soaked letters were refused by Prohibitionists; discharged (1886, November 24; New York Times, 2).

——— Postmaster at Sandusky, Ohio. Arrested for abstracting letters from the mails; proof in his own handwriting (1887, February 15; New York Times, 3).

INCOMPETENT, DISHONEST, AND A JAIL-BIRD.

——— Appointed postmaster at Sioux City, Iowa. Convicted in United States court at Yankton, Dak., and sentenced to penitentiary. Appointed in place of most efficient postmaster; Democrats send letters protesting, and declaring him "incompetent, dishonest, and a jail-bird; thought the President meant what he said about retaining worthy and capable officers until their terms expired, and had not therefore recommended anybody." Appointment secured by office broker who knew Vilas at Madison; predecessor removed on charge offensive partisanship, signed by two men (1885, August 5; The Tribune, 2).

—— Was arrested for stealing $1,000 worth of goods at Racine, Wis., and confessed and held in bonds for $600; forfeited bond and ran away; writes after long absence from Northern Dakota that he has been appointed postmaster (1886, December 10; The Tribune, 1).

—— Postmaster at Peoria. Alleged dismissed from Army for certifying false muster-roll; indicted several years ago for violation internal-revenue laws; pleaded statute of limitations; certified copy of indictment and record sent to President before appointment (1885, November 25; New York World, 4).

—— Postmaster at Newberry, Mich. Arrested with his deputy, C. W. Huer, charged with embezzlement; was active politician and a Democratic county treasurer (1888, May 7; New York Times, 1).

—— Postmaster at Flambeau, Wis. Convicted of robbing town treasury; turned Cleveland Democrat and became candidate for Indian agent, and then for postmaster (1886, February 1; New York World, 1). Protest of people finally prevented appointment

—— Postmaster at New Holland, Pa., absconded; accounts bad; notes protested (1885, December 11; New York Times, 1).

—— Appointed postmaster, Fort Dodge, Iowa. Appointment secured by J. H. Dunscombe, who, according to affidavit, required Cain to pay $400 yearly out of salary received for support of Democratic paper edited by Dunscombe's son (1886, May 25; New York Sun, 2).

—— Appointed mail agent Union Station, Ind. Was sentenced in 1872 to the penitentiary for two years for grand larceny; pleaded guilty of robbery in 1887 and was sentenced for two years; indicted for riot in 1879 and found guilty; in the same year he was indicted for robbery; and also in 1883 for assault and battery (1886, January 24; New York Times, 7). Full recommendation by Congressman BYNUM, with signatures of Governor Gray, Judge Niblack, Auditor Rice, Attorney Board, and Secretary Myers (1886, January 31; New York Times, 2).

—— Appointed janitor money-order division, Cincinnati: "colored man who was sent for three years to State prison for stealing gold watch and chain" (1885, July 3; New York Times, 1). Case investigated; found that —— served three years in prison but behaved well since (18 5, July 21; New York Times, 3).

—— Railway mail service, Indiana. Mail car allowed to go to Lafayette without messenger, and mail brought back. He was prominent political worker; appointed for that reason, and had boasted that he had bribed three members of council to vote for a street railroad. Testimony of Foulke, president Civil Service Association (1888, March 29; New York Times, 2).

APPOINTED WHILE IN JAIL.

—— Appointed postmaster at Lincolnville Centre, Me. Now serving out an eight months' sentence in jail for stealing postal money as deputy at that same place; petition signed by more than one hundred Democrats, and approved by the chairman of the Democratic State committee (1885, August 8; New York Times, 4). Appointment asked by Chairman Brown (1885, August 11; New York Sun, 2). Brown declares that he knew nothing about the appointment; was not in the list secured when he was at Washington (1885, August 12; New York Herald, 3).

—— Appointed postmaster at Columbus, Kans.; convicted in Cherokee County of forgery in second degree; was Democratic candidate for auditor of State two years ago; plan of fraud was to use fictitious deed of real estate as basis for loans on notes to fictitious persons (1886, July 24; The Tribune, 1).

—— Appointed postmaster at Kearney, Nebr., while serious charges were under consideration by Senate; discovered by inspectors to be a defaulter, and name withdrawn (1886, May 29; New York Sun, 2).

—— Appointed postmaster at Atlanta; was impeached as State treasurer in 1870 for malfeasance, but escaped conviction, vote in senate lacking two of the necessary two-thirds; suit brought to recover $27,000 corruptly received while in office, according to his own confession; all the facts placed before the President by Georgia Democrats prior to nomination (1886, February 17; The Tribune, 2).

—— Assistant postmaster at Coshocton, Ohio. Arrested embezzlement Government funds; failed to account or remit (1887, June 26; New York Sun, 2).

—— Appointed postmaster at Flatbush at request of F. Campbell; arrested for malfeasance in office, appropriating money passing in registered letters (1887, July 10; New York Times, 2).

—— Appointed postmaster at Lansing, Mich.; a professional lobbyist; Democrats indignant that man of his character appointed; Knights of Labor charged that —— received a big fee to look after their bill and then betrayed them; since appointment has compelled employés to contribute money to bear expenses of campaign; personal character unanimously reported unfit, and rejected without opposition (1886, August 5; New York Sun, 7).

—— Money-order clerk at Reading, Pa., short of $1,000; fast young woman in case (1887, June 17; New York Times, 1).

—— Postmaster at Huntington, Conn.; arrested for robbing mails (1887, January 21; New York Times, 1).

—— Appointed postmaster at City Island, N. Y.; a defaulter; borrowed of many friends and fled; said to be woman in case; office cleaned out of money and stamps (1888, April 13; New York Sun, 3).

—— Appointed postmaster Fairfield, Ill.; never settled accounts as clerk of court, Wayne County; refused to surrender books; rejected (1886, June 18; New York Sun, 2).

—— Nephew of Congressman SPRINGER; appointed postmaster at Jacksonville, Fla., two days before Congress met; got commission and qualified after Congress met in violation of law; charged with insulting and obscene comments on soldiers' reunion, and on the wife of chairman of the committee of arrangements; a prominent citizen, ——, a crony of ——, was made deputy, and charges that —— compelled him to divide pay; makes affidavit that —— was author of obscene paper above named; supported by other affidavits; all employés and postmaster neglected duties of office for four weeks in SPRINGER'S interest (1886, July 15; New York Sun, 1). Charges proved, and was rejected (1886, July 22; New York Sun, 1).

JAIL-BIRDS FOR PLACES OF TRUST.

—— Appointed postmaster at Fort Dodge, Iowa. Appointment secured by ——, who, according to affidavit, required —— to pay $400 yearly out of salary received for support of Democratic paper edited by ——'s son (1886, May 25; New York Sun, 2).

—— Appointed postmaster at Ithaca, N. Y. Office used as partisan headquarters; service in a state of chaos; chronic delays of New York mail; letter and wedding invitations delayed for days or weeks; reprimanded from headquarters (1886, December 17; New York World, 4).

TWO CONVICTS CHOSEN—ONE-LEGGED SOLDIER OUSTED.

—— Appointed postmaster at Vinton, Iowa; under indictment for violating State liquor law; a saloon-keeper and man of intemperate habits and general bad character; one-legged soldier turned out to make place vacant, and predecessor, ——, first appointed, but removed by Vilas because indicted and convicted (1886, May 27; New York Sun, 2). Rejected Democrats concurring (1886, June 17; New York Sun, 1).

—— Appointed postmaster at Hoboken. Man of questionable associations and deplorable illiteracy. It was alleged that Governor Abbett had refused to appoint him to a minor office in his gift on account of educational deficiencies. Was he appointed that he might learn to read and write? (1886, July 14; New York Times, 4).

—— Appointed postmaster at Dennison, Iowa; a saloon-keeper, violating State law by selling whisky and beer; appointment the result of arrangement between —— and himself to furnish money for starting a German Democratic paper; —— had offered to start such a paper, if appointed, from the salary, but had been rejected (1886, May 28; New York Sun, 2). —— rejected; found to be mere "dummy" for —— (1886, June 25; New York Sun, 2).

—— Appointed postmaster at St. Louis; thrashed Mr. Joseph Pulitzer in street, Star, November 12 (1885, November 13; New York Sun, 2). St. Louis dispatch to Sun says: "Appointments are stench in nostrils of decent people. In vain did Congressman GLOVER tell Executive his nominee for postmaster was a common drunkard, his nominee for surveyor a rascal, his nominee for collector of internal revenue but one remove from imbecile; appointing in face of burning protests notorious drunkards, embezzlers, dark-lantern politicians, helpless imbeciles, at the beck of cross-roads Confederate Senators, bargaining with them for a packed convention. If Manning's machine attempts renomination, the next national convention will not be held in St. Louis (1886, August 1; New York Sun, 8).

—— Appointed postmaster at Chicago, well-known Copperhead (1885, May 7; The Tribune, 1). Reported since his appointment has been active in Senatorial contest just ending. Offense which merits dismissal in fourth-class postmaster can not properly be overlooked in postmaster of first class (1885, May 21; New York Times, 4). Lawyer of feeble health, lacks experience; physical energy, mental quickness desired. In responsible minor offices men were placed by him whose unfitness led one into United States court as defendant in action for malfeasance. He claims he was persecuted because he had shown up gross inefficiency of Chicago postal service. Discontent at Chicago widespread; business some divisions uniformly behind; takes New York papers longer to travel 2 miles in Chicago than all the way from New York (1888, January 13; New York Sun, 1).

—— Appointed postmaster at South Salem, in place of ——, who had held office twenty-two years; removes post-office to his house, a mile and a half from the village; boycotted by the people (1885, December 14; The Tribune, 1).

—— Appointed postmaster at Webster City, Iowa. Had charged incumbent —— with partisanship, but said in application he was editor of a Democratic paper and chairman of the Democratic committee; that he had made speeches in campaign, and wanted office as a reward; that salary would enable him to do more work for his party than ever. Made eighteen speeches and continued on committee; has been even more offensive partisan himself (1886, April 10; New York Sun, 1.)

—— Appointed postmaster at Lynchburgh. Editor, who, after appointment, called Sherman "first-class fraud, miserable mountebank, unscrupulous scoundrel, uncharitable dog;" and Logan "semi-civilized Illinois ourang-outang, his dirty diatribes;" and Hoar white-livered, onion-eating, nasal-twanged old hypocrite; and Conger "a slang-wanger," etc. (1886, May 15; New York Sun, 2). Rejected, but again reappointed; charged with tissue-ballot frauds, offensive partisan, and intense hostility to civil-service reform (1886, August 10; New York World, 4).

—— Appointed postmaster at Dennison, Iowa, in place of ——, removed for partisanship, but —— was editor Democratic paper, member Democratic committee, delegate in convention, made stump speeches after appointment and took part actively in Democratic campaign. He was appointed by Postmaster-General, as documents show, as reward for party services, and his own letters to President show that usefulness to party would be greatly increased by appointment (1886, March 26; New York Sun, 3). Wrote to Postmaster-General that he would devote his salary to establishment of German Democratic paper (1886, May 27; New York Sun, 2). Adverse report on above facts (1886, March 26; New York Times, 5).

—— Appointed postmaster at Vicksburg; approved assassination of Matthews, advocating use of extreme measures to secure Democratic success; advised murder of Republican sheriff; in April, 1885, his paper, The Herald, said: "White Democrats should direct attack at white Republican bosses and kill them when necessary" (1886, January 20; New York Sun, 2).

JAIL-BIRDS.

Washington Post says: "Federal patronage in Cincinnati employed to elevate most disreputable and odious characters. No less than four criminals hold Government places in Ohio to-day as direct result of Democratic dispensation. Recent subordinate appointments Ohio in Treasury service include three notorious malefactors, one chronic work-house inmate, one in penitentiary for theft, another indicted for murder, but escaped because principal witness disappeared" (Washington Post, 1885, November 8). Rhode Island postmaster had been arrested nine times in three months for violation of liquor law. Pennsylvania clerk of mint confessed writing a forged letter of Neal Dow to influence German votes in Ohio (1885, September 8; New York World, 4). Maine postmaster appointed while in jail (1885, August 23; The Tribune, 5).

THE BRUTAL REVILER OF GRANT.

—— Appointed postmaster at Meridian, Miss.; business manager and principal editor of Mercury which published editorial "coarsely assailing the memory of General Grant; appointed in place of Hancock, removed as offensive partisan. No man who is such a fool as to write an article of the kind is fit to be a postmaster;" disavowal of ——; declares not personally responsible (1885, August 10; New York Times, 4). Had been indicted in United States court for unlawfully conspiring to evade civil-rights law (1885, September 3; New York World, 4). Was leader of bulldozers, whose paper advocated use of violence to carry Democratic ticket; after Grant's death articles published of most brutal character (1886, January 20; New York Sun, 2).

—— Appointed postmaster at Berlin, Wis.; arrested for embezzlement; $30,000 borrowed as if for firm (1886, May 18; New York Sun, 1).

—— Appointed postmaster at Philadelphia; was chairman of Democratic city committee. Crosby states could be no more serious violation of spirit of law than removal of Huidekoper, a postmaster of especial merit, supported by many Democrats. (1885, November 26; The Tribune, 2). Complaint of civil-service association that he distributed appointments equally among election districts of city, appoints men who can not write or speak grammatically, dismisses men without charges, and examinations of appointees alleged to be fraudulent. (1886, November 10; New York Times, 5). Complaints challenged by —— and by local board (1886, November 13; New York Times, 5). Testimony Senate committee that only three or four clerks were retained out of four hundred or five hundred, and only four dismissed for cause. Huidekoper removed after Vilas had told him his office was the best managed in the United States (1888, April 5; The Tribune, 1).

—— Appointed postmaster at Natchez; chairman Democratic committee, manager election frauds in 1884; details of reasons for rejection (1885, August 7; The Tribune, 2; August 16, The Tribune, 1, and September 8, New York World, 4). Nevertheless confirmed (1886, June 4; The Tribune, 2). Chairman Republican committee removed for offensive partisanship; chairman Democratic committee appointed, who manipulated election returns so that district having great Republican majority is represented by Democratic Congressman; political activity while postmaster (1886, January 20; New York Sun, 2).

—— Postmaster at Monroe, Ind.; also Gray, postmaster at Portland, Ind., seated on platform at eleventh district Democratic Congressional convention; Daniel Krisher, postmaster at North Manchester, chairman delegation; Postmaster R. L. Seaton and William Mertz, postmaster at Vera Cruz; in all, fifty postmasters present, pernicious activity (1886, September 1; New York World, 4).

—— Appointed Superintendent Railway Mails; formerly discharged as Republican for inefficiency; constant complaint of business men; notorious Indiana partisan, appointed in place of ——, one of the most efficient officers in the Department.

—— Appointed postmaster at West Point in place ——, many years postmaster; no one there knows him (1888, May 30; the Tribune, 1).

The condition of the post-office in Chicago has been a scandal and a disgrace. The outcry became so great at last that the Department was forced to send a commission out there to make an examination, the result of which was the removal of a number of subordinate officers. But still the trouble was not remedied. Corning S. Judd, the postmaster, was a lawyer of some ability; a well-known copperhead; a man against whose private character I have no charges to make, but he was in feeble health; lacking in experience and the necessary qualifications for such a position; lacking in physical energy and those mental qualities and aptitudes which are essential to such a position. At last the complaints were so loud and deep that he has been removed.

The post-office at Indianapolis, occupied by Aquilla Jones, has been a very sink of political corruption. Postmaster Jones openly declared that he set at defiance all the civil-service professions of the President; that he should remove officers and appoint others in their places solely for political consideration.

The Philadelphia post-office, which had been managed for eight years by General Huidekoper, was admitted on all hands, I believe, to have been the best managed post-office in the world, not even excepting the celebrated London office. General Huidekoper had conducted his business purely upon civil-service-reform principles. There was no charge, there could be no charge, made against his management of the office. He was removed and one Harrity, chairman of the Democratic city committee of Philadelphia, put in his place. No such record of inefficiency can be found in the history of the management of any great office in the country. Delays innumerable have occurred in the transmission and the delivery of letters ever since his advent to the office. Illiterate and drunken men have been substituted for carriers in the place of excellent men. Carriers have been seen reeling through the streets with the mail-bags on their backs. Letters have been scattered along the sidewalk; mail-boxes not visited for twenty-four hours at a time, and numerous instances in which letters directed from one part of the city to another have been days, and in some instances weeks, before reaching their destination. It is notorious that the employés of the office spent a large portion of their time in carrying out the behests of Harrity in the great Democratic factional fight against SAMUEL J. RANDALL. All these things are amply proved in evidence taken before the Committee to Investigate the Civil Service. As a specimen of some of the irregularities in that office, I submit the following testimony of Edward J. Frysinger, in which he says that a printing-press was put into that office by Harrity, and Frysinger employed as a printer to print Democratic notices on Government paper:

TESTIMONY OF EDWARD J. FRYSINGER.

Edward J. Frysinger, having been duly sworn, was interrogated as follows:

By the CHAIRMAN:

Q. Where do you live?
A. At 13 Madison street, Chester.
Q. Have you been in the post-office at Philadelphia as an official lately, and if so, when?
A. Yes, sir; from the 21st of April to the 1st of September, 1887.
Q. By whom were you appointed?
A. By Postmaster Harrity.
Q. How did you leave the office?
A. I sent in my voluntary resignation.
Q. What place did you hold in the post-office?
A. I was printer.
Q. Is there a printing establishment in the office?
A. I understand there is yet. I opened the establishment when I went there.
Q. There had been none there before?
A. No, sir; I laid it out.
Q. The men were appointed and you set them to work?
A. Yes, sir.
Q. And you had charge of the printing department in the post-office?
A. Yes, sir.
Q. Which was a new feature?
A. Yes, sir.
Q. What kind of printing did you do?
A. Principally the work of the Department.
Q. And of the office?
A. Yes, sir.
Q. How had that hitherto been done?
A. At the Government Office in Washington.
Q. Do you think it is less expensive?
A. It is more convenient to have it there.
Q. Yesterday Mr. Watrous produced a copy of a political circular which was printed in the Press, with which he is connected as editor, which circular was read before the committee. It purports to have been printed at the office by you, or under your direction. Have you knowledge of any such transaction?
A. I printed a circular of that character there.
Q. In the post-office?
A. Yes, of the character he referred to. There was a fac-simile of it in the Press. I suppose that is what he referred to.
Q. Have you the original with you?
A. I have a written order for it. Yes, sir.
Q. Will you produce it?
(The witness produced the paper called for.)
The CHAIRMAN. Please read it.
The WITNESS (reading):

"By request of the Democratic city executive committee you are invited and expected to attend a meeting of the Democratic executive committee of the Twenty-ninth ward, to be held at Quantrell's Hall, Eighteenth and Ridge avenue, on Wednesday evening, June 1, 1887, at 8.15 o'clock, sharp, purpose for the of organization. Please be present.

"Yours, etc.,

"R. C. LLOYD,
"*Chairman Ward Committee.*"

Q. Is there any indorsement upon that in the corner?
A. The directions to me are written in the corner, as follows:

"Mr. FRYSINGER:

"Please set to size of postal-card.

"J. J. V.

"5, 27, '87."

Q. Did you print that circular in the post-office printing department?
A. Yes, sir.
Q. How many of those did you print?
A. I think I printed about seventy of those circulars. The order was for postal-cards, but we afterwards used circulars.
Q. For circulation in this district?
A. I don't know what was done with them.
Q. By whose direction did you print it? Why did you print this political circular, which had nothing to do with the post-office, on the Government printing-press in that office? Did you do it of your own motion, or by direction?
A. By direction.
The WITNESS. He told me to print that first circular and destroy all proof and evidence. I did so; I destroyed all evidence; I took it upstairs to Mr. Vogel, at his desk, and told him that this was rather a dangerous business, and he said no, he did not know that it was. Prior to that, though, downstairs, he had told me it was by authority of Postmaster Harrity and Mr. Drake. I asked him who Mr. Lloyd was, the name that was signed to it, and also to the first one. I said, "Is he liable to disclose anything like this any day?" He said, "Oh, no; he owes his position as magistrate (I think it was) to Mr. Harrity's influence, or to his help." I told him he might change his views some day and become angry, or something of the kind; any way, there the conversation stopped. Postmaster Harrity at that time was in Atlantic City. In about three days Mr. Vogel came down into my room and told me there would be no more work of that character, as Postmaster Harrity had forbidden it, fearing it would leak out; and I supposed it would stop. But in several weeks' time after that this written order was sent down in an envelope.
Q. The one you have here?
A. Yes, sir; and I printed these and took them up to Mr. Vogel, and told him that I understood all that kind of work was to stop. "Well," he says, "Postmaster Harrity is willing we shall print it, only it is to be sent from this room, so that in case it should leak out he can say—Mr. Harrity can—that he had nothing to do with it; that is all."
Q. Mr. Vogel told you this?
A. Yes, sir.
Q. And he, you say, is the personal clerk of the postmaster?
A. He does considerable of the personal writing of Postmaster Harrity.
Q. Upon that you printed it?
A. I printed it upon that authority, deeming that, of course, it was by the authority of the postmaster himself.
Q. You remember the conversation distinctly?
A. Yes, sir; very distinctly.
Q. What are your politics?
A. I am a Democrat.
Q. You have always been a Democrat?
A. Yes, sir.
Q. And are now?
A. Yes, sir; just as much as ever.

By Senator MANDERSON:

Q. How much of a printing plant is there in the office?
The WITNESS. Do you mean in full?
Senator MANDERSON. Yes.
The WITNESS. The material when I was there was worth from $1,000 to $1,200.
Q. Do you mean to say that all of the printed blanks are now printed here in the office?
A. I do not know what they do now. At the time I was there any of the blanks were printed there. There are forms used in the Government Departments, and we have to have a great many of one form, and it pays best to ship those here. But this was more for the convenience of the Department, and was to print notices, etc., that they wanted immediately, and ordinary blanks.
Q. How is the paper that is used supplied?
A. It is supplied from Washington.
Q. Furnished from the Post-Office Department?
A. Yes, sir; from the Department at Washington.
Q. And all you do here is the mechanical work upon your own type and press?
A. Yes, sir.
Q. What presses had you?
A. I had a quarter-medium improved Gordon.
Q. What is the power?
A. It is without power; it should not have been, but I was compelled to do it.
Q. And you think that is a more economical method of furnishing blanks?
A. I think, considering the convenience to the Department, it is good policy to have it there.
Q. The economy is in the time of obtaining matter needed, rather than in expense?
A. The majority of the work that was done there for the Department could be done as economically, and especially at the salary that I was paid, as it could be in Washington.
Q. Have you any familiarity with the Government Printing Office at Washington?
A. I have some familiarity with the salaries paid. I never worked there, but I am posted on such things.
Q. You speak of two different circulars. How many were issued of the first one, the printing of which you protested against?
A. The first were postal-cards. There were about fifty of those, I think; I can not recollect exactly.
Q. And about seventy of the second lot of circulars?
A. Yes, sir.
Q. By whom was the postal-card material and circular material furnished?
A. The postal-cards were sent down to me from upstairs, and as to the paper I really do not recollect whether I used it from the room or whether it was sent down from upstairs.
Q. But it came to you in the usual manner that postal-cards or paper would come to you?
A. Yes, sir; the cards were sent down.

By Senator BLODGETT:

Q. Did you have any conversation with Postmaster Harrity in reference to the printing of these documents?
A. No, sir.

Q. None at any time?
A. Not that I recollect of.
Q. Have you had any correspondence with Postmaster Harrity on the subject?
A. Yes, sir.
Q. Will you please state what it was?
A. I wrote to him something to the effect that I had done as he knew, printed matter that was not proper; I can not recollect the words exactly, but something to that effect.
Q. Did you refer to the printing of that letter, and are you quite sure that you referred to that?
A. I have a copy of the letter at home.
Q. From your recollection did you refer to this special case in your letter?
A. I referred to that printing I had done that, as he knew and as I stated in it, I had no right to do.
Q. What did you ask him to do?
A. I spoke to him—I did not ask him to do anything, I think.

Thus adding proof that the Democratic officials are using not only the subordinate officers under their employ, in the pay of the Government, to do the labors to print Democratic circulars on the printing-presses of the Government, but using the Government paper and postal-cards for that purpose.

Below I submit some extracts from papers showing complaints from different parts of the country:

Mr. PLUMB. I ask now that an extract from the Topeka Capital, commencing with the marked part, be read.

The Chief Clerk read as follows:

"Let us consider for a moment what would be the result if the proposed investigation should be made as asked for by Mr. PLUMB in the Senate and Mr. PERKINS in the House. The Post-Office Committee, after thorough inquiry, would find that the heads of the Postal Department were engaged in a censurable effort to serve the public with postal arrangements entirely inadequate, utterly refusing to recognize the fact that the entire West was being flooded with a vast increase of mail-matter without corresponding increase of force to handle the same. The said committee would moreover find that these Department heads had full knowledge that this was the cause of the whole trouble and that it was entirely in their power to accomplish a speedy remedy if their purblind meanness was not too deeply rooted.

"From among the thousand cases of willful neglect to serve the people properly the committee might take the condition of the Kansas City and Pueblo run on the Atchison, Topeka and Santa Fé with which to illustrate their report. This run received at Kansas City on the 1st day of July, 1886, 11,653 pounds of mail-matter, to handle which, as well as other pouches taken on *en route*, the run employed a force of 40 men. On the 1st day of August, 1887, the same run received at Kansas City 23,000 pounds and the force has been augmented by 8 new men. In other words, 48 men were expected to handle 23,000 pounds of mail, while one year before 40 men had all they could do to properly handle 11,653 pounds, or an increase of over 100 per cent. in labor and of one-sixth per cent. in laborers. And even this small addition was not given till the old force had struggled with the work till they fainted at the rack.

"Moreover, the committee would find that as a result of the rapid filling up of Kansas, and the States and Territories west of her, that the mail received on this run has increased since August 1, 1887, at a greater rate than at any time in the past, till now it is absolutely impossible for the present force to extricate from the pile of pouches under which they are buried every day.

"R. M. Thomas, superintendent of the railway mail service in the seventh division, in a desperate effort to expedite matters, divided this run at Dodge City, ordering the east end to work Kansas and New Mexico, Arizona and what is known as No. 3, leaving Colorado and Utah for the west end.

"With four men to a car the east end is not able, at present, four days out of the week to get through with Kansas alone, and all the rest is left for the west end to handle when there is only two men to the car, making it necessary to throw off New Mexico and Colorado at La Junta most of the time. Very often the east end can not work No. 3, then the west end has it to do first, so that frequently over 100 pouches of Colorado mail is left to be worked during a run of 65 miles, a greater part of which, of course, is thrown off at Pueblo unopened. A large portion of this is daily papers. The transfer clerk does the best he can with it, and sometimes gets it started back within forty-eight hours. The committee would find that the remedy for the evils on this run was very simple.

"Let it be restored to its former condition when the men ran through, thus saving three or four hours which is now lost in tying out racks and rehanging and in receipting for twenty or thirty pouches of registered mail; put four men to a crew and two helpers from Kansas City to Newton, making fourteen new men in all, and any mail could be handled to the entire satisfaction of the public.

"Chief Clerk Hunter, at Kansas City, and Superintendent Thomas, at St. Louis, know well enough what the trouble is, and have, no doubt, asked for sufficient force, but it has not and will not be given them. These gentlemen also know that the old men are being so overworked that they are becoming discontented, and a large number of them are making arrangements to leave the service. New men can not stand it to take their places, so that the situation seems to be growing more deplorable every day.

"If the committee should be of a particularly prying turn of mind it might find, hidden away somewhere, a private circular which a certain head of a Department thought necessary to issue to the postal clerks, instructing them not to talk with any one excepting the head of their own department in regard to any trouble in the mail service whatsoever, or to ventilate any 'supposed' grievances on account of overwork or otherwise, to a newspaper man or any one else, and that any knowledge of a violation of the order would be followed by immediate dismissal from the service. Thus deliberately they write themselves egregious asses and complacently wave their ears over that solemn truth."

Mr. PLUMB. I also send up a slip from the Emporia Daily Republican, which I ask to have read.

The Chief Clerk read as follows:

"The Soldiers' Tribune, of Lyons, Kans., joins the plaint against the inefficiency of the present mail service. Says the Tribune: 'The Emporia Republican and Newton Republican frequently come straggling in from the west, tired, weary, and as much the worse of the wear as though they had been on a health-seeking tour to Colorado or New Mexico.'"

Mr. PLUMB. I send up another extract, from the Topeka Daily Capital, which I ask may be read.

The Chief Clerk read as follows:

"HOW LONG, O LORD!

"How long must the people of Kansas endure the present infamous and outrageous mail service?

"Every day complaints come to this office from subscribers of the Capital in Kansas, asking if something can not be done to remedy the existing evil. We have called attention to this miserable service repeatedly, our Congressmen have presented the complaints of Kansas people to the Democratic House only to be ignored and ridiculed. Every effort possible has been made to correct the miserable manner in which the mail-matter is handled, and yet no relief comes.

"Yesterday one of our subscribers at McPherson wrote us that the Capital never reached that place on the day of publication, and that two or three days' mail would be dumped in there at one time. There can be no excuse for this delay. The Capital is mailed in the Topeka post-office each morning, and it should leave on the 1 o'clock train in the afternoon for McPherson, and reach that place by 4 or 5 o'clock.

"The rotten mail service in Kansas and the entire West is enough to damn the present Democratic Administration. It has shown itself wholly incompetent to handle this most important Department of the public service, and when the time comes there will be a rising up among the outraged people of the West against this Administration that will relegate it to a deserved oblivion.

"Speed that day."

Mr. PLUMB. Now I ask that there be read a letter from the manager of the Kansas City Journal, which covers a point mentioned in a speech of the Senator from Texas yesterday about the fast mail.

The Chief Clerk read as follows:

"KANSAS CITY, MO., *February* 1, 1888.

"DEAR SIR: Thanks for your efforts in behalf of a public wearied with hopeless waiting for an improvement of methods and reform in the administration of that Department of the Government which comes into the daily business and social life of every intelligent citizen of the West.

"I wish, without lengthening my story, to give a phase which can not be charged up to inefficient subordinates. Upon a railroad to Smith Centre, Kans., which has been in full operations three months, there is no mail service. Upon the authority of a post-office official, I state that on the Chicago, Kansas and Nebraska (Rock Island system in Kansas and Nebraska) nothing beyond a pouch service is yet in operation, and this not until long after the road had been in business.

"The Chicago, Milwaukee and Kansas City Railroad, after long delay in bridging the Missouri River at this place, put on their freight trains last November and passenger trains about the 1st of December. There is no mail service on that road yet, and our papers for Excelsior Springs, about 35 miles from here, are sent out on a freight train. The opening of such lines must be known months before such opening actually transpires, yet no move is made to use them as postal routes until after in operation. Usually three to four months' time elapses then before the Department begins to make an expense, and saves so much to enter up as political capital. The service when begun, badly as it is managed, is not more disreputable than the beggarly management at headquarters. 'Like master like man' finds its exemplification in the postal service of the United States. A 'barren ideality,' the fast train upon whose movements thirteen roads wait here at Kansas City, detains the sending of two-thirds of all mail going from this vicinity into Kansas from two to four hours.

"The local force at Kansas City, and every city of the Missouri Valley, is seriously inadequate; to serve a 'penny wise and pound foolish' economy.

"Yours, respectfully,

"J. A. MANN.

"Hon. P. B. PLUMB,
"*United States Senate, Washington, D. C.*"

Mr. PLATT. Will the Senator from Kansas allow me to put in an extract from a letter which I received yesterday while the Senator from Texas was speaking?

Mr. PLUMB. I will.

Mr. PLATT. I wish to show that this complaint is not confined to the West. Indeed, scarcely a day passes that I do not receive from my constituents writing me on other subjects complaints of the inefficiency of the mail service in Connecticut. This letter is from the Henry Bill Publishing Company, of Norwich, and I read that portion of it which relates to the mail service; it is dated February 11, 1888:

"NORWICH, CONN., *February* 11, 1888.

"DEAR SIR: We are very much annoyed and troubled by the apparent disorganization of the whole postal system of this country, caused, as we believe, by the removal of experienced postal-route agents and others and putting inefficient men in their places. Our entire mail matter is very much delayed. We do not receive letters from any part of the country as quickly by twenty-four hours as we used to, and from many parts it is delayed for days. Besides this, large numbers of letters that we send out are never received by the parties to whom they are sent, and the same with letters sent to us.

"We are the largest patrons of the post-office in this city, sending out about one-ninth of all mail-matter that goes from here, and our business extends over the entire country, and has to be transacted almost entirely through the mails, and the delays and other things that we have spoken of are very serious losses to us. A letter sent to us from Palmer, Mass., a distance of less than 60 miles, did not reach us for more than a week after it was sent, and this is a sample of a large number of similar cases that we could mention. But our greatest trouble is in so much mail-matter being lost, and we think the trouble is that the mail-route agents, being inefficient and not able to do the work that the thoroughly skilled and efficient route agents have been doing, are tempted to destroy the matter, as they can not distribute it.

"I presume it is useless for us to make this complaint, but think it best to let you know how we are bothered.

"Hon. ORVILLE H. PLATT,
"*United States Senate, Washington, D. C.*"

The Chief Clerk read as follows:

"The time has come, in fact it came long ago, for the United States postal authorities to do something for the Western mail service. We do not know whether the rank service which we have been receiving is due to incompetency or lack of sufficient help, but one thing we do know, that it is about as weak as the people are going to stand by and accept without kicking vigorously. Day after day, week in and week out this office has received numerous and repeated complaints of failure to receive papers. We have traced the matter down and find that it is due to the rotten mail service. We are possessed of ordinary patience, but the time has gone by for us longer to remain silent. Yesterday morning at 3.30 the greatest outrage that has ever been perpetrated upon a daily newspaper in Kansas since the State was admitted into the Union was served the Gazette by the route agent who worked the mail going west on train No. 203, either through ignorance, drunkenness, imbecility, or maliciousness, we know not which."

To the foregoing I now add an extract from the Memphis Avalanche, a Democratic newspaper. It is headed "The Cause of the Trouble:"

"There can be no doubt that Senator PLUMB had a partisan object in asking for an investigation of the mail service of the West and South, which was declared to be inefficient. But it is to be regretted that it did not pass. The service is not what it should be. There can be no doubt of the truth of that proposition. Complaints are numerous and well-grounded, but the cause is not that ascribed by Mr. CHACE, who claimed it was due to the fact that 90 per cent. of the employés had been dismissed. Upon investigation it will be found that the trouble does not come from the ninety Democrats recently put in office, but from the ten Republicans who are allowed to remain."

I shall not make any remarks about the comparison between the strength and virtue and so on of ten Republicans as compared with that of ninety Democrats.

"Every one of them would be glad to see a change, and few of them would hesitate, in a quiet and unobtrusive way, to put a spoke in the wheel of the Democratic wagon. By all means let us have an investigation of the affairs of the Post-Office Department as administered in the South."

I have also an extract from the St. Joseph Gazette, one of the leading Democratic papers in Western Missouri:

"A postal clerk, who is not employed on the Central Branch, informed an Atchison Champion reporter lately that the principal cause of irregularities in the mail service on that road is the lack of car-room and facilities. He says the letter mail is amply provided for, but this requires nearly all the available space in the cars, and there is no room to handle the newspaper mail. The Gazette would like to believe that numerous and constantly recurring irregularities in the newspaper-mail service of the territory in which it circulates depend upon causes so easily remedied as the one reported from the Central Branch. This would at least lend to a very damaging annoyance continually suffered by the press the hope that the trouble is not altogether irremediable."

It will be seen that the complaints are pretty evenly distributed between Democratic and Republican newspapers, and the Senator from Texas will have his labor for his pains if he seeks to make the people of the West and the South believe that they are having a good mail service when they know very well they have not.

Mr. PLUMB. Mr. President, I thought I had presented sufficient newspaper extracts. But having been reproached by the Senator from Texas with partisanship, I will contribute now the Democratic quota to the complaints against the Department. I will read first from a paper published at Pine Bluff, Ark., vouched to me as being a Democratic paper:

"The large crowd in front of the post-office every morning waiting for a turn at the general-delivery window shows that the amount allowed by the Government for clerical help is certainly inadequate to the needs of the office. The niggardly style in which the postal affairs are run is not at all satisfactory to the public. Congress should do something to rectify this condition, and failing to do it, it will have some vicious things said about it. It is a serious thing for the laboring people of this city to be compelled to wait hours for a chance to get their mails. No blame can attach to Mr. Alexander, as we understand it, for this state of affairs, but the trouble lies in the small allowance made for clerical help. Pine Bluff is no village now. She is a city of about 15,000 people and growing fast."

Mr. PLUMB. I ask the Secretary to read in this connection the article which I have marked, being an extract from a leading Kansas paper, the Daily Capital of Topeka, and which appears also in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of the 22d of this month.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The Secretary will read the paper, if there be no objection.

The Chief Clerk read as follows:

"THE MAIL SERVICE OF KANSAS.

"Never at any time in the history of Kansas has there been in the United States mail service such an utter disregard of the rights of the people as at this time. Notwithstanding the great increase in population, the stupid attempt on the part of the Administration to make a record for economy has cut down the clerical force necessary to properly distribute the mails at large offices and in the mail trains, and it is consequently too small to do the work. Tons of mail-matter pass through Kansas on the train westward that can not be disposed of by the force allowed by the Post-Office Department. The result is that it is carried past the towns where it belongs, and brought back after two or three days' absence in Colorado or New Mexico. It is not the fault of the railway clerks, because the Department asks of them a task that it is not possible for them to perform. The people of Kansas have been patient, and the press has been lenient over this Democratic folly. Mails going west are so heavy that men working to the extent of their strength, doing more than double duty, can not handle them.

"Appeals to the Department at Washington for adequate help to take care of this important public service are unheeded. The railway mail service through Kansas has become criminally neglected, and it is time this attempt of the Democratic party to make capital by a show of false economy should be brought to the attention of Congress. In reply to continued appeals for the Department to send a man to examine the railway mail service in Kansas, a man came, and overlooking the tons of mail that could not be distributed in time to be thrown off at the towns where it belonged, he succeeded in having two or three clerks fined for not having the regulation gold-lace band on their caps, and thus civil-service reform was indorsed and the record of the party for economy maintained."

Mr. PLUMB. I offer also a letter received a day or two since from the secretary and business manager of the Kansas City Journal, one of the leading daily papers of the West, on the same subject.

The Chief Clerk read as follows:

"KANSAS CITY, MO., *January* 28, 1888.

"DEAR SIR: Is it possible to bring to bear such pressure, by means of a Senate committee on investigation of Western mail service in Missouri and Kansas, as will rectify the present demoralized condition of said service?

"Our relations to this service are such that we suffer more perhaps than any other line of business and know more of its delinquencies than those engaged in other vocations.

"I can say after eighteen years' continuous labor in this one office, with full facilities for learning as to general efficiency of the mail service, that it was never so bad nor so badly administered as during the past year, and that the tendency at this time is toward a down grade. Can you give this attention and bring it before the people in such manner as to lead to a reform?

"Very repectfully,

"J. A. MANN,

"*Secretary and Business Manager Kansas City Journal.*

"Hon. P. B. PLUMB, *Washington, D. C.*"

Mr. PLUMB. To meet the possible suggestion that the information contained in the newspaper article already read and the letter from the business manager of the Journal may be colored, being from Republican sources, I send to the Clerk's desk to be read an article from a paper claiming to be the leading Democratic paper of Kansas, and the official organ of the party in that State, which will show that complaints are not confined to Republican sources. The article is from the Abilene Gazette, a daily paper published at Abilene, Kans.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The paper will be read, if there be no objection.

I have very carefully avoided putting into the RECORD anything that was said of a partisan character in regard to this matter. In sending up to be read slips from newspapers I have carefully eliminated all possible which had any partisan tinge whatever, including only that which contained a bold narration of the facts connected with the mail service in the West. I should like to add a little to the record, and directly in the line of the defense set up by the Senator from Texas. In a particular case, that of a Democratic newspaper in Kansas which made complaint of the service, the Senator from Texas alleges that it was due to a failure on the part of the publisher of the paper to get the required certificate from the postmaster. That is simply an incident in the general complaint; it is not the substance of it at all. I will ask to have read from the same paper, the Abilene Gazette, another specification; it being, as I have said before, a Democratic paper.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The article will be read.

The Chief Clerk read as follows:

"Junction City is 25 miles from Abilene. The trains leave here at noon and arrive there at 1 o'clock. The fifty subscribers of the Gazette at Junction City received three days' papers at once, and yet they wonder why we are old before our time. They think it strange that we kick. Call it indiscretion if you want to, but even Job would murmur if he ever had such an experience as this.

"The Gazette reaches Junction City, 25 miles from here, by way of Kansas City. Now, this seems strange, but it is a fact. The route agents prefer to do this way, and while it is some little inconvenience to the public and to us, still we will stand it.

"After all, the old-fashioned mail system was pretty fair. It had its conveniences, and you knew just when a letter or a paper would reach its destination when it was once mailed.

"The Topeka Commonwealth has not been received at Abilene for four days. We will receive a bundle perhaps in a few days. They will come via Denver by fast freight."

Mr. PLUMB. I now ask to have read a letter written by a subscriber to the Atchison Daily Champion, and published in that paper a few days since.

The Chief Clerk read as follows:

"WHITE CITY, KANS., *February* 6, 1888.

"GENTLEMEN: Is there no remedy for the irregularity of the mails?

"I commenced to take the Daily Champion some three months since, because I like it better than any other State or Kansas City daily, and have taken it some twelve years; but I am almost discouraged. My papers come to me from two to four days old; for instance, I got my paper dated February 2 this morning, February 6, just four days in transit. The Department had better put on the old overland stage, drawn by faithful mules; would then get it in two days at least. We have two railroads, the Chicago, Kansas and Nebraska and Missouri Pacific, and get mail four times daily.

"T.

"ATCHISON DAILY CHAMPION."

Mr. PLUMB. I will state that the point at which that letter was written is about 75 miles distant by rail in a direct line from the place where the paper is published. It took, as the writer says, four days for the paper to get that distance of 75 miles, and there are four trains a day.

I now ask that there be read an extract from the Atchison Daily Champion on the same subject, commencing with the marked part.

The Chief Clerk read as follows:

"It is an undeniable fact that never in the history of the country has the Post-Office Department been so inefficient as under the present Administration. There has been one unbroken series of delays and inexcusable blunders in the transmission of the mails, and in the different post-offices of most of the States, especially Kansas, gross and almost criminal carelessness has been the rule for the past two years. Newspapers, letters, and packages, plainly addressed, have either been delivered to the wrong parties, or remailed to other points, or piled up in the offices, where they were deposited and not delivered at all. In some cases the fault of all this is with the Department at Washington, the authorities not providing clerical help; in other and most cases the fault is in the local offices, where ignorant and incompetent help is employed.

"Not only have the mails been badly managed, and the business of the country been embarrassed in consequence, but the rulings of the Department, in nearly every instance where postal questions have been submitted, have been distinguished for their stupidity and want of a broad and intelligent appreciation of the needs and rights of the public.

"A case in point is that recent order requiring all letters mailed on a train to be put off at the first office to be canceled by the postmaster, the postal clerks not being allowed to cancel stamps, which subjects business men to unnecessary inconvenience and loss of time, and an indication that the Department is not disposed to accommodate the public when it can be done as well as not and without additional expense. The same style of doing business characterizes every other order that has been issued by the Department for the last two years. It all shows that the Post-Office Department is now in incompetent hands and that it and all the other Departments of our Government have outgrown the limited capacity of the Democratic party."

Mr. PLUMB. I now ask that there be a paragraph read from the Orange City Free Press of date of February 4, 1888.

The Chief Clerk read as follows:

"WORSE AND MORE OF IT.

"Friday morning all newspaper mail from the east destined to this office was carried on west or eaten up by the route agent. No mail of any description was received from the west. If this thing keeps on people will be obliged to transmit their mail by private carriers. Let us hear from the Abilene Gazette again. The Gazette, by the way, has not been received at this post-office now for three days."

Mr. MANDERSON. Mr. President, I must confess my surprise at the charge made by the Senator from Texas that this is in the nature of making political capital rather than an earnest and honest desire to correct an existing evil. Certainly nothing that was said by myself the other day would warrant that assertion. I sought simply to present a defect in the administration of postal affairs in the State that I have the honor in part to represent.

I read letters that had been received by me from the editors of newspapers. I stated, not, perhaps, at such length as I should at the time, some of the personal complaints that had come to me, not only from those editing public journals, political journals, but from those engaged in all trades and in all professions. I perhaps should have gone further and should have said that my attention had been called to the matter by personal knowledge of the administration of the postal affairs of my own State. I am giving nothing at second hand, but I could very properly give here, if time would admit, my own experience as to the defects of the postal service west of the Missouri River.

I indulged in nothing in the way of complaint or censure of the Post-Office Department, but it is marvelous to me that in the presence of this record showing the character of the debate that occurred here the Senator from Texas should indulge in this sort of remarks. Why, Mr. President, I turn to the debate that was had here on the 1st day of February and I find that the distinguished Senator from Alabama [Mr. MORGAN], not a Republican, but one in political accord with this Administration, followed in the line of the suggestions made by the Senator from Kansas [Mr. PLUMB], and expressed his gratification that this resolution had been introduced recognizing that there were evils which demanded attention. I read one or two extracts from the speech of the Senator from Alabama. He said:

"The clerical force to do this work has not kept pace with the increase of all mail-matter carried over our lines, nor have the salaries that belong to the inferior officers in the service of the Government of the United States been increased sufficiently to enable them to do this additional amount of work."

Again he said that we not only ought to increase the pay, but we ought to provide for the increase of the number of these postal clerks.

The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BECK] said:

"Mr. President, I should like to say a word, if I may be allowed. I have looked into this matter with some care of late, and I am glad that the resolution is offered, and hope it will be adopted, because it is going to develop a great many things."

Again he said:

"I hope all this will be gone into and developed, and then let us do something which will make the service good and efficient."

Here is pretty fair Democratic recognition, it seems to me, that the present service is bad and inefficient; and it is not that we desire to censure the present Post-Office authorities, but because we want to remedy these existing evils, that we press this matter. The Senator from Texas, authorized so to do by the Post-Office Department, in his speech delivered yesterday spoke of the complaint that was made by Mr. Rounds, who at the time of his death was one of the proprietors

and one of the editors of the Omaha Republican, a Republican journal published in Nebraska. I do not think that Mr. Rounds in this presence needs anything in the way of indorsement. Every man here knows him from personal association with him to have been a truthful, honest man. I read from a letter by him in which he complained of the difficulties under which his journal labored along with other citizens of that town. I am told that all the foundation there was for that complaint was that some young men, three in number, one being discharged after another, who were employed by the Omaha Republican Company to attend to its mailing-list, had neglected to place the address on the wrappers of the newspapers, and they had been thrown in the waste-basket, and in that way had miscarried.

It is quite likely that that complaint was made, but that complaint was made on the 16th day of June, 1887. The investigation immediately followed, and the report from which the Senator from Texas read is dated the 6th day of July of that year. But the letter I called the attention of the Senate to and that I read in part was dated the 26th day of November, 1887, and this is the complaint that it made:

"Without any disparagement of our present post-office officials"—

And so we say here. We do not disparage the competency of the gentlemen who are in charge of the Post-Office Department; we do not attempt to give the reason for this abuse, but we enter our protest in this, as we claim, the proper place for the entering of such complaints.

"Without any disparagement of our present post-office officials, everybody knows and complains of the mail service here. Especially is this true as regards our paper, and, we presume, the others in this city, and we are in constant receipt of complaints from subscribers of the non-receipt or irregular and late receipt of their papers."

And I read a corresponding complaint from Mr. Hitchcock, the editor of the Omaha Journal, in which he said, after speaking of his own difficulties:

"What is true of the newspapers is true of bankers, wholesale merchants, and others having heavy mails. The service is abominable, but the postmaster is not to blame. He and his force are up to their ears in mail-bags, overwhelmed with work, and crowded into inadequate quarters."

AN OPEN LETTER—THE SHAMEFUL MANNER IN WHICH BUSINESS IS TRANSACTED AT OUR POST-OFFICE.

OFFICE OF THE H. P. HUBBARD COMPANY,
New Haven, Conn., October 10, 1888.

FRIEND BEN.: September 19th we wrote an important letter to the Providence, R. I., Dispatch, a new Republican daily; not getting any reply, we wrote again on the 24th. Patiently we waited until October 2, when, entirely out of patience, we telegraphed them for an answer, collect, thinking it was their fault. They answered, saying that they had not received either letter. We then wrote on the 5th, repeating our former letter, and, to make reasonably sure of their receiving it, we paid you 10 cents and registered it. Your receipt is dated the 4th (evidently an error), and yet, allowing this one day, how is it that it should take four days for the letter to be delivered to them? We hold the return registry card signed by them on the 9th. Omitting Sunday for rest, the highly intelligent reformer, to whom, in the line of your duty, you intrusted this registered letter, must have walked over, making an average of 38 miles a day. Has he returned yet, and is he tired?

I have not as much objection to the victors enjoying the spoils (while they can), but as a pure matter of business do seriously object to this sort of employés. The Department should appoint competent men, or else not discharge those who are faithful.

With great regret at the disorganized condition of the service, as evidenced by frequent blunders and delays,

I am yours, truly,

H. P. HUBBARD.

BENJAMIN R. ENGLISH, *Postmaster.*

I have received from a friend in Pasadena, Cal., a letter from which I read the following extract, the letter written to this party having been sent to Pasadena and returned reinclosed to them. I quote:

I regret very much that it [the letter] should have been so long in reaching me and should have made a fruitless trip across the continent and back. It is entirely due to our bad post-office here. About the time that letter came the state of our mail could hardly have been worse, and I think it really is a very serious drawback to living here. Only those people who had lock-boxes were sure to get anything, and they even missed letters and scarcely received any papers. The papers were just neglected and set about the post-office in sacks, and any one who wished or had the opportunity helped themselves to them. We have had a lock-box all the time, but a registered letter with the full address and box number on it lay in the office nearly a month before we received it. I am told it was even worse at San Diego, where the postmaster deliberately had several loads of unassorted mails carted off and dumped into the bay, because, he said, there was no time to sort it.

These are only samples of a few of the complaints that have come from the newspapers and individuals all over the country. I might fill the RECORD with them. At first the people complained, then they became angry, and at last the thing has become a standing jest, and the people use the United States mail as the standard of comparison for slowness, inefficiency, and uncertainty.

HOPES FOR THE FUTURE.

The record for the past thirty-five years proves that the hope for the highest measure of prosperity for the postal service lies in the success of the Republican party. The first important reduction of letter postage in this country was made less than fifty years ago, during the term for which General William Henry Harrison was elected President. At that time the postage on an ounce letter from New York to Pittsburgh was $1. In 1888 the Republican Presidential candidate, General Benjamin Harrison, is pledged by the platform upon which he was nominated to an effort to secure the carriage of an ounce letter anywhere within the wide extent of the country at a charge of 1 cent.

Such is the wonderful transformation of the postal service within two generations, and such the record of the two parties in the management of this great Department.

Mr. CALL. Mr. President——

Mr. DOLPH. I ask the Senator from Florida to give way for a few moments until I can put a question to the Senator from Iowa, who reported the bill.

Mr. CALL. Certainly.

Mr. DOLPH. I learn that there is an anxiety among some of the people on the North Pacific coast in regard to the provisions of the Senate substitute as to the tariff on coal. I should like to ask the Senator from Iowa if the substitute puts coal upon the free-list in any form, and what the provisions of the substitute are in regard to coal?

Mr. ALLISON. I have had several inquiries in the same direction. "Coal-slack or culm of coal" is put by the substitute upon the free-list; but that is one of the mistakes of the measure, and really it should have been corrected before it was reported. However, it is the intention of the committee, at least of the majority of the committee, that coal-slack or culm shall pay a duty as now.

Mr. DOLPH. Will the Senator explain what the article is that he now mentions?

Mr. ALLISON. It is refuse coal which passes through, I believe, a half-inch screen, by regulation of the Treasury Department; but it is difficult to distinguish between coal and coal-slack. The committee propose to put all coal upon the dutiable-list at the rate now provided by law—75 cents a ton for coal, and slack at 30 cents a ton, as now. I will say to the Senator that is one of the amendments the committee will propose when the bill is taken up by paragraph for amendment.

[Mr. CALL withholds his remarks for revision. See APPENDIX.]

Mr. HAWLEY. Mr. President, I have taken the floor upon the pending bill known as the tariff bill, and have brought my notes and documents here with the intention of making what is commonly called a speech, perhaps of an hour and a half; but I shall frankly confess, Mr. President, that I have not the courage. My heart fails me, and partly because my heart is in another place. I am to speak in Connecticut to-morrow night, and I think I belong there.

I am very glad this Senate tariff bill has been reported. I think it in the main a very good bill; perhaps the best first draught that was ever submitted to Congress. It is the result of diligent, I may say intense, labor for some months on the part of the Republicans of the Senate Finance Committee. It is the result of a search for information from all the sources they could think of best qualified to inform them. It is built upon a definite principle in the maintenance of the old doctrine of protection, which, excepting at intervals, broken at times for a short period by acts that resembled a free-trade tariff, has been the doctrine of the country; and also the doctrine of all the large civilized nations of the world with one single exception, and that exception is a country which can not possibly afford to adopt such a tariff. It is absolutely out of the power of Great Britain to make the protective tariff that we contemplate, because we have (what Great Britain has not) within our limits, somewhere between the Atlantic and the Pacific, the northern lakes and the southern gulf, nearly every possible element that is needed for the support, the progress, and the glory of the nation; everything in the mines, everything in the field, every textile fabric. All these things are laid before us, and the possession of these wonderful resources of this great variety of climate—this very possession of itself intimates a command from the Divinity that we should improve it and build up a great people here.

Our duty is at home as a nation, not in any narrow, contracted, illiberal, or unchristian spirit; but in a great and broad sense our duty is at home. No such task was ever laid upon a race of people or upon a continent as is placed upon us here.

Why, sir, we hear a demand that we shall seek a foreign market and not limit ourselves to the confines of our own land. Gentlemen forget that the marvelous growth of this country is such as to tax all its own marvelous powers. Seek a foreign market, sir! We shall bring into this country in this decade by the natural increase and by immigration a body of people equal in numbers to the whole of Spain. Sixteen or seventeen millions of people are coming here, being born here, to grow up here and have homes. Their houses are to be built, their furniture is to be built, the iron ware is to be furnished, their farming implements, their fences are to be put down, their churches and their schoolhouses are to be built, and their clothing is to be made, and all this is to be done for sixteen new millions of people between 1880 and 1890, and in the next decade it will be done for 18,000,000 of people. We need not be disturbed about foreign markets, neither need we be seeking for work to be done outside. We shall find foreign markets and work, but we have a great work at home.

We are reproached for the lack of a foreign commerce. We built in the year 1887, if Mr. Poor, an established authority, is to be accepted, 12,000 miles of railway. Our book of statistics says it costs $65,000 a mile to build and thoroughly equip a railroad. If that be true, and if it be true that Mulhall is right in saying that steam-ships cost from £16 to £24 per ton, then, accepting the highest of these figures, we find that the railways built in 1887 in the United States cost twice as much as all the steam-ship tonnage of Great Britain, and we have in one year a means of commerce that more than doubles the three millions tonnage of steam-ships which is the boast of that nation and the admiration of the free-trader.

That is where the resources of this nation go, where the savings and the earnings of this people go, to building up the nation. If by any legislation of ours we can erect such barriers, such dikes, such breakwaters as to protect our people, in all this grand transformation, from sudden inroads from without, from unjust and unwise competitions, it

is an obvious duty to do it. There is no Christian duty to-day resting upon us to leave our well-paid labor here open to the rush of illimitable quantities of goods from an overcrowded market dumped in upon us to the derangement of our industries. We are under no obligation to do that.

It is a misfortune, if you please, of many other nations that their people are ill-paid and ill-fed and ill-clothed; that they are not as productive, man for man, as ours. It is the inheritance from previous bad government. No matter from what fault or what reason, there are the facts. It is moreover a fact that you can not scale down the wages of the American to the wages of the European by any legal process or by any effort that man can put forward, because this nation, on this continent of illimitable resources, has great demands for labor, and will have for generations. There is a greater demand here than anywhere else, and the rewards of labor will continue higher than elsewhere. But yet a breaking down of our industries by legislation, by a reversal of the old legislation, would cause, undoubtedly, a lowering of those wages, while it could not bring them to the figure where they could successfully compete in foreign markets for a great many of the manufactures of the world.

We are nearer an honest and honorable trial of this great question than ever before. The jury is ready. Twenty-five days from this the question will be decided. The issue is free trade against protection, not frankly even now as I wish it to be made, yet I have in my eye at this very moment, in this Chamber, men who do not disguise it. Every free-trader in the United States understands perfectly on which side of this contest he belongs. The Free Trade League at its last annual meeting, in its resolutions, set forth almost precisely, indeed precisely, the course that has been pursued in the preparation of the Mills bill.

It is their programme for the advancement of the cause, not that we should undertake now directly to apply to ourselves the tariff which Great Britain has, but that we should sap and undermine by beginning, for example, with what some of them call raw materials, disregarding the fact that what is raw material to one man is the finished product of another, and that we shall begin also by an assault upon weak spots here and there that we may break and divide the forces of protection. For example, by making salt and wool free—making wool free in an endeavor to divide the manufacturing forces of New England, New York, and Pennsylvania.

So the issue is truly made. The question is whether we shall begin a course of entire economic reconstruction of the United States and pass through years of disturbance and readjustment. If the free-traders shall have their own sweet will by the possession of the executive and both branches of the legislative department, it is not to be supposed that they will begin with the British tariff. Indeed they would soon throw themselves out of power by that. Mongredien, one of the ablest writers in behalf of free trade, lays down the policy for a nation in our circumstances, if it is to undertake this economic revolution. He advises that it begin as the Mills bill begins and as the Free-Trade League advised, with one thing or a few things at a time, hoping that a change in that way might not be violent and permitting men released from one industry to easily turn themselves with their capital to another.

But, sir, as I said, I do not intend to enter fully into this argument. I am going where the jury is. The bill has been presented; its purposes and general character have been set forth by the authors of it. Those who desire to speak here upon it can do so, but the people are not looking this way nor caring much what we say or do now. No one supposes that the bill can be discussed item by item, as it must be and as its friends wish to have it discussed before the final vote is taken. That work must inevitably go over until December. It is my humble judgment that the best service that the Congress of the United States can do is to go home, and I do not think I am deserting duty by saying that, for one, I am going.

Mr. REAGAN. Mr. President, I think the country is to be congratulated on the fact that in the pending political contest there is submitted to the people a great political issue which affects all the interests of the country, and which calls for the determination by the people themselves of the true principles which should govern in the levying and collecting of taxes for the support of the Government.

On the one side it is proposed by the theory of the Senate Finance Committee's bill to levy a tax upon the people of this country for the protection of domestic industries, and making the collection of revenue an incident and not the principal object of its collection. On the other side the proposition is that we shall levy and collect taxes for the support of the Government as provided for in the Constitution, allowing such protection as is incident to the collection of revenues for the support of the Government.

I am not prepared to say that if separately submitted I would vote for all the items in the tariff bill which was sent us from the House of Representatives, nor am I prepared to say that if separately submitted I would vote against all the items in the substitute bill of the Finance Committee of the Senate. But I do most earnestly approve the theory of the House bill which proposes to reduce the burdens of taxation on the people, and to reduce the surplus of revenue in the Treasury by reducing the rates of taxation on the necessaries of life. And I am as earnestly opposed to the theory of the Senate bill which proposes to reduce the surplus of revenue by reducing the tax on such luxuries as tobacco and whisky and raising the taxes on the necessaries of life, such as clothing, iron, steel, implements for use in agriculture and the mechanic arts, salt, lumber, etc., so as to exclude them wholly or in large part from importation and thus increase the cost to consumers.

I should have liked to present an analysis of these two bills and to call attention to the compound rates of duty imposed by the Senate bill, and to show how it increases duties above what is required by the present law and over those proposed by the House bill. But I can not do this unless I had tables reducing the mixed rates of the Senate bill to ad valorem rates. Such tables have not yet been prepared; nor can I now have time to make a satisfactory analysis of these bills.

I desire to express my preference, however, for ad valorem rates, which all can understand, to mixed specific and ad valorem rates which no one but an expert can understand, and which serves to hide from the public the extent to which they are taxed.

My principal object in the remarks I shall now submit is to make some reply to the remarks of the honorable Senator from New York [Mr. HISCOCK]. That Senator is one of the Senators who represent the most populous State in the Union, which contains much greater wealth than any other State in the Union, which controls a much larger internal and foreign commerce than any other State in the Union, which contains the great commercial and cosmopolitan metropolis of the Union, and in which is concentrated the great mass of the capital of this country employed in domestic and foreign commerce, in railroads, the telegraph and express business, in shipping, in mining, etc. He is one of the Senators from a State whose commercial and social relations are blended with those of the people of every other State in the Union, and whose commerce extends to every country on the globe. He is one of the Senators representing a State whose business and prosperity depend on the industries, commerce, and good will of the other States of the Union, and which is usually national and fraternal in its politics and organization.

In view of these facts we would naturally and reasonably expect those representing that great State and its vast and varied interests to be broad, liberal, national, and fraternal in their political views.

With the friendliest feelings personally for that Senator, and with a purpose to be entirely fair, I think it a duty to offer some criticisms on his speech of Tuesday last. In that speech he says:

> It is the same question that divided the North and South and incited a bloody and expensive war and the division is on the same agricultural and geographical lines. It is another great struggle on the part of our Southern friends for cheap and degraded labor and against the industrial system of our Northern States.
>
> There are several causes which have tended to increase the value of labor for the last twenty years in this country. The two most prominent are the manufacturing industries of the North and the abolition of slavery in the South. Democracy acquiesced in the latter, but is making its final struggle for the destruction of the former.

Further on the Senator makes the following statement:

> In this connection I refer to a startling feature of the Mills bill. I have before me a list of the principal products of the manufactories of the United States. The value and places of manufacture are taken from the census report of 1880, and doubtless there has been some increase since, but there has been little or no change in respect to the location or percentage of product in the respective States, I am assured. The list contains about one hundred lines of goods, all now protected. The aggregate value of the product for the last census year, 1879, was nearly two thousand million dollars. Of this amount less than 5 per cent. was manufactured in those States which composed the late Southern Confederacy, and a little more than 95 per cent. was manufactured and made chiefly outside of the States which contributed their quota to the Confederate service. This is a startling fact, but I have something still to add more remarkable. The Mills bill envelops them all within its cuttle-fish folds and provides a 38 per cent. reduction in the protection now afforded them by law.
>
> I have a table before me from which I desire to quote:
>
> Soap and candles, $26,260,792 worth made in the Northern States, and only $291,935 in value made in the Confederate States—placed on the free-list.
>
> Bags, other than paper, $9,635,300 worth made in the Northern States; $91,300 made in the Confederate States.
>
> Glass manufactures, $21,154,571 in value made in the Northern States; none in the Confederate States, and there is a reduction upon some of the grades or classes.
>
> Stone and earthen ware, $7,814,027 in value made in the Northern States; $129,702 made in the late Confederate States.
>
> Confectionery, a luxury, $23,880,672 in value made in the Northern States; $1,756,361 made in the late Confederate States, and a reduction of 20 per cent. of the duties or in the protection.
>
> Brushes and brooms, $10,272,527, the value of the products made in the Northern States; $288,328 made in the Confederate States; and a reduction from 20 to 33 per cent. in the protection.
>
> Iron-work, architectural (structural), $2,084,287 worth made in the Northern States, and $25,250 made in the Confederate States, and 11 per cent. reduction made by the Mills bill.
>
> Files, $2,486,533 worth made in the Northern States, and none made in the Confederate States, and a reduction of duty of 40 per cent. by the Mills bill.
>
> Nails and spikes, $5,629,240 worth made in the Northern States, none made in the Confederate States, and a 20 per cent. reduction made by our Confederate friends.
>
> Carriages and wagons, $100,463,044 worth made in the Northern States, and $4,278,292 made in the Confederate States, and a reduction of 14 per cent. made by their representatives.
>
> Furniture, $75,885,045 worth made in the Northern States, and $1,960,680 worth made in the Confederate States, and the Mills bill reduces the protective duties nearly one-half.
>
> Hardware, as classified in the census report, $22,644,793, worth made in the Northern States, and $8,900 worth made in the Confederate States, and a reduction of 11 per cent. is made by the Mills bill.

But, Mr. President, I will not weary the Senate with calling attention to these various items.

Mr. HAWLEY. Will the Senator allow me to make a statement right there so

that it may go in in this place? I perceive that the majority of the Committee on Ways and Means which made up that bill is composed of Democrats from Confederate States in the proportion of six Democrats from Confederate States to two from Northern States.

Mr. REAGAN. If the Senator from New York will allow me, I desire to inquire in which class he puts the States of Maryland, West Virginia, Kentucky, and Missouri?

Mr. HISCOCK. I will say in reference to that that these products are largely in the Northern States outside of those States. The comparison I speak of here, however, is between the Confederate States and the others.

Mr. REAGAN. The aggregate, then, will embrace the States of Maryland, West Virginia, Kentucky, and Missouri?

Mr. HISCOCK. Yes, sir.

A word in reference to Texas. Perhaps it is proper that I should make this statement in view of the expression I shall quote from the remarks of the Senator from Texas [Mr. COKE]. We will take the products of Texas on this list. They are:

Brick and tile	$448,418
Carriages and wagons	301,800
Lumber, planed	456,000
Lumber, sawed	2,673,449
Oil, cotton-seed, and cake	276,450
Sash, doors, and blinds	416,500
Foundry and machine-shop products	552,778
Tin-ware, copper-ware, and sheet-iron ware	491,420

Of the products of those industries I have indicated Texas contributed $5,597,415 in value only.

Something has been said in respect to the constitution of the committee that reported the House bill. Texas was most prominently represented there, and the share she has had in the formulation of the bill it is unnecessary for me to refer to.

This statement is made by the honorable Senator to show that as the eleven States to which he refers, and which he designates as comprising the late Southern Confederacy, manufacture so little as compared with the other twenty-seven States that they ought not to have a potential voice in the enactment of laws regulating the duties on imports. It will be observed that the Senator excludes the States of Maryland, West Virginia, Kentucky, and Missouri from the list of Southern States, and adds their manufactures to those of the Northern States, doubtless for the purpose of showing the greatest possible disparity between the manufactured products of the Northern and Southern States.

These figures, so unfavorable to the Southern States, he tells us, were taken from the census of 1880, and he adds, "Doubtless there has been some increase since, but there has been little or no change in respect to the location or percentage of product in the respective States, I am assured."

To show that the Senator is not as well informed on this subject as he usually is, I present a statement showing the increase of population, the aggregate and the per capita increase of wealth, the increase in railroad mileage, in the number of manufacturing establishments, in the capital invested in them, in the number of employés in them, in the value of their products, in the value of mineral products, in the value of farm products, in the number of schools, the number of children who attend them, and in the expenditures for public schools in the Southern States between the years 1880 and 1888.

Items.	1888.	1880.	Per cent. of increase.
Population	18,942,858	14,639,714	29.4
Gross wealth	$3,240,774,722	$2,161,792,795	49.8
Wealth per capita	$171,111	$148,142	15.6
Railroad mileage	35,679	17,808	100.0
Number of manufacturing establishments	59,185	34,563	71.4
Capital	$426,597,000	$179,366,230	143.5
Number of hands	440,253	215,245	112.8
Value of products	$565,058,103	$315,934,794	85.4
Value of mineral products	$25,462,600	$3,347,445	760.6
Total value of farm products	$793,098,293	$611,697,048	29.7
Schools	62,058	45,031	37.8
Children in attendance	2,402,117	1,832,620	30.7
Expenditures for public schools	$11,742,.07	$6,415,706	83.2

Mr. ALDRICH. Will it interrupt the Senator from Texas if I ask him a question?

Mr. REAGAN. No, sir.

Mr. ALDRICH. I should like to ask the authority of the table he submits.

Mr. REAGAN. I will state the authority. I am indebted to the Washington Post of September 16 for this table, as copied from the New Orleans Times-Democrat. And the Post accompanies it with the statement that—

It is certain that in no other portion of the world has such a record been made in the past eight years as these figures contain.

I will state to the Senator that while I have not the papers before me, yet from having seen publications in the Manufacturers' Record of Baltimore, the table evidently came from that paper. It makes a specialty of collecting these statistics.

Mr. ALDRICH. I had a double purpose in asking the Senator the question: In the first place, to find out the authority for an elaborate statement like that, which, if it could be made off-hand, would certainly save the country many million dollars in the collection of the census; and, second, whether he undertook to say, or was meant to be understood as saying, that the South had increased more rapidly in manufactures from 1880 to 1888 than the North.

Mr. REAGAN. I have no doubt it has.

Mr. ALDRICH. In manufactures?

Mr. REAGAN. Proportionately it has increased more rapidly. I mean the percentage of increase has been much greater in the South than in the North, in my opinion.

Mr. ALDRICH. Then the Senator's idea in making the statement is not to show that the South has suffered from a protective system?

Mr. REAGAN. That is not my object. The Senator may give that construction for his purposes if he chooses; but I made the statement to show that that increase has occurred in spite of a protective and oppressive tariff.

From the table I have presented it is seen that in that time the increase of population in these States has been 29.4 per cent., the increase of aggregate wealth 49.8 per cent., the increase of wealth per capita 15.6 per cent., the increase of railroad mileage 100 per cent., the increase in the number of manufacturing establishments 71.4 per cent., the increase of capital invested in manufacturing establishments 143.5 per cent., the increase of hands employed in them 112.8 per cent., the increase in the value of manufactured products 85.4 per cent., the increase in the value of mineral products 760.6 per cent., the increase of farm products 29.7 per cent., the increase in the number of schools 37.8 per cent., the increase of attendance in schools 36.7 per cent., and the increase of expenditure for public schools 83.2 per cent.

I desire, also, to present two tables copied from the Fort Worth Gazette of October 8, 1888, which were confessedly taken from the Manufacturers' Record. I desire to say in reference to that publication that it makes a specialty of obtaining information as accurately as it can as to the progress of manufactures in the Southern States, and I apprehend that it is reasonably accurate in its presentation of these statistics and facts.

The following table illustrates the increasing diversity of the new enterprises. We give the following comparison, showing the number organized during the first nine months of each of the last three years:

Enterprises.	First nine months of—		
	1888.	1887.	1886.
Iron furnace companies	15	25	8
Machine-shops and foundries	101	80	56
Agricultural implement factories	12	17	8
Flour-mills	114	98	71
Cotton-mills	59	59	9
Furniture factories	55	41	19
Gas-works	23	29	19
Water-works	73	65	21
Carriage and wagon factories	53	32	12
Electric-light companies	122	53	23
Mining and quarrying enterprises	361	444	114
Lumber mills, including saw and planing mills, sash and door factories, stave factories, etc	626	512	362
Ice factories	46	76	42
Canning factories	211	60	11
Stove foundries	4	3	5
Brick-works	128	141	43
Miscellaneous iron-works, rolling-mills, pipe works, etc.	28	56	16
Cotton compresses	35	33	11
Cotton-seed oil mills	23	15	3
Miscellaneous enterprises not included in foregoing	853	754	322
Total	2,942	2,594	1,175

Here is an increase in the first nine months of this year of 358 new enterprises compared with the same time in 1887, and of 1,767 compared with the same time in 1886.

Summing up the amount of capital and capital stock represented by our list of new enterprises and the enlargement of old plants for the first nine months of 1888 we have:

FIRST NINE MONTHS OF 1888.

Alabama	$19,939,000
Arkansas	6,900,000
Florida	2,945,000
Georgia	9,388,000
Kentucky	22,101,000
Louisiana	5,259,000
Maryland	6,059,000
Mississippi	1,591,000
North Carolina	5,254,000
South Carolina	3,850,000
Tennessee	8,660,000
Texas	14,836,000
Virginia	8,929,000
West Virginia	5,703,000
Total	121,415,000

I know that it is the habit of gentlemen who rely upon sectional prejudices, and whose interest and disposition it seems to be to disparage the South, to try in every way to discredit the progress of that country. They need but look at the extent of territory there, the character of that territory, its resources, both agricultural and mineral, its water power, its genial climate, and that energy which has enabled its citizens to do what they have after utter prostration and poverty, to see that in a few more years the people of the South intend to command the respect of even the fanatics of New England.

When it is remembered that at the close of the war between the States, twenty-three years ago, those States were desolated by a most

destructive war, their social and industrial systems overthrown; that a very large proportion of their men, in the vigor of manhood, had fallen in battle or died of disease in camp or hospital; and that for about four more years they underwent a process of political reconstruction, which, under the manipulations of the military, provost-marshals, Freedmen's Bureau officers, camp followers, and lawless plunderers exhausted the most of what little property the war had left them, with a servile race, for the most part wholly unfitted for the duties and responsibilities of citizenship, enfranchised and made the ruling class, the wonder to thoughtful men would be not that such a people were as poor as the Senator from New York would represent them to be, but rather that they had been able to reorganize society and re-establish civil government and make such wonderful industrial progress.

In reference to the poor figure the Senator makes Texas cut as a manufacturing State, if he had been as anxious to place her in a creditable light before the Senate as he seems to have been to discredit her enterprise, he would have recognized the fact that she is a new State, with no such accumulations of capital as exist in the older States; and a very little inquiry would have enabled him to ascertain that she is now the first cotton-producing State in the Union, produces about one-eighth of all the cattle in the Union, is now the first sheep-growing State in the Union.

Mr. DOLPH. Will the Senator from Texas permit me to ask him a question?

Mr. REAGAN. Yes, sir.

Mr. DOLPH. Did I understand the Senator to say that Texas was the largest sheep-producing State in the Union?

Mr. REAGAN. I will say to the Senator from Oregon that when the census was taken in 1880 California and Ohio exceeded Texas, but three years ago Texas had passed them in the race and had more sheep than either of them.

Mr. DOLPH. How many has Texas now?

Mr. REAGAN. Something over six million.

Mr. DOLPH. California has over six million, probably seven million.

Mr. REAGAN. The Senator has doubtless seen, as I have seen, from time to time, tables of this kind placing Texas ahead of all the other States as a sheep-raising State. Texas has more horses than any other State, except Illinois, and is steadily coming to the front in the production of corn and wheat, with farms of the value of at least $300,000,000; and besides these, has in money and land the largest school fund of any State in the Union or of any government in the world.

If the Senator had chosen to inquire he could have known that Texas cattle furnish a very large amount of the beef which feeds the good people of New York. And if he had chosen to consult the merchant princes of New York they could have told that their business was annually swelled by the receipts of the larger part of a million and a quarter bales of cotton, sent there from Texas, worth more than $60,000,000, and that Texas merchants buy probably more than that sum annually of merchandise in New York. And they would doubtless be able to tell him they have more respect for the people of Texas and of the South than he manifests.

The Senator from Connecticut [Mr. HAWLEY] having interjected into the speech of the Senator from New York the statement which I have quoted, that the majority of the Committee on Ways and Means, which made up the House tariff bill, is composed of six Democrats from the Confederate States—I am glad the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BLAIR] was not here to reprimand a brother Senator for using the term "Confederate States"—the Senator from New York proceeds as follows:

> Something has been said in respect to the constitution of the committee that reported the House bill. Texas was most prominently represented there, and the share she has had in the formulation of the bill it is unnecessary for me to refer to.
>
> I think Arkansas, as one of her Representatives was so prominent in the formation of the bill, should be referred to. That State manifestly should indicate the policy that should control or shape this country in respect to manufacture and protection. I have searched through this list and I find that Arkansas contributed of those products in sawed lumber $1,793,848 worth, and oil, cotton-seed, and cake, $590,000 worth, making $2,383,848 in value as her total manufacture of the products I have indicated. And Arkansas will be potential in shaping the financial or the economic policies of the Government if the House bill is accepted by the country.
>
> A Representative of Tennessee has had something to do with the House bill. Tennessee made of brick and tile a little more than half a million dollars' worth; of carriages and wagons a little more than a million dollars in value; of foundry and machine-shop products a little more than a million dollars' worth. She furnished some lumber, some cotton goods, and the aggregate of her contribution to the volume which I have given is valued at $12,068,481.
>
> West Virginia speaks through this same bill. The Senator from Texas has inquired whether she was represented in the list to which I have called attention. She is to the extent of having contributed $5,385,296 in manufactured goods.
>
> Georgia, I think, has done better than the others, for her people make some cotton goods, and with her cotton manufactures the aggregate is $15,083,046.
>
> Kentucky contributed to more items upon the list than any other of the Southern States, and the total of her manufactures in these lines of goods (I do not speak of her whisky) amounts to $18,156,385.
>
> I suppose whisky was not mentioned, because it contributed a very much larger revenue, and it would not do to credit the South with a larger revenue.
>
> I have them aggregated together, so that I can give the figures here. The measure which was forced through the House and in favor of which the Democracy pronounce in the Senate was formulated by gentlemen who represent the States named, and by those gentlemen alone, I may say, for they had the control of the Committee on Ways and Means.

This, with what preceded and followed these remarks, could have had no other purpose than to raise a sectional issue and revive the passions and prejudices of the war, in the absence of and to supply the place of legitimate argument based on the respective merits of these two bills, and sustained by patriotic devotion to the best interests of the whole country.

It will be remembered that when the Senator from New York was showing how little manufacturing had been done in the late Confederate States he omitted the States of Maryland, West Virginia, Kentucky, and Missouri, and placed their products in his aggregates for the Northern States. Now, the Senator from Connecticut, in order to show that six of the Democrats of the Ways and Means Committee were from the late Confederate States, includes West Virginia and Kentucky among them, as there are only six members from all the Southern States on that committee, embracing the two from West Virginia and Kentucky, the other seven being from Northern States; and the Senator from New York accepts this new classification, because it aids his sectional view while it conflicts with his previous statement.

However misrepresentations might be allowable to deceive either enemies or friends in war, it is hardly to be expected of great statesmen in the most important and responsible positions when discussing a public measure for the benefit of a common country and Government.

The Senator from New York then presents the following table and statement:

They aggregate as follows:

Texas	$5,597,415
Georgia	15,083,046
Kentucky	18,156,385
Tennessee	12,068,481
West Virginia	5,385,296
Arkansas	2,383,848
Total	58,674,461

These States contributed of the manufactured goods enumerated in the schedule to which I have referred the value of $58,674,461 out of an aggregate of $1,867,392, and these Representatives assume to speak for the industries of the country, to shape the economical policy of the country, and to provide the markets for the wage-army employed by and capital invested in manufacture.

Here, again, the Senator from New York embraces West Virginia and Kentucky, but forgets to mention Maryland and Missouri, these two States having, as shown by the census of 1880, 195,111 persons employed in manufacturing establishments, while all the States named by the Senator had only 201,742 persons so engaged, being but 6,631 more than in the two States so omitted to produce sectional effect.

With no malice or unkindness of feeling, but for the purpose of subserving the ends of justice and fairness, I have made this criticism on the part of the speech of the Senator from New York to which it refers. His high position and the great State he in part represents made it necessary that his effort to influence the action of the Senate on so great a question by such questionable means should be exposed. What must be thought by fair-minded people, who feel a patriotic pride in the welfare of their whole country; and what must be thought by just people of the great State of New York, much the largest recipient of the commercial advantages and blessings of the whole Union, when they see that one of their Senators has employed appeals to sectional and war prejudices in order to influence the adjustment of a great economic question in which all the American people are equally interested without reference to the parts of the country in which they live?

The Senator from New York says:

> It is the same question that divided the North and South, and incited a bloody and expensive war, and the division is on the same agricultural and geographical lines.

Can the Senator suppose any one but himself will believe this to be true? Its nearest approximation to truth consists in the fact that protection barons and millionaire manufacturing corporations are by our tariff legislation robbing all other classes of the people by the levy of an average tax on them for their benefit of nearly one-half the value of all the goods they buy of the kinds of taxed imports; and if this shall be continued it must in the end enslave the great mass of the people.

In the statement above quoted the Senator makes the implied admission of a fact which he and other protectionists have been trying to keep out of view—that is, that the interests of the agricultural States were different on this question from those of the manufacturing States. But he fails to draw the line between the two classes of States at the right place. If his hypothesis were true, then the States south and west of Pennsylvania would certainly be classed as agricultural States, while those north and east of that State might be classed as manufacturing States. But I submit that his whole statement is incorrect, and assert that the division of interests in this respect is not by State lines and sections of the country, but by vocations. The protected manufacturer, wherever he is, in whatever part of the Union, in whatever State he may be, gets his share of the unjust tax levied on all the other people of the country, whether they are in the South, the West, or in the East, and whether they be farmers, mechanics, artisans, laborers, merchants, lawyers, doctors, or preachers; and they extort this tribute from

their own employés and operatives just as they do from all others who are required to pay this monstrous tax on the necessaries of life.

Another fallacy presented, at least inferentially, by the speech of the Senator, is that the people of the States where but little manufacturing is done are not entitled to an equal influence in the determination of the tariff question with those of States where more manufacturing is done. This assertion, it is fair to presume, is made on the principle that the citizen who meets a highwayman has not as much interest in his money and watch as the robber has. But this monstrous doctrine is in full harmony with the essential principles and action of the protectionists, who maintain in effect that the more the masses of the people are taxed for the benefit of the few the richer they are, and that a tax unnecessarily collected, as is now done under existing law, of $600,000,000 a year off of the people at large for the benefit of the barons of protection, is a public blessing, resulting from the blessed beneficence of a protective tariff.

And this accords with the Republican policy as demonstrated in their acts of legislation and practices of exempting capital from its share of the burden of supporting the Government, and of levying upon agriculture and labor the tribute which is building up a class of millionaires and increasing the hosts of tramps and paupers.

Mr. ALDRICH. Mr. President——

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The Senator from Rhode Island appeals to the Senator from Texas.

Mr. REAGAN. Certainly; I yield.

Mr. ALDRICH. Do I understand the Senator from Texas to say that we are collecting $600,000,000 for the benefit of manufacturers in addition to the amount which is paid at the custom-houses?

Mr. REAGAN. I will give the Senator the exact figures, so that there can not be any mistake. I do affirm substantially what the Senator supposes, and I will show him the process by which I reach that conclusion, so that he may at his leisure make any criticism he may see proper, and see whether he can overthrow my position or not.

Mr. ALDRICH. If the Senator from Texas will permit me, I will state my reasons for asking the question.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. Does the Senator from Texas yield?

Mr. REAGAN. Yes, sir.

Mr. ALDRICH. I understand the Senator to say that $600,000,000 are added annually to the price of the domestic manufactured products of this country by the operation of the tariff.

Mr. REAGAN. No, I did not say that. I said much worse than that about it.

Mr. ALDRICH. What is the Senator's statement?

Mr. REAGAN. I do not know that I can turn at once to the statement that I made on the 16th of August, but I there show the amount of imports for the year ending the 30th of June last, the portion of those imports which are taxed, the portions which are not taxed, with the average rate of duty upon the taxed imports. I will read a few paragraphs from my remarks on a former occasion, which will answer the question:

> The value of our imports for the year which ended June 30, 1888, was $723,873,630. Of this sum the taxed imports amounted to $479,805,362; the remainder, $244,068,268, being imported free of duty. The average rate of duty on the taxed imports was 47.10 per cent. and yields a gross revenue of $225,988,225. Now, let us see what it costs the consumers of the country, the farmers, laborers, artisans, professional men, and others, to obtain this $225,988,225 of gross revenue. The value of manufactured products in the United States for the year 1880, as shown by the census, was $5,369,579,191. It is fair to assume that when we tax imports $47.10 on the $100 worth of imported goods this enables the makers of domestic products of the same kinds to add 47.10 per cent. on the dollar to the price of their fabrics, and still to undersell importers by the amount of the cost of transportation from foreign countries to this. This may not be strictly accurate, but it is near enough correct to illustrate the view I am presenting.
>
> A tax of 47.10 per cent. on the amount of our domestic manufactures of 1880 (and they are considerably more now) would yield $2,527,071,798 of revenue. But let us deduct $2,000,000,000 from the $5,369,579,191 as the assumed proportion our free-list bears to the taxed imports and we still have $3,369,579,191 of domestic fabrics of the kinds of our taxed imports. A tax of $47.10 on the $100 of this sum would show that to obtain $225,988,225 of gross revenue for the support of the Government from imports we are taxed $1,587,071,798, which does not go into the Treasury, but is transferred by law from the consumers to the manufacturers of these goods.
>
> But this sum should be reduced by the amount of a reasonable average tax, say 30 per cent. A tax of 30 per cent. on $3,396,579,191 would yield $1,010,873,757 of revenue. Deduct this sum from $1,587,071,798 and still the consumers of our domestic manufacturers would be unnecessarily taxed the sum of $576,198,044 a year. This is the sum annually transferred, according to this calculation, from the consumers to the manufacturers of these fabrics.

That is the answer I make to the Senator, with this additional statement, that I have placed it at $576,000,000. Most other statisticians—most statisticians, I should say, for I do not claim to be one—place it at at least $600,000,000. I have placed it at the lowest estimate of any one I have ever seen make the calculation.

Mr. ALDRICH. My purpose in asking the question was to get, if I could, some accurate statement from a representative Senator upon the other side of the Chamber as to the cost of the protective system to the people of this country. I understand the Senator from Texas to state it variously at $600,000,000, $1,600,000,000, and $1,800,000,000 per annum. He stated in the first speech from which he read, but which he asked the Reporter to omit as he thought he was reading from the later speech, that the amount would exceed $1,800,000,000 annually, being 47 per cent. upon four thousand million dollars' worth of manufactured products. In the next statement he makes it $1,600,000,000, but reduces that a thousand million as the amount which would be added by what he considers a moderate revenue tax.

My purpose in asking the question was this: If $600,000,000 was correct, that is only 10 per cent. of the value of our manufactured products instead of 47 per cent. If $1,800,000,000, which was the Senator's first statement, is correct, the people of this country under a protective system have been obliged to pay the manufacturers for twenty-seven years $1,800,000,000 a year. They have thus paid $48,600,000,000 since 1861, or $5,000,000,000 more than the whole wealth of all the people of the United States.

Mr. REAGAN. I do not know that I precisely understand the Senator's suggestion. The first estimate I made without making the deduction. I took $1,578,000,000 as the amount, and then deducted 30 per cent. upon the proportion of taxed imports.

Mr. ALDRICH. Why should we raise a thousand million by taxation, then?

Mr. REAGAN. I do not say that; I say we transfer. I say that in raising $225,000,000 for the Government we transfer, according to this calculation, $1,587,000,000 to the manufacturers, which does not go into the Treasury, and after deducting from this sum $1,010,873,757 as the amount of a tax of 30 per cent. on the $3,369,379,191 of manufactured fabrics, there would still be $576,198,044 unnecessarily transferred by law from the consumers to the manufacturers.

Mr. ALDRICH. Let me see if I understand the Senator. Do I now understand him to say that if we had a revenue duty with an average of 20 per cent. we should then put into the pockets of the manufacturers of the country a thousand million dollars?

Mr. REAGAN. No, sir; that is not my position.

Mr. ALDRICH. What is it then?

Mr. REAGAN. If we impose the tax upon three billion three hundred and odd million a year of the $5,300,000,000, we throw off two billion for the purpose of meeting the average of what would be the free-list.

Mr. ALDRICH. When it is a thousand millions, what is it deducted for?

Mr. REAGAN. The Senator, I expect, will have to look at the figures as I give them. A tax of 30 per cent. on $3,396,000,000 would yield $1,010,000,000 of revenue.

Mr. ALDRICH. Does not the Senator mean to say that if we had an average ad valorem tariff of 30 per cent. it would result in putting a thousand million dollars into the pockets of the manufacturers?

Mr. REAGAN. No, sir; it would simply result in saving to the people $576,198,044 of their own money that is now transferred from them to the manufacturers by law.

Mr. ALDRICH. As this is a matter of some importance and has been long a contested question, and we seem now to be on the point of arriving at some accurate settlement of the subject, I pursue the inquiry with perhaps what may seem a little pertinacity. I understand the Senator to say that under our existing tariff we do pay either $1,600,000,000 or $1,800,000,000, according as you assume the basis for computation.

Mr. REAGAN. I do not say that. The Senator will see when he reads my speech that I do not say anything like it. I say we obtain a revenue of $225,000,000, and to obtain that amount we levy a tax upon the people and transfer from them to the manufacturers $1,587,071,798 that do not go into the Treasury; but we simply transfer it from one class of people to another, without consideration.

Mr. ALDRICH. One thousand million dollars?

Mr. REAGAN. One billion one hundred and eighty-seven million seventy thousand seven hundred and ninety-eight dollars.

Mr. ALDRICH. Will the Senator please repeat the basis on which he places his deduction of $1,600,000,000 or $1,800,000,000, as the case may be?

Mr. REAGAN. I will ask the Senator to read my remarks. My statement was clear. He will certainly understand it, and I do not care to repeat over and over the statements I have made.

Mr. HOAR. Will the Senator from Texas allow me to put a question to him?

Mr. REAGAN. Certainly.

Mr. HOAR. I understand the Senator to say that for every dollar of a tariff tax there goes into the pocket of the manufacturer an equivalent if his manufacture is a protected article?

Mr. REAGAN. I assume that.

Mr. HOAR. I understand the Senator does; and he thinks there goes into the pockets of the manufacturers about $500,000,000 in that way, after making allowance for what ought to be imposed as a necessary and proper tariff tax, an average tariff tax.

Mr. REAGAN. Yes, that is the assumption I made.

Mr. HOAR. If there goes into their pockets in addition to that a similar sum for the necessary tariff tax (whether the tax is necessary to the Government would not of course matter here in considering how much you transfer to the manufacturer), then the Senator would make out a sum equal to about one thousand eight hundred million dollars, if I understand him correctly.

Mr. REAGAN. About one billion five hundred and eighty-seven million seventy-one thousand seven hundred and ninety-eight dollars.

Mr. HOAR. The question I want to put is this: The manufacturing capital of this country in round numbers is three thousand million, or three billion dollars. So, according to the Senator's statement, there is transferred from the pockets of the people a sum equivalent, if it be $500,000,000, to 16⅔ per cent., or if it be a thousand million dollars and a little over, equivalent to 33⅓ per cent. of their entire manufacturing capital, saying nothing of their ordinary lawful, legitimate, and proper profits. Can the Senator explain how it is that if, since the high tariff of 1862 and so on, the manufacturing capital of this country has been getting in addition to all its lawful, proper, legitimate profit, a plunder from the people equivalent in one point of view to 33⅓ per cent. and in another to 16⅔ per cent. of their entire capital, the Government bonds all this time can be purchased and are greedily purchased at a rate which pays about 2.17 per cent.? Will the Senator explain that extraordinary fact?

Mr. REAGAN. I do not know that I comprehend the question which the Senator puts to me.

Mr. HOAR. I will repeat it. The Senator says that the manufacturers of this country, in addition to all lawful, proper, and reasonable profits, get in the way of plunder a sum of certainly $500,000,000, as he says, taking the sum which the Government ought reasonably and properly to have received of course. That would create an increased profit to manufacturers, whether the Government tax is proper or not, equal in one case to five hundred millions, and in the other equal to one thousand millions; that is, in one case 16⅔ per cent., and in the other 33⅓ per cent. of the entire manufacturing capital of the country.

I wish to know how it is that if since 1860 property invested in manufactures has been getting in this country as a regular and ordinary thing from 16⅔ to 33⅓ per cent. on the capital, at the same time Government bonds will realize in the market only a sum which will pay the purchasers about 2.17 per cent. interest? That seems extraordinary.

Mr. REAGAN. I think my proposition is a little misunderstood by the Senator. The only proposition which I made was that according to the basis of calculation which I made $576,000,000 more was collected under the present law than was necessary to be collected under a tax of 30 per cent.

Mr. HOAR. And that goes into the manufacturers' pockets?

Mr. REAGAN. I say that it is a transfer of that sum from the consumer to the manufacturer.

Mr. ALDRICH. May I trespass upon the patience of the Senator for one moment?

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. Does the Senator from Texas yield?

Mr. REAGAN. Yes, sir.

Mr. ALDRICH. If under a revenue tariff of 30 per cent. $1,000,000,000, according to the Senator's theory, would be added to the price of our domestic products, that would increase the cost of the manufactured products annually to this extent for the benefit of the manufacturers. If that is true, and if a revenue tariff would do this, I do not see any difference between a revenue tariff and a protective tariff as a system of robbery. It is only a question of degree. The legitimate, logical result must be that the Senator himself and every Senator who believes with him should be in favor of absolute free trade and the abolition of all custom-houses.

Mr. REAGAN. I do not know that I know what the Senator means by free trade. If he means a revenue tariff as contradistinguished from a protective tariff, then I want to be set down as a free-trader.

Mr. ALDRICH. In this particular case I meant the abolition of the custom-houses and of customs revenue absolutely; because if it would cost a thousand million dollars with a revenue tariff of 30 per cent. and cost a certain other amount if the duty were protective, I certainly should be in favor of a protective tariff; but I can not see how the Senator can be in favor of a revenue tariff if that is robbery to the extent of $1,000,000,000 to the people of this country.

Mr. REAGAN. The Senator has no choice in that. To talk about doing away with custom-houses is to talk about a thing that comes into nobody's mind, as there is universal assent to the collection of revenues necessary to support the Government by duties on imports. If the Senator means that, I suppose he will not find a free-trader in the United States, at least not one in a thousand certainly.

Mr. ALDRICH. I used the term "free trade" in a very narrow and technical sense. Every country from the beginning of civilization to the present time has collected some part of its revenue from customs, and there is no such thing actually as free trade in that sense.

Mr. REAGAN. I am glad at any time to yield to any explanation or question of a Senator, but I should like to proceed now and close my remarks. I am very sure that I will never convince the Senator that it is not right to tax the farmers of Texas one-half the value of their purchases for the benefit of the manufacturers of Rhode Island. I could not convince him of that until I could convince him that he ought not to want more money than belongs to his people. He may convince me, because I do not profess to be an adept in things of this kind as he is.

HOME MARKETS.

The Republicans assume that a protective tariff is justified because it furnishes a home market for agricultural products; and to sustain this view they refer to the much larger amount of farm products which are consumed in this country than are exported to foreign countries. The mode of presenting that question is both illogical and misleading. The true criterion is not how much of agricultural products our people consume at home, but how much, after supplying the home market, we export. During the last fiscal year, after supplying all our home markets required, our people sent to foreign markets $523,073,798 worth of agricultural products. There was that vast amount more than our home markets required, which but for our international exchange of commodities would have been lost to the farmers of the country, and its loss would have bankrupted the whole country.

The Republicans tell us their policy for reducing the surplus of revenue in the Treasury is to reduce the tax on tobacco and on other articles not produced in this country, and to so increase the duty on such imports as compete with American products as to reduce the imports and thereby reduce the current revenues. This policy of restricting trade, of commercial non-intercourse with other countries, is against the enlightened spirit of the age, is a reactionary policy which would destroy our foreign commerce and ruin all classes of business men and people. A suspension of our trade with foreign countries for one year would bankrupt all, whether farmers, merchants, or manufacturers. We can not sell abroad if we refuse to buy. A partial suspension of our foreign trade would be injurious to all exactly to the extent to which it might be carried.

Even without foreign trade, if the Republican policy of making all we need at home were carried out, we can not increase our home markets by increasing manufacturing establishments, for the reason that by the stimulus of high protection our people have more money invested in manufacturing and more machinery employed in that business than are necessary to supply the needs of our own country; and on account of the high price of living and material in this country, created by a high protective tariff, our manufactured fabrics cost so much that we can not sell them in foreign markets, and so have no inducement to build more manufactories to increase the home market.

One of the results of the excessive investment in manufactories is that the mills can not be run on full time, and laborers are often thrown out of employment by shutting down these establishments, and they and their families are made great sufferers because glutted markets require the suspension of manufacturing.

It is urged as an argument in favor of protection that it has been the cause of a great increase of the wealth of the country. That each new manufacturing establishment is an addition to the wealth of the country is certainly true, just as it is true that each new farm or workshop or office is an addition to the general sum of property. It is also true that the diversification of employments tends to increase wealth. In these senses the claim that manufactures increase wealth is justly made. But the general assumption that the great increase of wealth in this country is due wholly or mainly to its manufacturing interests is not warranted, though certainly they have contributed their fair proportion to it. The increase of wealth in this country is due to many causes, such as—

First. The great extent of territory.
Second. Its great fertility.
Third. Its great variety of productions.
Fourth. The extraordinarily rapid increase of population.
Fifth. The boundless mineral resources of the country.
Sixth. The superior facilities for transportation both by land and water.
Seventh. The improvements in chemistry during the last half century.
Eighth. The improvements in the mechhanical arts.
Ninth. The improvements in tools and machinery.
Tenth. And of late years the large exportation of agricultural products and the large importation of gold in return for these exports.
Eleventh. Improved mechanical skill and improved organization.

It ought also to be said that from causes I have heretofore stated during this session, and need not now repeat, that this increase of wealth is not generally diffused among the people, but has to a large extent gone into the possession of the great corporations of the country or into the hands of a few rich men, while the great mass of the people have not increased their wealth, and it is pretty certain a majority of them have grown poorer during the last ten or twenty years.

Such a question as that of the revision of the tariff, which affects every business interest and vocation in the country, ought to be discussed with candor and fairness. So much of interest is involved and so many people are interested in it, and so much intelligence has been and will be brought to bear on it, that sophistry and deceit and misrepresentation must all at last give way to truth. And the mere advocates of special interests will have to yield to the matured and honest judgment based on facts, which will sooner or later settle this great question in accordance with the best interests of the whole people.

I was led into this reflection in considering the monstrous fallacy which Republican politicians generally are trying to get the American people to believe, and in which they have to some extent succeeded, that a high tariff secures high wages for labor.

That the manufacturing capitalists and their agents have threatened and do threaten their operatives with a reduction of wages if the tariff

should be reduced, in order to control their votes, is no doubt true; and that many of the poor workmen are made to believe their wages are to be reduced on account of tariff reduction is no doubt equally true. This is not the convincing of their judgments by facts and reason, but is plainly fraudulent intimidation and coercion.

It can not truthfully be said that the rate of wages depends on the rate of tariff duties. If this were so, and a given rate of duties on imports would secure to the manufacturer a net profit of 10 per cent. and which enable him to pay his operatives $1 a day, and the law should change the rates of duties so as to enable him to realize a net income of 30 per cent., he should pay them $3 per day. No such thing ever happened or ever will happen. The employer will pay his operatives the sum which the labor market requires him to pay. No more and no less, whatever the duties on imports may be. If there are more laborers seeking employment than are required by the factories, their wages will be low, whether the duties on imports be high or low. If the amount of labor is not sufficient to supply the demands of the factories the price of labor will be higher and the rates of duties will not in either event affect the wages of labor. All men know this to be incontrovertibly true.

If times are dull, wages will be lower. If times are prosperous, wages will be higher, without reference to the rates of duty on imports. If money is scarce, wages will be lower; if plentiful, they will be higher, and the tariff will not in either case affect them. Wages, like every other marketable commodity, are to a greater or less extent governed by the law of supply and demand. The every-day experience and observation of the operatives in the manufacturing establishments demonstrates to them the fact that the employers demand their services at the lowest terms they can be had for without reference to the tariff. Of late years they often strike for higher wages, or to prevent the reduction of their wages, and in many cases it has happened that their employers, who have so much love for them and so much care for their interest just now when their votes are needed, have turned them adrift and employed cheaper labor, imported under contract from the oppressed and starving populations of Europe.

It must require a great deal of cheek in protectionists to argue that the rates of the wages of labor depend on the rates of tariff duties, and surely none but the most stupidly ignorant will believe them.

The idea that manufacturers are so greatly interested in the increase of the wages of their operatives, which would of necessity reduce their own profits, must cause a broad and knowing smile on the face of each of them when he looks into the face of another, and no doubt sometimes leaves them in doubt as to whether their political or hired advocates are sincere fools or hypocritical cheats.

Much stress is laid on the necessity of protection to manufactures which will enable our manufacturers to compete with those of European countries. While the wages of labor are as a rule lower there than here, there are other circumstances which go far towards equalizing the conditions of manufacturers in the two countries. In the first place, we have unlimited raw material for most manufactures without the expense of importation, while the cost of transportation, commissions, etc., of foreign-made goods 3,000 miles across the ocean, and the cost of exchange, give our manufacturers a decided advantage over them, and especially so in all heavy or bulky articles.

Besides this, Senator EVARTS, when Secretary of State in 1879, in an official report as Secretary of State, and Hon. James G. Blaine, in 1881, in an official report as Secretary of State, basing their statements on the reports of our foreign consuls, tell us that American laborers work more hours than those of Europe, are more efficient, and produce a larger amount of commodities for a given amount of wages than the laborers of Europe. And they assume that this, with our advantages in the possession of raw material, goes far towards equalizing, if it does not equalize, the condition for manufacturing in the two countries. And these two distinguished men were then speaking as Americans and not as partisans desiring to control the result of an election.

I ought to have mentioned here (which I believe some gentleman has referred to) that if high tariff makes high wages, it becomes necessary to explain how it is that in Russia, in Austria, in Germany, and in France, with high tariffs, labor is so much lower than it is in what is called "free-trade England," a country with lower duties.

All things considered, it is safe to assume that such a moderate tariff as will insure sufficient revenue to carry on the Government, pay pensions, meet the interest on the public debt, and gradually extinguish its principal, would place our manufacturers at advantage over those of Europe.

The pretense that the advocates of a high tariff are advocating an American and that the advocates of a revenue tariff are advocating an English policy is an insult to revenue reformers and an outrage upon truth and decency. It is the merest clap-trap, based on fraud and deceit.

The policy of the Republican party on this question is in harmony with its history as a party. It boldly affirms the doctrine of protection for the sake of protection, and treats the collection of revenue for the support of the Government as an incident to the assumed constitutional power to protect domestic manufactures, by taxing the people nearly one-half the value of the articles they are obliged to buy, and thus impoverishing them, in order to exclude foreign manufactures from our markets, and to make millionaires of a limited number of men and corporations.

The policy of that party, from the time it came into power, has been to stimulate and foster class interests and monopolies of every kind, and to plunder the many for the benefit of the few. And it has at all times been faithful and true to that policy, except when a State and national political convention meets, or in speeches, not in action, in a session of Congress preceding a Presidential election.

On those occasions it is profuse in resolutions and speeches in favor of the interests of the people, and especially of the laboring people of the country. It is then the greatest friend and special champion of popular rights, so far as resolutions and speeches can make it their champion. But what measure of policy, what act of Congress, can they point to as their work, which is not for class interests and against the interests of the people at large, and especially against the interests of workingmen and women? And notwithstanding all their late pretensions to interest in the welfare of the people and of labor, I make the prediction, and call their attention to it now, that when the approaching election is over they will direct their efforts as usual to the building up of class interests and monopolies, and that we will hear no more from them about popular rights and the rights of labor until the coming of another popular election.

I have on former days of this session pointed out the class legislation and monopolies built up and sustained by Republican policy, and will not restate them now.

Their bold advocacy of protection for protection's sake is in plain, palpable violation of the Constitution. But they have never allowed this instrument to stand in the way of their policy of centralization, of promoting class interests and of plundering the masses of the people for the benefit of the few. The Constitution provides that—

Congress shall have power to lay and collect taxes, duties, imposts, and excises.

And the purposes for which they may be collected are specified, and according to the Constitution they can be collected for no other purpose, are specified in the same clause and in the same sentence of the Constitution, and are—

To pay the debts and provide for the common defense and general welfare of the United States.

The words "general welfare of the United States" are held by the ablest and best expounders of the meaning of the Constitution to be not a separate grant of power, but rather a limitation upon the specific grants of power. If this interpretation of the Constitution is correct, as I believe it to be, where are we to find the power to pass laws for the protection of domestic manufactures? Certainly not in the power "to pay the debts" or "to provide for the common defense."

But independently of the question as to the absence of the constitutional warrant for such legislation, no principle is better settled in the State and Federal Constitutions and in the general policy of the country than that every citizen shall be protected in the ownership and enjoyment of his private property; and that he shall not be deprived of it except for public uses, and not then without just compensation. This right, with the necessary exception as to the taxes which must be contributed for public use, is hedged around and guarded and protected by many constitutional provisions, State and Federal.

A tax for protection is not to pay the debts of the United States, is not for the support of the Government, is not for the common defense, it is for no purpose for which we can impose a tax; but it is plainly and solely a tax to transfer the property of some private citizens to other private citizens arbitrarily and without compensation. It is to impoverish a part of the people by means of a law of Congress in order to enrich another part of the people by the same law. It is unwarranted, arbitrary, unreasonable, and unjust. It creates monopolies on the one side and destitution and oppression on the other. And its necessary outcome, if persisted in, will be to destroy our present system of Government and build up privileged classes and an aristocracy of wealth.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. CLARK, its Clerk, announced that the House had passed the following bills, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

A bill (H. R. 6246) for the relief of Samuel Fels;

A bill (H. R. 9949) for the relief of Patrick C. McQueeny; and

Joint resolution (H. Res. 229) to print the Agricultural Report for 1888.

ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY.

Mr. DOLPH. I move that when the Senate adjourn to-day it be to meet on Monday next.

Mr. ALLISON. If there are any Senators who are ready to speak to-morrow we may as well have a session. If there are none, of course I make no objection to adjourning over.

Mr. DOLPH. I have made inquiry in reference to that matter, and I can not find that any Senator is prepared to speak to-morrow on the tariff bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PASCO in the chair). The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Oregon.

The motion was agreed to.

PRESIDENTIAL APPROVALS.

A message from the President of the United States, by Mr. O. L. PRUDEN, one of his secretaries, announced that the President had, on the 8th instant, approved and signed the act (S. 2411) for the relief of C. A. Williams and others.

PRINTING OF GOVERNMENT SECURITIES.

Mr. COKE. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

Mr. GEORGE. I ask the Senator to withdraw his motion for a minute that I may give a notice.

Mr. COKE. I withdraw the motion for that purpose.

Mr. GEORGE. I do not see any member of the Committee on Finance here, but there was a bill referred to that committee in which I feel some interest. I have been written to concerning it by a great many men who are in the interest of labor. The bill was passed by the House of Representatives on the 29th day of August, 1888, read twice, and referred to the Committee on Finance on the same day. It has not been reported. It is a bill "to provide for printing Government securities in the highest style of art," and it provides:

That from and after the passage of this act all Government securities, bonds, notes, and internal-revenue stamps shall be printed in the highest style of the art of plate-printing from hand-roller presses.

I desire to give notice that if that bill is not reported from the committee by Monday next I shall move to discharge the committee from its further consideration and ask that it be put on its passage.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The Senator from Mississippi asks unanimous consent that the unfinished business may be informally laid aside, and that the Committee on Finance may be discharged from the further consideration of the bill named by him.

Mr. GEORGE. No; I said I would make that request if the bill was not reported by Monday next.

Mr. SPOONER. What bill is that?

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. Will the Senator from Mississippi again state the title of the bill at the request of the Senator from Wisconsin?

Mr. GEORGE. Yes, sir; it is a bill (H. R. 9623) to provide for printing Government securities in the highest style of art.

Mr. ALDRICH subsequently said: I understand that in my absence and in the absence of the chairman of the committee the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. GEORGE] desired to ask a question of some member of the Finance Committee.

Mr. GEORGE. Yes, sir. I gave notice that on Monday I should move to discharge the Committee on Finance from the further consideration of the bill which has passed the House of Representatives (H. R. 9623) to provide for printing Government securities in the highest style of art. That is a bill which requires such printing to be done by hand-labor and not by machinery.

Mr. ALDRICH. I will say that that bill upon its reception by the Finance Committee was referred to a subcommittee, consisting of the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. HARRIS] and the Senator from New York [Mr. HISCOCK], who commenced an investigation of the subject which has not yet been completed, and they have not reported their conclusions to the full committee.

REPORTS OF COMMISSIONER OF LABOR.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. Before submitting the motion of the Senator from Texas [Mr. COKE], the Chair lays before the Senate a concurrent resolution from the House of Representatives; which will be read:

The resolution was read, and referred to the Committee on Printing, as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That there be printed 5,000 copies each, in cloth binding, of the first and second annual reports of the Commissioner of Labor for the use of the Department of Labor.

REPORT ON PRODUCTION OF PRECIOUS METALS.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore* laid before the Senate the following concurrent resolution from the House of Representatives; which was read, and referred to the Committee on Printing:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the report of the Director of the Mint on the production of the precious metals in the United States for the year 1887 be printed, and that 9,000 extra copies be printed, 4,000 copies for the use of the House of Representatives, 2,000 copies for the use of the Senate, and 3,000 copies for the use of the Director of the Mint.

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED.

The bill (H. R. 6246) for the relief of Samuel Fels was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

The bill (H. R. 9949) for the relief of Patrick C. McQueeney was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

The joint resolution (H. Res. 229) to print the Agricultural Report for 1888 was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Printing.

INNOCENT PURCHASERS OF PATENTED ARTICLES.

Mr. GEORGE. I desire to call the attention of the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. PLATT] to a bill which was referred to the Committee on Patents some six or eight months since, and to which I called his attention about a month ago, to protect innocent purchasers of patent rights, and to ask him at what time we may expect the bill to be reported to the Senate?

Mr. PLATT. The Senator from Mississippi seems to be going for all the committees of the Senate this afternoon, I should judge. [Laughter.] I have not been able to report that bill yet, and it is probable now, with the Senate thinned to its present numbers, and the Senator from Mississippi knowing that I propose to go home to-morrow, that I shall not be able to report it at this session.

Mr. GEORGE. I simply desire to say that I feel a good deal of interest in that bill. I am not after the committees at all, but about a month or six weeks ago I called the attention of the Senator from Connecticut to the bill, and I think he promised to give it attention and report it at some early day.

EXECUTIVE SESSION.

Mr. COKE. I renew my motion.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Texas, that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business. After ten minutes spent in executive session the doors were reopened, and (at 4 o'clock and 45 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until Monday, October 15, 1888, at 12 o'clock m.

NOMINATIONS.

Executive nominations received by the Senate October 12, 1888.

UNITED STATES CONSUL.

E. P. Earle, of Alabama, to be consul of the United States at Cognac, *vice* Oscar Malmros, appointed commercial agent at St. Etienne.

CONFIRMATIONS.

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate October 12, 1888.

POSTMASTERS.

Lawrence Smith, at Gadsden, Etowah County, Alabama.
William R. Kelly, Fernandina, Nassau County, Florida.
Benjamin S. Chase, Natchez, Adams County, Mississippi.

WITHDRAWAL.

Executive nomination withdrawn by the President October 12, 1888.

PROBATE JUDGE.

J. R. Wilkins, of Beaver County, Territory of Utah, to be judge of probate in said county.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

FRIDAY, *October* 12, 1888.

The House met at 12 o'clock m. Prayer by Rev. J. H. CUTHBERT, D. D.

The Journal of the proceedings of Wednesday was read and approved.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. BARNES, indefinitely, on account of important business.

To Mr. STOCKDALE, indefinitely, to commence on Monday, October 15.

To Mr. ANDERSON, of Mississippi, indefinitely, to begin on Monday next, on account of important business.

To Mr. ROWLAND, indefinitely, on account of important business.

To Mr. DUNN, for the remainder of the session, on account of bad health and important business.

To Mr. OSBORNE, on account of personal engagements.

To Mr. MCKENNA, indefinitely.

To Mr. HOLMES, indefinitely, on account of important business.

To Mr. HITT, indefinitely, on account of important business.

Mr. JACKSON. In that connection, Mr. Speaker, I desire to ask ten days' leave of absence for the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. CHEADLE] on account of a desire on his part to visit his constituents. [Laughter.]

The SPEAKER *pro tempore* (Mr MCMILLIN in the chair). Without objection the leave will be granted.

There was no objection, and it was so ordered.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED.

Mr. KILGORE, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that they had examined and found duly enrolled bills of the following titles; when the Speaker signed the same, namely:

A bill (H. R. 4601) to amend the naval record of Nickolas Leuschen, Peter Leuschen, and Loth Possum;

A bill (H. R. 9447) to restore certain money to the fund for erecting a public building at the city of Detroit; and

A bill (H. R. 10606) to constitute Lincoln, Nebr., a port of delivery and to extend the provisions of the act of June 10, 1880, entitled "An act to amend the statutes in relation to immediate transportation of dutiable goods, and for other purposes," to the said port of Lincoln.

FOURTH OF JULY CLAIMS.

Mr. STONE, of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I offer a privileged report from a committee of conference.

The Clerk read the report, as follows:

The committee of conference of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill of the House 6514, making appropriation for certain claims reported by the accounting officers of the Treasury Department, having met, after full and free conference have agreed to the amendments made by the Senate, and recommend to their respective Houses the bill as amended.

W. J. STONE, of Kentucky,
JOHN B. PENINGTON,
G. W. CROUSE,
Managers on the part of the House.
JOHN C. SPOONER,
GEO. F. HOAR,
JAS. K. JONES,
Managers on the part of the Senate.

Mr. STONE, of Kentucky. I move the previous question on the adoption of the report.

Mr. NELSON. I should like a statement as to the amendments. A verbal statement is sufficient.

Mr. STONE, of Kentucky. I will make a verbal statement. It is the usual 4th of July bill, carrying the appropriation for claims allowed by the Quartermaster's Department, and passed upon by the accounting officers of the Treasury. It passed the House and went to the Senate. There it was found that by a mistake in printing a small claim had been left out that had been allowed. That was included, and the Senate amended the bill by attaching another claim to it of the very same character.

Mr. NELSON. As that is all, I waive the request to have the statement read.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The Chair will state that it is customary to have the statement of the House conferees read.

The Clerk read the statement, as follows:

These amendments are agreed to by the conferees of the House because the claims covered have been exhaustively examined by the Committee on War Claims of the House and the Committee on Claims of the Senate, and the recommendations of the War Department, the Quartermaster-General, and Commissary-General have been adopted by both said committees.

As precedents for these amendments to this bill, the House agreed to precisely similar amendments in the Forty-eighth and Forty-ninth Congresses.

The previous question was ordered, and under the operation thereof the conference report was agreed to.

Mr. STONE, of Kentucky, moved to reconsider the vote by which the report had been agreed to; and also moved to lay that motion on the table.

The latter motion was agreed to.

Mr. EZRA B. TAYLOR. Regular order.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

Mr. HOLMES. I ask leave of absence for Mr. J. R. BROWN, of Virginia, for ten days, on account of important business.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. If there be no objection, the leave will be granted.

There was no objection.

NAVAL RESERVE.

Mr. WHITTHORNE. Will my friend from Ohio [Mr. EZRA B. TAYLOR] indulge me in asking the House for the privilege of assigning a day during the next session for the consideration of a bill which I regard as important, and which has the approval of all parties in the country. I ask it now as I am going to leave the city. I want to fix December 12 next for the consideration of the bill. It is for the organization of the naval reserve. I very seldom in any way interfere with the business of the House, and never but to promote its regular and orderly dispatch.

Mr. DINGLEY (to Mr. WHITTHORNE). There is no objection here.

Mr. WHITTHORNE. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Ohio withdraws the call for the regular order, and I ask that Wednesday, December 12, be set apart for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 10622) reported from the Committee on Naval Affairs, being a bill to organize the naval reserve.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. Is there objection?

Mr. KILGORE. What is the bill?

Mr. WHITTHORNE. It is a bill to organize the naval reserve. It has been reported unanimously by the Committee on Naval Affairs and has general approval.

Mr. KILGORE. There is very serious objection to having twenty or thirty men fixing the order of business here for the next session. I have no objection to the bill of the gentleman from Tennessee, but I have uniformly objected to that proceeding, and I would occupy an inconsistent position if I were to treat the gentleman from Tennessee in any way different from the manner in which I have treated other gentlemen.

Mr. WHITTHORNE. Will my friend let me claim age and other personal reasons? [Laughter.]

Mr. KILGORE. Does anybody else want that kind of privilege?

Mr. WHITTHORNE. Nobody else wants to make a similar request. I have been impressed as far as any man could be by the gentleman's courtesy and by his urbanity and by every impulse he has exhibited for the dispatch of business.

Mr. KILGORE. Are you talking to me? Is all that for me?

Mr. WHITTHORNE. For the House and for you.

Mr. KILGORE. If there be no other objection, I will be willing, but as a general proposition I am opposed to days being set for bills in advance.

Mr. DUNN. Before consent is given I desire to know if the gentleman excepts from his order bills to raise revenue?

Mr. WHITTHORNE. Yes.

Mr. OATES. What is the proposition?

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. WHITTHORNE] asks to fix a day, December 12, for the consideration of the bill for the organization of the naval reserve.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE, of Kentucky. What is the bill?

Mr. WHITTHORNE. A bill for the organization of the naval reserve.

Mr. EZRA B. TAYLOR. I object.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The regular order is demanded.

ORDER OF BUSINESS.

Mr. RICHARDSON. Mr. Speaker, I hope the gentleman from Ohio will withdraw the demand for the regular order until I can obtain consent for the passage of a resolution to print the agricultural report for this year, and the report of the Commissioner of the Bureau of Labor, which have not been printed.

Mr. EZRA B. TAYLOR. I withdraw the demand for the regular order for that purpose.

REPORT OF COMMISSIONER OF LABOR.

Mr. RICHARDSON. It is simply to make the usual order for the printing of these documents.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution, as follows:

Substitute for House joint resolution 203, a joint resolution providing for printing the first and second annual reports of the Commissioner of Labor.

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That there be printed 5,000 copies each, in cloth binding, of the first and second annual reports of the Commissioner of Labor.

The substitute was adopted, and the resolution as amended was ordered to be read a third time; and it was accordingly read the third time, and passed.

Mr. RICHARDSON moved to reconsider the vote by which the resolution was adopted; and also moved that the motion to reconsider be laid on the table.

The latter motion was agreed to.

Mr. RICHARDSON. I ask that the original resolution lie on the table.

There was no objection, and it was so ordered.

AGRICULTURAL REPORT FOR 1888.

Mr. RICHARDSON. I now ask consideration of the joint resolution (H. Res. 229) to print the Agricultural Report for 1888.

The Clerk read the report, as follows:

The committee having considered the resolution to print the Agricultural Report for 1888, direct me to report the same back with the recommendation that it do pass.

The previous question was ordered on the passage of the resolution, and under the operation thereof the resolution was ordered to a third reading; and it was accordingly read the third time, and passed.

Mr. RICHARDSON moved to reconsider the vote by which the resolution was passed; and also moved that the motion to reconsider be laid on the table.

The latter motion was agreed to.

REPORT OF DIRECTOR OF THE MINT FOR 1887.

Mr. RICHARDSON. I now ask consideration of the resolution to print 9,000 copies of the report of the Director of the Mint for 1887.

The report (by Mr. RICHARDSON) was read, as follows:

The committee have considered the resolution and direct me to report the same back to the House with the recommendation that it do pass. The estimated cost of the printing is $2,484, taking the report of 1886 as a basis.

The resolution was adopted.

Mr. RICHARDSON moved to reconsider the vote by which the resolution was adopted; and also moved that the motion to reconsider be laid on the table.

The latter motion was agreed to.

PRINTING GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE.

Mr. RICHARDSON. I ask consideration of the bill (S. 3162) providing for the printing of Government publications upon private orders.

The title of the bill was read.

The report (by Mr. RICHARDSON) was read, as follows:

The committee have considered Senate bill 3162, providing for printing of Government publications upon private orders, and direct me to report the same with the recommendation that it do pass. There are two sections in the bill. The first only changes the title of the person formerly known as Congressional Printer so as to make it conform to the existing law, wherein he is called Public Printer, and providing that when Congress is not in session the books may be published under direction of the Secretary of the Interior, which is also to

make the provision agree with the existing law. The new legislation in the bill is in section 2, which provides that at any time after books or documents have been printed the Public Printer may have printed from the stereotype plates in the Government Printing Office said books or documents for any person desiring the same whenever the number desired will justify putting the plates to press, the same to be paid for at the estimated cost thereof and 10 per cent. thereon, to be paid in advance. The section also provides for the Public Printer making proper report to Congress of any such sale.

Mr. FARQUHAR. Mr. Speaker, from the reading of that report I very much question the policy of this bill. To my mind, the present law is liberal enough in its provisions for permitting printing to be done at the Government Printing Office for private parties. Under that law any person who chooses can order any publication he desires while the publication is going through the press upon paying the cost and 10 per cent. in addition, and that is quite as far as we should go. It never was the intention, in founding the Government Printing Office, to permit any private printing to be done there. The idea was that, as the employés of the office and all its material are employed and paid for out of the Government Treasury, the work done should be for the benefit of the people generally and not for individuals, and for one, I have always deprecated the policy of permitting private parties to have any printing done there.

I think it is unfair to American printers and publishers who have large investments in plants of their own, who employ printers and bookbinders and pay them good wages, that the Government should enter into competition with them. The policy is entirely wrong, and while I suppose there have been reasons for permitting it to a certain extent, I certainly do not think it ought to go any further. There appears to be no necessity for passing a bill of this kind, and until we have a good, thorough investigation of the whole subject I think no such bill ought to pass. If there were an opportunity to curtail the amount of printing that is done at the Government Printing Office I should be one of the first members on this floor to favor such a reform. As I have already said, I think sufficient latitude is allowed by the present law which permits parties to get as many copies as they want of any Government publication upon paying 10 per cent. over the cost, and giving their orders while the work is going on, so that the Government shall not be put to the extra cost of keeping forms or any other expenses of that kind. I certainly am not willing to go beyond that, and I think the better plan is to lay this bill over for the present.

Mr. RICHARDSON. Mr. Speaker, I shall not insist upon passing the bill at this time if the gentleman persists in his opposition to it after I have made a statement. This is a Senate bill which I understand has been passed by the Senate unanimously. The bill as it comes to us makes only this change in the existing law. At present any private party who desires extra copies of a Government publication by paying 10 per cent. above the cost to the Public Printer can have extra copies of such publication, provided he gives his order pending the printing of the document; indeed, I believe the order must be given before the document goes to press. Now, valuable Government publications are often put to press in the Government Printing Office before the public know that they are even contemplated, and this bill simply provides that after such a publication has been made, if any person desires to have it duplicated or to have extra copies printed, and if the number desired is sufficient to justify the Public Printer in putting stereotype plates to press again, he may do so upon the party paying the cost and 10 per cent. in addition. The only difference between this bill and the present law is that the bill would allow a new edition of a document to be printed, instead of requiring the order to be given before going to press.

Mr. FARQUHAR. That is exactly the policy that I utterly condemn. Let me illustrate the objection to it. Take for instance the Greely report. A Hartford firm has published that for a year or two past, but now that report is published by the United States, and under this bill any bookseller or any private individual could come in and use the United States Government Printing Office to put a new edition, an official edition, of that report into the market in competition with the edition of the Hartford man after he has gone to all the expense of printing the work and making his plates and all the other expenses incident to such an enterprise. I tell you, gentlemen, the very first opportunity that occurs I shall, as a printer and as a Representative, do my best to have a reform made in the Government Printing Office in this respect, so as to prevent the Government of the United States from entering into competition with private firms in the printing business. That policy has gone too far already. Originally when this 10 per cent. privilege was granted it was understood that it was only to be used for the benefit of the Departments and of members of Congress. It never was intended that the general public should come in and procure the Government publications in that way, and then go out and sell them as against private publishers. The policy is bad, and instead of being extended it ought to be curtailed. I am totally opposed to this bill.

Mr. RICHARDSON. I had not quite concluded the statement I desired to make.

Mr. FARQUHAR. One word more. Is the gentleman [Mr. RICHARDSON] aware that the publishers of this country by formal resolution, and the International Typographical Union, have condemned this policy?

Mr. RICHARDSON. I was not aware of it.

Mr. FARQUHAR. Well, they have; and they, as the men most interested, have a right to be heard.

Mr. HOLMES. I wish to ask the chairman of the committee [Mr. RICHARDSON] if it is not more important that the people of this country should be heard than the publishers?

Mr. RICHARDSON. I should think so. I should think that the people would have at least as much right to be heard on this question as the publishers who desire to make a profit out of them upon these publications. But, Mr. Chairman, to show the desirableness of such a law as this, take, for instance, such a publication as the Medical and Surgical History of the War of the Rebellion. That is a very valuable publication, but it is hardly of sufficient commercial value to justify private parties in reprinting it. Now, it is possible that if such a law as this were passed, inasmuch as the Government Printer has the stereotype plates on hand, private parties having a demand for that publication in the trade would avail themselves of the law to have a new edition printed, and thus be enabled to supply the demand of the public outside of orders given to the Public Printer or the distribution made through members of Congress.

It seems to me it would be a great accommodation to the public to enable them to get books of that character in this way. I do not know that the Government Printing Office does work any cheaper than the printers and publishers of the country, but certainly the public would be accommodated by a law like this in cases such as that which I have suggested. However, I shall not oppose the bill at this time. It is a Senate bill; it did not originate in our committee, and I am perfectly willing to let it lie over, if the gentleman from New York [Mr. FARQUHAR] desires.

Mr. FARQUHAR. I do.

Mr. RICHARDSON. I will withdraw the bill and let it go upon the Calendar.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. It will be referred to the Committee of the Whole on the state of the Union.

DISTRIBUTION OF CONGRESSIONAL JOURNALS.

Mr. RICHARDSON. I have only one other bill to present from our committee. I am directed by the Committee on Printing to report back favorably the bill (S. 2802) to fix the number of unbound and bound Journals of the Senate and House of Representatives, and to provide for their distribution. I ask that this bill be now put on its passage.

The bill was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That there shall be printed of the Journals of the Senate 1,055 copies, and of the Journals of the House of Representatives 1,174 copies.

Of the Senate Journals there shall be bound 1,025 copies, which shall be distributed as follows: To the office of the Secretary of the Senate, 78 copies; to the Senate library, 36 copies; to the Senate document-room, 25 copies; to the Senate folding-room, 43 copies; to the House document-room, 337 copies; to the Department of State, 10 copies; to the Department of the Interior, 435 copies; to the Library of Congress, 52 copies; to the Court of Claims, 2 copies, and to the library of the House of Representatives, 7 copies. Of the Journals of the House of Representatives there shall be bound 1,124 copies, which shall be distributed as follows: To the office of the Secretary of the Senate, 78 copies; to the Senate library, 36 copies; to the Senate document-room, 25 copies; to the document-room of the House of Representatives, 348 copies; to the Department of State, 10 copies; to the Department of the Interior, 435 copies; to the Clerk of the House of Representatives (for governors of States), 123 copies; to the Library of Congress, 52 copies; to the Court of Claims, 2 copies, and to the library of the House of Representatives, 15 copies. Of the unbound Journals of the Senate there shall be printed 30 copies, which shall be distributed as follows: To the Secretary of the Senate, 6 copies; to the office of the Clerk of the House of Representatives, 5 copies; to the document-room of the House of Representatives, 5 copies; to the Public Printer, 4 copies; to the library of the House of Representatives (for file copies), 5 copies; and to the library of the Senate (for file copies), 5 copies. Of the unbound Journals of the House of Representatives there shall be printed 50 copies, which shall be distributed as follows: To the Secretary of the Senate, 6 copies; to the office of the Clerk of the House of Representatives, 25 copies; to the document-room of the House of Representatives, 5 copies; to the Public Printer, 4 copies; to the library of the House of Representatives (for file copies), 5 copies; and to the library of the Senate (for file copies), 5 copies.

SEC. 2. That all laws in conflict with this bill are hereby repealed.

The report of the committee was read, as follows:

The committee have considered the bill to fix the number of unbound and bound Journals of the Senate and House of Representatives, and to provide for their distribution, and report the same back with the recommendation that it pass. The committee herewith submit the report made to the Senate April 26, 1888, upon this bill by Mr. MANDERSON, showing the reasons for the passage of the bill, and make the same a part of this report.

"The Committee on Printing, having made full investigation into the matter stated in the foregoing title, recommend the passage of the accompanying bill.

"It was learned by your committee that there were more of the unbound Journals of both branches of Congress printed and distributed in signatures or parts, semi-monthly, than were needed, and hence the number has been reduced. Since the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD has been made so complete by its index there seems to be little demand for the semi-monthly issue of the Journals, the former containing the same information in better form.

"Your committee, by correspondence and personal interview, endeavored to ascertain the exact number of bound Journals required for the good of the public service and to meet every reasonable demand. The result of this investigation is presented in the bill. By a mistake in the revision of the United States Statutes of 1878, the number of bound Journals was increased 1,550 copies. There being no need of continuing this duplication of the usual number, it was deemed in the interest of economy to cut it off. Wherever the committee has found it possible to reduce the number of Journals printed under old law or custom by fitting the issue to the exact requirements, it has been done. The following

tables will show in convenient form the distribution of the number of copies of the Journals proposed to be printed in the bill:

Unbound copies in signatures.

	Senate.	House.
Office of the Secretary of the Senate	6	6
Office of the Clerk of the House	5	25
Document-room of the House	5	5
Public Printer	4	4
Library of the House (file copies)	5	5
Library of the Senate (file copies)	5	5
Total	30	50

Bound copies of Journals.

	Senate.	House.
Office of the Secretary of the Senate (for Senators)	78	78
Senate library	36	36
Senate document-room	25	25
Senate folding-room	43	43
House document-room (for members)	337	348
Department of State	10	10
Department of the Interior (for States)	435	435
Clerk of the House (for governors of States)		123
Library of Congress (for foreign exchange)	52	52
Court of Claims	2	2
Library of the House of Representatives	7	15
Total	1,025	1,124

The bill was ordered to a third reading; and it was accordingly read the third time, and passed.

Mr. RICHARDSON moved to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed; and also moved that the motion to reconsider be laid on the table.

The latter motion was agreed to.

ALFRED PLEASANTON.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore* (Mr. MCMILLIN). On a former day of the session the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. HOOKER], the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. TOWNSHEND], and the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GEAR] were appointed conferees on the part of the House upon the bill (H. R. 2972) authorizing the President to appoint and retire Alfred Pleasanton with the rank and grade of colonel. Since that time the gentleman from Illinois and the gentleman from Iowa have left the city. The Chair therefore appoints in their stead the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. WHEELER] and the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HENDERSON].

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

A message from the Senate, by Mr. MCCOOK, its Secretary, announced that the Senate had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the bill (H. R. 7547) granting the right of way to the Yankton and Missouri River Railway through the Yankton reservation in Dakota.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed without amendment House bills of the following titles:

A bill (H. R. 2196) for the relief of S. T. Marshall;

A bill (H. R. 11107) to amend an act entitled "An act to authorize the Fort Smith and Choctaw Bridge Company to construct a bridge across the Poteau River in the Choctaw Nation near Fort Smith, Ark.;"

A bill (H. R. 11152) for the relief of the legal representatives of Eliza M. Ferris; and

A bill (H. R. 11581) making an appropriation for the enforcement of the Chinese exclusion act.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed with amendments, in which the concurrence of the House was requested, House bills of the following titles:

A bill (H. R. 2579) authorizing the President to appoint and retire Andrew J. Smith, late colonel of the Seventh United States Cavalry and a major-general of volunteers; and

A bill (H. R. 7935) for the relief and civilization of the Chippewa Indians in the State of Minnesota.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed with amendments House bills of the following titles, requested a conference with the House on said bills and amendments, and had appointed as conferees on said bills respectively Mr. VEST, Mr. SAWYER, and Mr. CULLOM:

A bill (H. R. 11262) to authorize the construction of bridges across the Kentucky River and its tributaries by the Richmond, Nicholasville, Irvine and Beattyville Railroad Company; and

A bill (H. R. 11338) to authorize the construction of a bridge across the Coosa River at Gadsden, in the State of Alabama.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed bills and joint resolution of the following titles; in which the concurrence of the House was requested:

A bill (S. 3348) for the relief of George K. Otis;

A bill (H. R. 3351) for the relief of Samuel Hein;

A bill (S. 3612) donating condemned cannon and small-arms to Naval Post No. 400, Grand Army of the Republic, Department of Pennsylvania;

A bill (S. 3621) for the payment to the widow of the late Chief-Justice Morrison R. Waite the balance of a year's salary; and

Joint resolution (S. R. 113) concerning the conference to be held in Washington December next to consider the best means of preventing the introduction of yellow fever and other epidemic diseases into this country.

ORDER OF BUSINESS.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The regular order having been demanded, the first business in order is the call of committees for reports.

Mr. LANHAM. I desire to submit a motion to dispense with that call, and will, as preliminary thereto, ask unanimous consent that gentlemen having reports to present may file them in the usual manner with the Clerk.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. If there be no objection, that order will be made.

There was no objection.

FILING OF REPORTS.

The following reports were filed by being handed in at the Clerk's desk:

PUBLIC DOCUMENTS ON PRIVATE ORDERS.

Mr. RICHARDSON, from the Committee on Printing, reported back favorably the bill (S. 3103) providing for the printing of Government publications on private orders; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

I. T. HOUZE.

Mr. BLISS, from the Committee on Pensions, reported back with amendment the bill (H. R. 11571) granting a pension to I. T. Houze; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

E. C. PASCHAL.

Mr. BLISS also, from the Committee on Pensions, reported back with amendment the bill (H. R. 11566) granting a pension to E. C. Paschal; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

SELMA AND MERIDIAN RAILROAD COMPANY.

Mr. MASON, from the Committee on Claims, reported back favorably the bill (H. R. 4521) for the relief of the Selma and Meridian Railroad Company; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

JULIA A. NUTT.

Mr. STONE, of Kentucky, from the Committee on War Claims, reported back favorably the bill (H. R. 11580) for the relief of Julia A. Nutt, widow and executrix of Haller Nutt, deceased; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The question is now on the motion of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. LANHAM] to dispense with the morning hour for the call of committees.

The motion was agreed to.

ALLEGED CORRUPTION IN REFERENCE TO LIBRARY BUILDING.

Mr. RICE. I desire to call up a privileged report—the report of the special committee appointed to inquire whether any member of the House of Representatives has by improper means sought to influence the action of the architect of the new Library building.

The report was read, as follows:

The special committee appointed in pursuance of a resolution of the House of Representatives of the 4th of September, instant, which directed said committee to inquire into and report to the House whether any member of the House, acting for himself or in concert and combination with others, has sought by persuasion, intimidation, or other corrupt and improper means to influence or control the action of Mr. J. L. Smithmeyer, the architect of the new Library building, in the selection, acceptance, or approval of inferior or improper materials to be used in the construction of said building; and the further resolution of the House of Representatives of September 17, directing the said committee to inquire into and report to the House whether any member of the House, acting for himself or others, or in connection with any person acting for or in the interest of others, and with the knowledge of any member, or acting for or with the knowledge and in the interest of any company, person, or individual with whom any member of the House is interested or associated in any business, directly or indirectly, has sought by persuasion, intimidation, or any undue or improper influence to direct or control or influence the action of Mr. J. L. Smithmeyer, the architect of said building, in the selection or acceptance, or in procuring to be selected or accepted, material to be used in said building, or in the management, control, or construction of said building, beg leave to report that they have had the same under consideration; that charges were placed before the committee against Hon. WILLIAM G. STAHLNECKER, a member of the House of Representatives; that counsel in support of the charges and in opposition thereto appeared before the committee and were heard in conducting the investigation; that the sworn testimony of witnesses was taken, and the same is herewith submitted to the House, together with the charges above mentioned.

The testimony is very full, and the examination was given considerable latitude, greater, perhaps, than the matter at issue would strictly warrant in support of the charges.

The committee is unanimous in the opinion that the evidence does not sustain the charges, and there is no impression upon the mind of any member of it that Mr. STAHLNECKER is not fully exonerated from all charges of any improper attempt by persuasion, intimidation, or other corrupt means to influence or control the action of Mr. J. L. Smithmeyer, the architect of said Library building, in the selection or acceptance of any material to be used in the construction thereof, nor does his action in connection therewith in any way reflect or leave a shadow of suspicion upon his honor, or upon the dignity and honor of the House of Representatives.

They desire also to say, in conclusion, that they are satisfied from the investigation that the distinguished gentleman who offered these resolutions and set on foot this inquiry was actuated by the most honorable motives and a sincere desire to vindicate the integrity of the House of Representatives.

They recommend that the report, charges, and testimony be printed for the use of the House.

Mr. RICE. If no gentleman desires to discuss this report, I ask for a vote upon its adoption.

The question being taken, the report was adopted.

Mr. RICE moved to reconsider the vote by which the report was adopted; and also moved that the motion to reconsider be laid on the table.

The latter motion was agreed to.

ORDER OF BUSINESS.

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Speaker, owing to the fact that it has been stated with great earnestness and positiveness by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. EZRA B. TAYLOR] that no further business shall be done during this day, or perhaps during the remainder of the session—a sentiment which perhaps is joined in by other gentlemen—I shall not make the motion customary on Friday morning that we go into Committee of the Whole for the consideration of private business. Believing that the statements which have been made so earnestly in reference to this matter will be carried out, I move that when the House adjourns to-day it adjourn to meet on Monday next.

Mr. HOOKER. Before the Chair puts that motion I beg to make a suggestion in reference to the course which the gentleman from Texas [Mr. LANHAM] indicates his purpose to pursue. We have heretofore on private bill day called the roll of members up to a certain point; and I think there ought to be no objection to completing the call. We have gone as far as the letter M or N; and I think it would be a very great hardship on gentlemen whose names have not yet been reached if we should not now complete the call. I do not see any reason why we should not go into Committee of the Whole in order to do so.

Mr. LANHAM. I fully appreciate what the gentleman from Mississippi has stated, and if the matter were left to me I would proceed in the usual manner. But the statements to which I have referred having been made, and I take it having been made in earnest, it would seem unnecessary to consume the time of the House if there can be no business done.

The present motion, however, does not interfere with that question.

Mr. HENDERSON, of Iowa. That does not interfere with the order for the evening?

Mr. LANHAM. Not at all.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the gentleman from Texas, that when the House adjourns to-day it adjourn to meet on Monday next.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. O'NEILL, of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I now desire to interrupt the gentleman from Texas for a moment. What the gentleman from Mississippi has stated is true, and it bears hard upon those of us whose names are lower down on the list. Our names have been nearly reached—those whose names begin with "O" [laughter]; we have been here for several Fridays waiting to be reached, and I have a little bill here which is of importance to one of my constituents, and I would like very much to have an opportunity of considering it.

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Speaker, with a view to fixing the responsibility where it may properly rest, I will submit the motion that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar.

The motion was agreed to.

The House accordingly resolved itself into Committee of the Whole, Mr. ROGERS in the chair.

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Chairman, I now ask unanimous consent that we may adopt the same order of procedure observed on last Friday; that is to say, that the names of members be called alphabetically, beginning where we left off on the last call of the roll, and as each member's name is reached that he may have the privilege of calling up one bill, the same right of objection by five members being permitted as has heretofore been adopted.

Mr. DUNN. I presume that means to take up the unfinished business, if that is adopted.

Mr. LANHAM. Of course that would have to come up first.

Mr. STOCKDALE. Is it understood that if a member calls up a bill when his name is reached and objection is made, he may have the right to take up another?

Mr. LANHAM. That would be a change in the order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is advised that the Nicaragua bill was before the committee at its last session and is the unfinished business.

Mr. LANHAM. I renew my request now, Mr. Chairman, that we may proceed in the same manner as heretofore, and that the same rule as to objection shall be adopted.

Mr. STOCKDALE. As I understand it, if a member calls up a bill and it is objected to, he then has the right to call up another.

The CHAIRMAN. That has not been the order heretofore. If a member withdraws a bill he has been granted the right to call up another; but if the bill is objected to, that right does not attach.

Mr. STOCKDALE. I ask unanimous consent that that order be adopted.

Mr. BACON. I understand that the last request, that of the gentleman from Mississippi, is one for unanimous consent.

The CHAIRMAN. It is in the nature of an amendment to the motion of the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. BACON. But I presume that both require unanimous consent.

Mr. OATES. I hope the gentleman from Mississippi will not undertake to change the rule that has heretofore prevailed and which is fair to all members. No one gentleman ought to have an advantage over any other in that respect.

Mr. BACON. As I understand from the Chair, the request of the gentleman from Mississippi requires unanimous consent.

The CHAIRMAN. It was put in the nature of a request for unanimous consent, but is an amendment,

Mr. BACON. If unanimous consent is required, I object to it.

The CHAIRMAN. It does require unanimous consent.

Mr. BACON. Then I object.

Mr. McMILLIN. I wish to submit a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. McMILLIN. I believe this order would not interfere with the unfinished business?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair understands the Nicaragua Canal bill is the unfinished business, and would come up first.

Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection, and it was so ordered.

NICARAGUA CANAL COMPANY.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will now report the title of the unfinished business coming from the last meeting of the committee.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 1305) to incorporate the Maritime Canal Company of Nicaragua.

Mr. FULLER. What is the status of that bill?

The CHAIRMAN. The motion is pending to lay the bill aside to be reported favorably to the House.

Mr. DUNN. I understand the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. FULLER] desires to offer some additional amendments, and if I may be permitted I yield to him for that purpose. The question before the committee was on laying the bill aside.

Mr. FULLER. I desire to be heard for a few minutes first on this question.

Mr. DUNN. I have no objection to that.

Mr. LANHAM. There was an amendment proposed by my colleague [Mr. CULBERSON] to this bill.

Mr. BAYNE. That was agreed to.

Mr. DUNN. It was adopted, and is now a part of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is advised by the Clerk that the parliamentary status of the measure is this, that the motion was pending to lay the bill aside and report it favorably to the House. The question was being taken on that motion, and upon it the gentleman from Iowa raised the question of no quorum. The parliamentary status of the bill, then, is upon that motion.

Mr. LANHAM. The amendment of my colleague [Mr. CULBERSON] had been adopted in committee.

The CHAIRMAN. It had been adopted, and the question was on laying the bill aside as amended.

Mr. DUNN. I hope now, Mr. Chairman, that no objection will be made to the motion to amend or to the privilege that the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. FULLER] asks, to offer amendments and to address the House.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of no quorum has not been withdrawn.

Mr. FULLER. I withdraw it temporarily until I can be heard.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman withdraws the point of no quorum temporarily, and I would submit to the gentleman from Arkansas that the proposition to lay the bill aside with a favorable recommendation should be withdrawn.

Mr. DUNN. I withdraw it.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it will be so ordered. The Chair will recognize the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. FULLER].

Mr. FULLER. I call for the reading of the bill, and ask that it be printed in the RECORD as part of my remarks.

The bill is as follows:

An act to incorporate the Maritime Canal Company of Nicaragua.

Whereas to facilitate commercial intercourse by water between the Atlantic and the Pacific States, as well as with foreign nations, it is deemed desirable for the public interest of the United States that a ship-canal be constructed between the Atlantic and Pacific Oceans, on what is known as the Nicaragua route: Therefore,

Be it enacted, etc., That Frederick Billings, Charles P. Daly, Daniel Ammen,

Francis A. Stout, Horace L. Hotchkiss, Edward F. Beale, Hiram Hitchcock, C. Ridgley Goodwin, A. C. Cheney, J. F. O'Shaughnessy, H. C. Taylor, J. W. Miller, A. S. Crowninshield, A. G. Menocal, Charles H. Stebbins, T. Harrison Garrett, Jules Aldige, R. A. Lancaster, Alfred E. Mills, Gustav E. Kissell, Horace Fairbanks, George H. Robinson, Alfred B. Darling, Joseph E. McDonald, James Roosevelt, Christian Devries, Frederick F. Thompson, Henry A. Parr, and such other persons as may be associated with them and their successors are hereby constituted and created a body corporate and politic in deed and in law, by the name, style, and title of "The Maritime Canal Company of Nicaragua," for the construction, equipment, management, and operation of a ship-canal from the Atlantic to the Pacific Ocean, either entirely through the territory of the Republic of Nicaragua or through Nicaragua and in part through the territory of the Republic of Costa Rica with such collateral, connecting, or cross canals as may be necessary to connect therewith, and to exercise such other powers as have been conferred by the Government of Nicaragua by the concession of that republic to the Nicaragua Canal Association, through Mr. A. G. Menocal, its representative, and dated the 23d day of March, A. D. 1887, and finally approved by the legislative and executive authority of the Republic on the 20th, 23d, and 24th days of April, A. D. 1887, and such powers as the Republic of Costa Rica may confer of the same kind as those named in said concession; and the said Maritime Canal Company of Nicaragua by that name shall have perpetual succession; may sue and be sued, plead and be impleaded, defend and be defended in all courts of law and equity within the United States; may make and have a common seal; and shall have and possess the rights, powers, and privileges usually possessed by similar companies. It may receive, purchase, hold, and convey such real and personal estate, property, and rights of property, or concessionary rights as may be necessary to carry into effect the purposes of this act (may issue stock to the amount of the value thereof in payment therefor, and the stock so issued shall be declared and taken to be full-paid stock and not liable to any further calls or assessments); may do all lawful things to secure the full enjoyment of the powers, privileges, rights, benefits, and grants contained in any canal concession so made by the Republic of Nicaragua or to be made by the Republic of Costa Rica, as aforesaid; and to aid in the construction of said canal and to carry out the purposes of this act, the said Maritime Canal Company of Nicaragua is hereby authorized to issue its bonds, and to secure the same by mortgage on its property and rights of property of all kinds and descriptions, real, personal, and mixed, including its franchise to be a corporation. The principal office of said corporation shall be in the city of New York, and all legal process may be served upon the person who may at the time be in charge of said office or upon the attorney of said company, whose name and address shall be certified by the president of the company, and such certificate shall be filed in the office of the Secretary of State of the United States.

SEC. 2. That the capital stock of said company shall consist of not less than one million shares of $100 each, with the right to increase the capital stock to two million shares of $100 each, upon the vote of two-thirds of the stock of said company at any time outstanding, which shares shall in all respects be deemed personal property and shall be transferable in such manner as the by-laws of said corporation may provide. Five incorporators, who shall be chosen by a majority of the number from those named in this act, shall have power to open books of subscription to the capital stock of said company in the city of New York, and at such other places in the United States, Nicaragua, or elsewhere, as they may designate, who shall receive all subscriptions for stock; and no stock shall be transferable except upon the books of the company provided for that purpose. The said incorporators shall give thirty days' notice of the time and place of the opening of said books, by publication in one daily newspaper in New York City, and one newspaper in Managua, Nicaragua, and one in San José, Costa Rica, if the said canal should be in part in the territory of that Republic. Sixty days' previous notice shall be given of the payment required of the time and place of payment by publication in one daily newspaper in the city of New York and in one newspaper in Managua, Nicaragua, and one in San José, Costa Rica, if the said canal should be in part in the territory of that Republic; and in case any stockholder shall neglect or refuse to pay, in pursuance of such notice, the stock held by him may be sold to the highest bidder for cash, according to the regulations to be made therefor in the by-laws of said company. The directors hereinafter provided for may adopt regulations and by-laws not inconsistent with the provisions of this act.

SEC. 3. That the affairs of said company shall be managed by a board of directors, fifteen in number, who shall hold their office for three years and until their successors are duly chosen and qualified, and a majority of whom shall be citizens and residents of the United States. At the first election five shall be chosen by the stockholders for one year, five for two years, and five for three years, and at each annual election thereafter five shall be chosen by the stockholders for three years. The said board shall elect from its number a president, who shall be a citizen and resident of the United States, and one or more vice-presidents of the company, who shall hold office for such terms as the by-laws of said board may provide and until their successors are duly elected and shall have qualified.

SEC. 4. That for the management and disposition of the stock, property, estate, and effects of the said company the board of directors may make such by-laws, rules, and regulations as may conform to the authority granted in such canal concession or concessions, and not be inconsistent with this act or the laws of the United States or the existing treaty stipulations of the United States with the Government of Nicaragua or of Costa Rica, if the said canal should be in part in the territory of that Republic; and may fix the time for election of directors, and in case of vacancy in said board, caused by death, resignation, or otherwise, may fill the same. No person shall be a director who is not a stockholder, and any one ceasing to be a stockholder shall cease to be a director. All meetings of stockholders shall be held at the office of the company in the city of New York, and at least one such meeting shall be held in each year; but failure to elect directors on the day appointed by said by-laws shall not be deemed to dissolve said company, but such election may be holden on any day appointed thereafter by the directors first giving thirty days' notice thereof, in manner aforesaid. The directors, of whom eight, including the president, shall be a quorum, shall have full power touching the election or appointment of all officers of the company, and said officers shall hold office at the will and pleasure of said board.

SEC. 5. Nothing in this act contained shall be deemed or construed to in any wise restrict or impair any right of the United States under any treaty in force with the Republic of Nicaragua.

SEC. 6. That Congress shall at all times have the power to alter, amend, or repeal this act when in its judgment the public good may so require.

Mr. FULLER. Mr. Chairman, I objected to the passage of this bill on last Friday because it was private-bill day, when it was understood that bills of no great and general importance should be considered, and for the further reason that only a few members were present, and I believed that a bill of this magnitude should be considered in full House. I also felt that the bill was too loosely drawn and did not have incorporated those safeguards which should be inserted in a bill of this kind. The object of this measure is a desirable one, and, in my judgment, of very great importance to the country. I know that there is a very general wish on both sides of this Chamber to pass a measure at this session of Congress looking to the building of the contemplated canal. I shall insist, however, on the adoption of certain amendments, which I deem necessary to protect the public who may have business connection with this organization, and if these amendments are adopted I shall not object to the consideration and passage of the bill.

I regret that only two or three members of the committee (Commerce) having charge of this bill are present. Owing to the multiplicity of questions presented for our consideration, and the utter inability for want of time to personally examine the merits of each measure, I have depended largely for information to aid my judgment in the discussion by the committees reporting bills. I especially regret that my colleague [Mr. ANDERSON, of Iowa] is not present, who is a member of the Committee on Commerce, for I am well satisfied that he would insist on material amendment of this bill before its passage.

The history of corporations in this country the past twenty-five years is more than sufficient to satisfy any legislator that no charter should be given to any set of men, I care not how high their business standing, unless there are careful provisions against stock-jobbing, watering of stocks, and putting worthless and pretended stocks upon the market. The people of this country have suffered so much in this regard hat in most of the States, especially the Western States, the Legislatures have insisted, in the granting of charters to corporations, on the insertion of the most stringent provisions to guard the interests of those who invested in the contemplated enterprises.

I would call attention to the Iowa, Kansas, and Colorado laws upon this subject. It is not of the general order of legislation for Congress to charter corporations to do business and own personal and real estate on foreign soil. I am aware bills similar to the present one and the bill known as the Tehuantepec Ship-Railway bill have been before Congress, but while they have passed the Senate they have not become laws. Up to the present time Congress has insisted on inserting all the necessary safeguards in the charters, but for some reason they are left out of this bill, and about all the reason I have heard given for their absence is because the present incorporators are honest men. This will not do in legislation.

I find this bill provides that the directors may adopt regulations and by-laws; but there is no provision for the approval of the stockholders, no provision in reference to amendment of the same, or any provision requiring a notice of meeting of stockholders.

This bill does not require the making of an annual report by the officers of the company or any penalty for not so doing, or any punishment for knowingly making a false report.

I find no provision for the payment of certificates for stock issued nor to prevent capital stock paid in from being withdrawn or returned to stockholders or diverted from the use intended; nor any penalty for so doing.

No statute of limitation is fixed for subscriptions for stock and amount to be paid thereon, nor is any time fixed for commencement of the construction of the canal, nor any time fixed for expiration of corporation by limitation, if work is not commenced by a certain time.

The important and necessary provision absolving the Government from all pecuniary liability is left out of this bill; but heretofore it has always been insisted on being inserted.

I will now call attention to some amendments which I deem necessary to perfect this bill, and which I shall offer at the proper time. But first I desire to call the attention of the gentleman having charge of this bill to section 1, commencing on line 41, to the words "may issue stock to the amount of the value thereof in payment therefor, and the stock so issued shall be declared and taken to be full-paid stock and not liable to any further calls or assessments." I would like an explanation of these words when the gentleman comes to explain the bill, for I find, commencing with line 52, that for the purpose of constructing this canal the company is authorized to issue bonds. Is it proposed to pay for construction in both bonds and stock?

The first amendment is as follows:

The directors hereinafter described, with the approval of the majority of the stockholders, may adopt regulations and by-laws not inconsistent with the provisions of this act. But no amendment to or change in the by-laws shall be made except by a majority vote of the stockholders, either personally or by proxy, and at a meeting called for the purpose. At least twenty days' notice of any such meeting shall be published in a newspaper of general circulation in the city where the principal office of the company is located.

Is it not a proper and necessary safeguard to the stockholders that a provision should be incorporated to prevent the directors from changing the by-laws except by a majority vote of the stockholders and at a meeting called on published notice?

Second amendment proposed:

Said company shall annually, within sixty days from the 1st day of January of each year, make a report in detail, showing the condition of said company on the 31st day of December and exhibiting the following, namely: First. The amount of the capital stock of the company. Second. The property or assets held by the company. Third. The liabilities of such company. Fourth. The receipts of the company during the preceding year. Fifth. The expenditures during the preceding year. Said report shall be under oath and signed by the president and at least five directors of said company, and shall be deposited in the office of the Secretary of State of the United States. Said company failing to make and deposit said report shall be subject to a penalty of $10,000 for every month that said company shall continue thereafter to transact business.

Third. If said report shall be false in any material representation, all the offi-

cers who shall have signed the same, knowing it to be false, shall be jointly and severally liable for all damages arising therefrom.

Mr. Speaker, in my judgment no corporation should ever be organized by a legislative body unless it requires an annual report to be made of all its business affairs and showing its condition in detail. This is due to all investors, and if report is false a punishment should follow.

Fourth. That no certificates for stock shall be issued till at least 10 per cent. of the same shall be fully paid for in money at the par value of said stock, and the money deposited in the treasury of said company; and said stock so subscribed shall not be assignable until the whole of the same shall have been so paid in; and no payment on account of the capital of said company shall be made except in money; and said company is hereby prohibited from returning or repaying any part of the money so paid. No bonds in excess of the amount of capital paid and received shall be authorized or issued until such paid capital shall amount to the sum of $5,000,000. No part of the capital stock paid in shall be at any time withdrawn or returned to the stockholders or in any manner diverted from the proper uses of the corporation. Every person violating or aiding in the violation of the foregoing provision shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor, and on conviction thereof shall be punished by a fine not exceeding $10,000, or by imprisonment not exceeding five years, or by both said punishments, in the discretion of the court.

Stock should be bona fide and represent something and have a value, and no pretended payment for stock should be permitted. It should not be huckstered about and traded for jackknives. It should represent the value of the property. You can not build a canal on wind or paper. A corporation should not be permitted to mortgage until there is a cash investment made on the part of the stockholders. Nor should the capital stock paid in be diverted into other channels, as in case of the Union Pacific Railroad Company. If such a provision as this had been incorporated in that bill, the scandals and crimes connected with the Credit Mobilier would have been avoided. It matters not how national the objects sought to be accomplished, or how high the personal and financial standing of the incorporators, the legislative body should in granting a charter protect the public from a misappropriation or improper use of the stock.

Fifth. That if stock to the amount of ten millions of dollars shall not be subscribed, and 10 per cent. thereof actually paid in, before the expiration of two years next after the passage of this act, or if the work of constructing said canal shall not be actually commenced before and be in progress at the expiration of four years next after the passage of this act, the said corporation shall be deemed to have expired by limitation, and all its franchises and privileges shall be deemed to have absolutely ceased and become determined.

It has been the rule for years in chartering corporations by Congress to insert a provision of this kind. It prevents the too frequent practice of obtaining a charter for the purposes of trade and merchandise. It gives the company four years in which to commence construction. In a company where capital stock is one hundred million it seems clear that requiring ten million of stock shall be subscribed and 10 per cent. thereof paid in is a provision which should be insisted upon as an earnest that the company is bona fide and means to take hold of, build, and finish this great enterprise.

Sixth. That nothing in this act contained shall be held or construed to in any manner involve the United States in any pecuniary obligations whatever, other than in respect of the payment of tolls as provided in this act.

This is a very important amendment. In the Forty-ninth Congress the substance of this amendment was incorporated by the Senate in the Tehuantepec Ship-Railway bill and also in the Maritime Canal Company charter. I know it is said by eminent authority that the United States assumes no liability without this amendment, but wise men differ. The chairman of the Judiciary House Committee (very high authority, in my opinion) thinks a liability is created by the terms of the present bill. In any event, it is a proper provision to insist upon, and it clearly defines the status of the United States.

Mr. Chairman, I have no doubt but that this great necessity to commerce will soon be completed. The time has arrived, in this day of wonderful progress and enterprise, when the waters of the Atlantic and Pacific will be united at or near the Isthmus of Panama or Nicaragua. Capital in aggregated form is seeking all the known recesses of the earth for investment, and the business men of America will not permit this great project to fail which promises such a rich return on the investment. The progress of civilization the last twenty-five years is almost beyond comprehension. One of the greatest achievements of modern times was the building of the Suez Canal. The proposed enterprise is equally of as great importance. It is a necessity to the age.

The discovery of Bessemer, invention of the compound (steam-ship) engine, telegraph, and telephone have in a great degree annihilated time and space, and the time is fast approaching when no country or set of men shall have a corner or monopoly in the products and markets of the world. No country can in this day of progress maintain or sustain itself with a Chinese wall about it, as has been intimated on this floor. True progress and development does not depend on iron-clad laws and restrictions, but on the virtue, integrity, and industry of the people. I trust this bill will be so amended as to protect the public, and that this great project will soon reach its consummation.

In case the foregoing amendments are adopted I shall interpose no further objections to the passage of the bill.

I understand that the bill is now before the committee for amendments.

The CHAIRMAN. It is.

Mr. FULLER. Then I offer the following amendment.

The Clerk read the amendment, as follows:

Strike out all after the word "company," in line 30, section 2, and add to said section the following: "The directors hereinafter described, with the approval of the majority of the stockholders, may adopt regulations and by-laws not inconsistent with the provisions of this act; but no amendment to or change in the by-laws shall be made except by a majority vote of the stockholders, either personally or by proxy, and at a meeting called for the purpose. At least twenty days' notice of any such meeting shall be published in a newspaper of general circulation in the city where the principal office of the company is located."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment.

Mr. PHELAN. Mr. Chairman, I simply desire to answer what I think was a covert thrust made by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. FULLER] at the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. ANDERSON], who is absent. If I clearly understood what the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. FULLER] said, he intended to convey the impression that Mr. ANDERSON, who is now absent, should be held somewhat responsible for inconsiderate action on the part of the Committee on Commerce in not having incorporated in the pending bill the amendments which he has proposed. I am not responsible for the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. ANDERSON], who is absent, but I merely wish to say in defense of him and the Committee on Commerce in general, that no doubt he was actuated by the action of the Republican members of the Senate, who, under the leadership of Senator EDMUNDS, the leading Republican lawyer of that body, passed the bill practically as it was reported from the Committee on Commerce.

For myself, I desire to say that I regard the amendments offered by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. FULLER] as eminently judicious, and I shall vote for them, although I shall vote against the passage of the bill in its present position. The amendments which the gentleman suggests simply remedy some few of the radical defects of the bill. There are other defects in that bill which I regard as of such importance as to compel me to vote against the bill. I therefore shall vote for the amendments, but I shall reserve to myself the privilege of voting against the bill.

Mr. BAYNE. Vote! Vote!

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

The committee informally rose, and Mr. MCMILLIN took the chair as Speaker *pro tempore*.

A message from the Senate, by Mr. MCCOOK, its Secretary, announced that the Senate had passed a resolution authorizing the printing of the annual volumes of the astronomical observations of the Naval Observatory for 1886, 1887, and 1888.

The message further announced that the Senate had passed a resolution authorizing the printing of 50,000 copies of the fourth annual report of the Bureau of Animal Industry, for the year 1887; and requested the concurrence of the House therein.

MARITIME CANAL OF NICARAGUA.

The committee resumed its session.

Mr. DUNN. Mr. Chairman, I will say that I am not physically able to discuss this question if it were desirable to do so, but I do not think the House feels that there is necessity for an elaborate discussion. We all know and feel that we may safely accept a question of simple law coming from the distinguished Senator who is understood to have scrutinized carefully and mainly to have draughted this bill—I refer to the distinguished Senator from Vermont, Mr. EDMUNDS. All know his purity, his ability, and his great skill; and we know his entire freedom from all disposition to make improper and unsafe concessions to corporations. This company does not seek aid of the Government either directly or indirectly by grant or implication. They simply ask a charter. They desire the prestige of a national charter, granted by the Congress, enabling them to avail and to utilize the great and magnificent concessions made by the Government of Nicaragua to this company. Many of the points which have raised the apprehension of my friend from Iowa [Mr. FULLER] have been guarded and protected by the articles of concession from the Nicaraguan Government to this company. They guard against improper squandering and disposition of the stock of the company or the properties which that government grants to the company; and if there is any apprehension in the mind of any gentleman at all that this Government may by omission or laches of any kind be involved in any liability, or grant unrestricted power to this company, I will be glad for him to show it and to offer an amendment that will protect against it, for I am as far from desiring to do either of these things as any gentleman of the House can be.

I look and I may perhaps be dazzled by the magnificent prospect that lies before us, and the grand results which I foresee from the achievement of this great enterprise, the final great master-work in engineering that now remains to make the whole world close neighbors and to expedite and facilitate the world's commerce as has never been done before. The construction and opening of this canal will multiply the tonnage not only of this country, but of the whole world, by three, without the building of another ship. It will more than triple the capacity of the tonnage of the world. No one can to-day estimate the magnificent results which mankind must reap from its fulfillment. Therefore, if gentlemen have apprehensions, I beg that they will present such amendments as will relieve their own minds, and then let us

give to this company the small, naked privilege of availing themselves of this great concession, so as to go on and complete the last great remaining work of commerce and civilization.

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Chairman, the object of this measure will doubtless meet the approval of every member on the floor of this House, and of the entire country. The only question is whether the bill contains proper safeguards for the protection of the public. One of the greatest burdens laid upon labor in this country is that it has been obliged, and is obliged, under the system of incorporating transportation companies by the several States, to pay tribute largely to fictitious capital, capital which has never been invested at all. It is provided by the amendment which has been read that the stockholders of this company shall be required to pay in 10 per cent. of the capital, and, as I understand it, there is nothing requiring them to pay anything beyond that.

Mr. DUNN. The gentleman can not suppose that it would be possible to complete the work without paying for the stock?

Mr. RYAN. No; but I do suppose that it would be possible, by borrowing the money on bonds secured by mortgage, to complete the work without paying in more than 10 per cent. on the stock. I say such a thing is possible. Supposing that to be done, then the revenues derived from the canal must pay off that indebtedness and the interest upon it, after which the surplus would be devoted—to what? Why, to paying dividends upon the stock. Now, the question is whether this measure contains provisions to guard against the public being required to pay dividends upon capital only 10 per cent. of which has actually been paid in. Dividends might be declared upon the dollar of nominal capital when the capital really invested was only 10 cents. I am not familiar with the details of this bill, and I do not know but it contains ample provisions to guard against an imposition of that kind upon the products of labor which must be transported through this canal. I ask my friend who has charge of the bill whether it does contain such a provision?

Mr. FULLER. I think I can answer the gentleman, so far as the amendment which I have offered is concerned.

Mr. RYAN. Well, I desire that information.

Mr. FULLER. The amendment which I propose to offer prescribes, first, that 10 per cent. of the capital shall be paid in money; next, that the money shall be deposited in the treasury of the company; that the stock shall not be assignable until the whole of the capital shall be paid in, and that no payment on account of the capital of such company shall be made except in money. Further, it prohibits the company from returning or repaying any part of the money so paid in. Therefore, if the amendment is adopted, the money must stay in the treasury. Then there is a further provision that the company can not issue bonds until $5,000,000 have been paid into the treasury. It seems to me that the amendment covers very fully the questions raised by the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. RYAN].

Mr. RYAN. That was a difficulty I had in my mind in relation to this bill. I think that point ought to be amply guarded; and if it has been, and other safeguards are adequate, I am entirely satisfied with the bill and shall gladly support it; but having only heard read the amendment of my friend from Iowa [Mr. FULLER], I am not clear that it does not adequately provide against watered capital. We all know that the several States that created our great transportation corporations were greatly at fault in not providing such safeguards in their charters. The result is, as everybody knows, that the labor of our country is taxed heavily to pay dividends on fictitious capital.

There is scarcely a line of railway in this country that is not represented by pretended capital from 25 per cent. to 300 per cent. in excess of what it would cost to duplicate the same line of railway. The products of labor are taxed by some of our great railways to pay dividends upon $90,000 per mile, whereas the same line could be duplicated at a cost not exceeding $25,000 per mile. We hear a great deal about the wrongs committed against labor, and yet this, the greatest of all wrongs, is rarely mentioned. It is a system of robbery as wicked as it is insidious. It is one which is likely sooner or later to be assailed with the irresistible fury of a plundered public. It is a wrong of such gigantic and far-reaching consequences that there is sure in the near future to come from the people an imperative demand for its complete eradication.

Then shall we sit here and create a corporation to which the commerce of the world must pay tribute without providing adequate safeguards against such a perfidious system? A large share of that commerce, it is true, will be the products of the labor of foreign nations, but a goodly share of it will be the products of American labor. I insist that Congress shall never again create a transportation corporation with power to carry on such a system of piracy against the labor of this country. Out of abundance of caution I shall therefore offer as an amendment to the amendment of my friend from Iowa the following:

And no dividends shall be declared or paid on the stock authorized by this act in excess of 8 per cent. per annum on the amount actually paid to said company upon such stock.

I am as anxious for this measure to pass as anybody. It is one of great public importance. But I am not willing to create this corporation without such restrictions in the charter as shall adequately protect the public.

Mr. STOCKDALE. Mr. Chairman, I have examined this bill to some extent, though not very fully, but I am not willing, in dealing with such an important measure, to take it simply upon the statement that the gentleman who drew it up and advocated it was very able, because I have sometimes found it to be the case that the more able and astute the gentleman is who frames a measure of this kind, the less the Government is protected and the more the corporation is benefited.

I do not want to be understood as saying anything against corporations in general or against this particular corporation, but to speak briefly of the merits of this bill as it is framed and before the House. No member on this floor is more heartily in favor than I am of the scheme for establishing some communication—or as many lines of communication as you please—between the two oceans so as to aid the commerce of this country. I concur in all that has been or may be said as to the great commercial advantages of the scheme; and I think the Gulf States will probably be the first to realize those great advantages.

The gentleman from Arkansas has spoken of the large and liberal concessions made by Nicaragua. That gentleman is a lawyer well enough versed in the law to frame a bill of this sort, or any other, and I regard his legal opinion with great respect. But I do not consider the concessions made by the Nicaraguan Government very large or very liberal, though they are large enough in verbiage. In those concessions it is provided that the vessels of war of all governments that may be at war with the Nicaraguan Government shall be rigorously excluded from passage through this canal or entrance to it. As the canal will be on the soil of Nicaragua, such a provision is well enough; but it does not stop there. There is provision for excluding the vessels of any country that may be at war with Nicaragua or any Central American republic. Taking the family of republics down there, it would be a very easy thing for a powerful government to produce a state of war between some one of them and the United States Government. A declaration of war by any one of them would stop our vessels. In matters of war diplomacy is not always conducted upon the broadest and most magnanimous scale.

A government at war sometimes has very great influence over smaller governments; and the state of war contemplated by this provision might occur by the smallest Central American republic being declared in a state of war with the United States Government, and that might be done at the instance of some great country which might be at war or preparing for war with the United States Government. Who is to determine what a state of war is? Some of the ablest lawyers in this House, when we had under discussion the proposed settlement of the French spoliation claims, differed in opinion with reference to the question whether there was or was not at the period when those claims originated a state of war between France and the United States. The gentleman from Georgia [Mr. TURNER] made a very able historical and logical argument to show that there was a state of war between these two countries, and that, therefore, the Government of the United States was not liable to pay those claims. Other very able lawyers argued, probably as ably and logically, that there was no war. All parties will admit that there never was a gun fired between France and the United States during all that time, and that no war was ever declared by either Government. A war may exist without a declaration of war (as it did between the United States and Mexico) until fighting had been done. But in the case of France and the United States war was not declared nor a gun fired; yet gentlemen have insisted—very powerfully, I think—that a state of war did exist between the two countries.

Mr. MILLIKEN. The court decided the other way.

Mr. STOCKDALE. I am informed by my friend that the court decided the other way; but I think the gentleman is mistaken, unless he refers to the finding of facts of the Court of Claims in finding the facts at the instance of Congress, and the findings of that court can not be cited as decisions.

Now, who is going to say whether war exists or not? Shall our vessels stand at the mouth of this canal on the one side or the other until it is decided by some court whether war exists or not? And what court shall decide it, a court of the United States or a court of some of those southern republics? Suppose one court decides that there is war, and another decides that there is not; then what? What power is then to determine whether this rigorous exclusion shall be enforced, whether our vessels shall go through the canal or hover at the two entrances and view vessels of other countries pass them? This bill does not contain one line in the way of provision by which this Government will have any power, authority, or influence to say who shall go through that canal. United States vessels might go to the mouth of the canal on either the Atlantic or the Pacific side, and the Nicaraguan Government might say, "Your Government is at war with some one of the Central American republics," and our vessels would have to wait until that question was determined.

There is no provision by which the Government of the United States can exercise any control whatever. It yields power entirely, so far as there is a yielding of power, to this company. There is no grant of power by the United States Government, I admit, except this act of incorporation. This Government has no territorial jurisdiction to

grant, no authority to grant or withhold such jurisdiction except as it may be involved in the general doctrine which the people of this Government have adopted and which is embodied as a part of its policy, to which all parties assent, that our Government can not allow that canal to be dug or a railroad to be built across the Isthmus without having some sort of control there; at least to the extent of having that line of communication neutral for the benefit of nations. That is as little as we could ask; and this is a very important concession if we intend to maintain the Monroe doctrine, for is it not the inevitable sequence of the action of Congress in chartering this company that we accept and acquiesce in and indorse all the provisions contained in these concessions, misnamed, of the Nicaraguan grant?

If this bill should pass and be signed to-day there is nothing in it which would prohibit this company from selling out to-morrow every dollar's worth of its stock to the Government of Nicaragua or England or Germany or Kamchatka or to any company representing any foreign government. The company must have its office in New York, it is true.

Mr. DUNN. All the prohibitions which the gentleman intimates are necessary will be found in the articles of concession of Nicaragua.

Mr. STOCKDALE. I think the gentleman is mistaken in that; but if he be correct, to whom does the Nicaraguan Government make these concessions? Not to the United States Government, but to this company. And Nicaragua may buy out the company to-morrow; England, Germany, Egypt, or any other country may buy it out to-morrow; if these gentlemen want to sell, and I apprehend that gentlemen who produce a scheme like this would be willing to sell out for a profit, if they get this charter. They are business men, under no obligations to anybody.

The concession of the Nicaraguan Government is to the company. It is not a treaty. There are treaties, but I am speaking of the concessions, that they are not in the form of a treaty with the government, but in the form of voluntary concessions to this company for the purpose of producing that canal.

Now, I say, Mr. Chairman, that a scheme of this magnitude I believe can be so hedged about, if gentlemen are anxious to build it, that the Government of the United States will have some right and some power to interpose its voice if it be undertaken to be established in a manner inimical to the United States either in war or peace, either in commerce or in reference to its prestige upon the high seas.

This canal will be a part of the high seas physically, or in practical effect on commerce, if it shall be built. Yet it will be controlled by a private corporation, by this charter over, which no government will have specific control except Nicaragua.

Mr. FARQUHAR. Let me ask the gentleman from Mississippi if the primary condition of things in reference to the proposed construction of the Suez Canal was in any respect different from what is proposed in reference to this Nicaraguan Maritime Canal Company? I should like to know whether a governmental guaranty is needed to initiate or complete the work intended to be built by this Maritime Canal Company. Is there any more necessity in this instance that the Government of the United States should guaranty this company than there was in the case of the Suez Canal by the French Government? Its stock without such guaranty was floated in the money markets of the world, and one of the grandest commercial successes in modern times was accomplished with no governmental guaranty, and with no special protection of the kind indicated.

Now, let me say to my friend from Mississippi—and I do not intend to make a speech—the Nicaraguan Government has gone as far as it can go, and I can not see why the Government of the United States——

Mr. STOCKDALE. I hope, Mr. Chairman, this speech is not to come out of my time.

Mr. FARQUHAR. I wish, then, the gentleman from Mississippi would state just what kind of guaranty he deems necessary in this matter.

Mr. STOCKDALE. The gentleman has entirely misunderstood me.

Mr. FARQUHAR rose.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Mississippi declines to yield further.

Mr. STOCKDALE. I am willing to yield for a question, but not for a speech.

Mr. FARQUHAR. I wish to know what guaranty the gentleman would have different from that in the case of the Suez Canal?

Mr. STOCKDALE. I am not discussing this project on the basis of the Suez Canal, and I did not say anything about this Government guarantying this canal. If the Government were to undertake to guaranty the construction of this Nicaragua Maritime Canal Company, I would myself vote against the bill.

Mr. FARQUHAR. I do not mean any money guaranty, but I refer to a governmental guaranty as to the protection of the rights of the company.

Mr. STOCKDALE. Let me ask the gentleman from New York how long after the construction of the Suez Canal, under the concessions of the Egyptian Government, Great Britain had the controlling interest in it?

Mr. FARQUHAR. The controlling interest is in the hands of the French.

Mr. STOCKDALE. Great Britain was said to have acquired the controlling interest in the Suez Canal, and, so far as I understand, holds that control to-day.

Mr. FARQUHAR. It may possibly so far as the money interest. I know the French shareholders had to lay down their stock on the English stock exchange. But that was not governmental interference. Neither the English Government nor the French Government, as a government, has anything to do with it. It may possibly be the majority money interest was transferred.

Mr. STOCKDALE. Certainly, and with that transfer obtained the control of the canal. It occurs to me that the gentleman's illustration is a very bad one. If there is anything in the constantly expressed and reiterated policy of the United States Government, it is that nothing of so great a value shall pass from under the control of the Government, or in reference to which they shall not have some part in the control of this great water way. The prestige of the United States in the western waters and over the continent of America is one of the tenets of American political faith. If there is anything on which the Government of England prides itself, whether it be tangible or intangible, it is the prestige of Great Britain upon the high seas. And if the Suez Canal was constructed upon concessions not materially differing from the Nicaraguan concessions, nevertheless the English Government took good care that Englishmen had control of that canal shortly after it was finished. And if we pass this crude bill based upon these skillfully drawn concessions, we will find England controlling this canal in the near future, and the people of the United States will point with derision at the record of the Fiftieth Congress in this matter.

And who does not know that the money control of a great improvement like that means in effect the physical and supreme control of it? There is the condition to which I object, and now——

Mr. FARQUHAR. Will the gentleman permit an interruption? In section 3 of the bill he will find that the control—if he means the national control or the nationality of the members comprising the board of directors—is fixed, for it provides that it shall consist of fifteen directors holding office for three years, and that a majority of them shall be citizens and residents of the United States.

Mr. STOCKDALE. I am aware of that.

Mr. FARQUHAR. And therefore I do not see how we can possibly go any further than that, except to make the whole board of directors citizens and residents of the United States.

Mr. DUNN. I desire to save the gentleman from Mississippi unnecessary labor on that point. The gentleman insists that the company can sell its stock and property to another government.

Mr. STOCKDALE. To any other person or corporation that it pleases.

Mr. DUNN. But you said that it could sell it to a government; that it could sell it to any government. Is that the proposition?

Mr. STOCKDALE. I will hear you.

Mr. DUNN. You will hear me to see if you can sustain the proposition.

Mr. STOCKDALE. No, sir; I will hear you to submit a question; not to present an argument.

Mr. DUNN. Has the gentleman read article 8 of the concession?

Mr. STOCKDALE. I have read all of the concessions.

Mr. DUNN. Article 8 of this concession from the Nicaraguan Government expressly controverts the position that the gentleman assumes, and would prohibit the action that he seems to apprehend. It provides as follows:

> The present concession is transferable only to such company of execution as shall be organized by the Nicaraguan Canal Association, and in no case to governments or to foreign public powers. Nor shall the company cede to any foreign government any part of the lands granted to it by this contract, but it may make transfers to private parties under the same restrictions. The Republic of Nicaragua can not transfer its rights or shares by selling them to any government.

Does the gentleman understand that there is an absolute prohibition against the sale of the shares or of the property to any other government or power whatever?

Mr. STOCKDALE. That is a prohibition of sale as to governments. But the gentleman must see that it is no answer to my position, notwithstanding the air with which the gentleman claims to give me information. They can not sell under the concessions to a government as a government, but will the gentleman undertake to say as a lawyer that they can not sell to the citizens of a government, or to any corporation organized by any government or under the authority of any government on the face of the earth? It precludes the sale to a government itself as a government, but not to a citizen, or to the citizens or corporations of a government.

Mr. FARQUHAR. But if they did sell to the citizens of a government they would not have governmental rights. They would never have such rights as a government. They would have simply the right of investment. I do not see how you can strengthen the matter beyond what this bill proposes in that regard. No sale of this property can give any power beyond what the concession from Nicaragua gives to this company.

Mr. STOCKDALE. But that is the very point. This concession is to the company and not to the United States Government, and if at any time the Nicaraguan Government desires to so change her con-

cessions as to allow sales to be made directly to other governments, she would only have to get the consent of the corporation and this Government could not interpose an objection.

Mr. DUNN. Will you make an amendment that will improve that portion of the bill?

Mr. STOCKDALE. I am willing to do that if time be allowed. But will the gentleman permit me to proceed now in my own way? I do not think that the floor belongs to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. DUNN. I am not claiming it.

Mr. STOCKDALE. There seems to be a great deal of impatience upon the right because I rise to discuss the question presented by this bill, which, on the information that I possess and on the best light that I can bring to bear on its construction, is a giving away of the rights of the American Republic to that prestige that it should have and has a right to claim on the high seas in that direction.

This is a concession of the Nicaraguan Government to this company, and the long reading of the article of concessions on the part of the gentleman from Arkansas, that they can not sell to any government, as a response to my argument is simply a begging of the question. They can sell to a corporation or to individuals of any government, and that was what I meant to say.

Mr. BAYNE. Will the gentleman yield to me for a question?

Mr. STOCKDALE. Yes, sir.

Mr. BAYNE. I understand you to concede that the bill might be so amended as to preclude the difficulties that you apprehend may arise?

Mr. STOCKDALE. I think it might be so amended.

Mr. BAYNE. That in other words the power rests in Congress to amend it?

Mr. STOCKDALE. I believe it does.

Mr. BAYNE. Now, has the gentleman read the fifth section of the bill?

Mr. STOCKDALE. Yes, sir.

Mr. BAYNE. That "Congress shall have at all times power to alter, amend or repeal this act"——

Mr. STOCKDALE. Yes, sir.

Mr. BAYNE. "When in its judgment the public good may so require?"

Mr. STOCKDALE. Yes; I am coming to that. There never was, Mr. Chairman, in my judgment, a more miserable catch-penny device inserted into any bill that went before an enlightened legislative body than that.

Mr. BAYNE. What? The reservation of the power to alter or amend?

Mr. STOCKDALE. What is the power? It is not the power to alter or amend only.

Mr. BAYNE. Oh. yes. I have quoted the language.

Mr. STOCKDALE. It is the power to repeal as well. I was about to add, I claim to understand the English language.

Mr. BAYNE. The bill itself provided that Congress shall have the power to alter or amend.

Mr. STOCKDALE. I do not say that that language is not contained in the bill. If the gentleman would do me the honor to listen to me with a little more patience, he would see that there is a very clear distinction in the point that I am trying to make. Congress by the sixth section of the bill reserves the power at all times to alter, amend, or repeal the act when in its judgment the public good may so require.

I say no company would invest a hundred millions with that saving clause in it, if they did not intend to sell out or transfer the stock so as to speedily put the company and the enterprise beyond the reach of the United States Government, where the repeal would not affect them.

I did not know that I would raise such a storm around me when I began to discuss the merits of this bill. Gentlemen seem to resent any infringement of it as though it were a child of theirs; but since the attention of the House has been called to this last section, I ask gentlemen on this floor who represent a constituency of business men if after they have granted these powers to the company, and after that company shall have gone on and expended a hundred millions of money—or after they have expended $200,000,000, as they have the right to increase the capital—by money or water, and if that company undertake to sell or do anything else with its property not inconsistent with the concessions of the Nicaragua Government and not inconsistent with this charter as it now stands, that Congress would have the temerity to go on and repeal the act and destroy their enterprise after they have, under the guidance or connivance of the Government, expended this large amount of money?

There is not a man on the floor who would vote to repeal the law as long as the company shall not act inconsistently with the bill or in violation of it. Laws may be repealed, and properly so; and I grant that the power exists here. There is no question about that. But the power to do a thing, and the good faith, the consistency, and the respectability of doing it, are two different things. I say that the powers proposed to be here granted will be on record to be read of all men, and will operate as an indorsement of the Nicaragua concessions, and the company will have the right to regard them as settled on the basis of good faith: for no respectable man can vote to repeal the law which would destroy their rights and property acquired under them, when the company shall have expended their money, unless they had violated the provisions of the bill or the concessions. That clause of the bill struck me with peculiar force, giving arbitrary power to Congress to repeal or alter a law, or to amend or change it, and thereby destroy the rights of property. But where is the policy of the Government expressed?

Mr. BAYNE. In the last section:

That Congress shall at all times have the power to alter, amend, or repeal this act when in its judgment the public good may so require.

Mr. STOCKDALE. That is a most singular proposition to come from a gentleman who represents a business community. These people who spend their money are not to be consulted at all. If the public good requires it then the owners are not to be consulted.

Mr. BAYNE. Oh, no.

Mr. STOCKDALE. That is what it says and means. What does it mean if not what it says? Who is to determine whether the public good requires the repeal of the charter? Why, this Congress is to determine it; and whenever it pleases it can determine that the public good requires the repeal of this law or the alteration or amendment of it without providing further to take any consideration of the interests of these parties who are to expend their money and construct this stupendous improvement; and this is another serious objection to the framing of this bill. What I said in answer to the gentleman is that Congress has power to make this bill as it ought to be, and should do so. I am not going into captious objections to it. If I was I would not make the remarks I have made.

I have not been an obstructionist and will not be now. I will abide by the vote of the House. But I believe that if this bill shall pass now, with all these powers in it and all these defects in it and these dangers in it—and every time gentlemen on the other side speak there is something new evolved to show that this company would be at the mercy of Congress under the power this last clause would give—that it will be disastrous to the success of this great enterprise of constructing that canal. For I say that in my opinion no set of men who have brains enough to have $100,000,000 are going to build a canal under such a provision as this, and particularly after this discussion of the powers of the Government as shown in this bill; and I doubt very seriously the good faith of the scheme when gentlemen say they will undertake to invest $100,000,000 on such a document as this. It is too uncertain, too vague, and too indefinite a document for business men to make an investment of $100,000,000 upon.

Therefore I say that men interested in such an enterprise as that embraced by this bill—and men who I am told control millions—if they will invest $100,000,000 on any such document as that under this concession of the Nicaraguan Government, it looks very much like a trading scheme or to get the United States Government committed to it and then proceed under the auspices of some other government. As I have said, these concessions can give no power, except so far as Nicaragua has the power to grant them, under that charter, and these people could sell to whom they pleased. They could sell to a citizen of Nicaragua their stock, notwithstanding the majority of the stockholders and the president also be citizens of the United States, and the general office may be in New York, and they may also have another office, or other offices, as they put it, in Europe or any other country.

The chief office may be where the president is; they may call that their chief office, and yet they may do all their business somewhere else and transmit it to the chief office. In other words, this concern, after being chartered by the Government of the United States, can pass out of their hands in less than a week, and the Government gives them the power to do what? Why, if I be correct in my understanding, it simply gives them the power to trade in the stock of this corporation which is to exist on paper.

Now, it may be said that that is harmless; but why should the Government of the United States do a thing simply because it may be harmless? This means something, or else these gentlemen would not want it, and I will tell you what I think it means to this Government. It means a giving away of power on the part of this Government to control or influence the construction of canals across the Isthmus, and when we do that we do not do a harmless thing. We do an extremely foolish thing when we raise up a barrier in our own way which will confront us when we undertake hereafter, as we may undertake, by treaty or by the advancement of money, to control the construction of a canal to connect the two oceans; and it is no argument to say we can escape this awkward attitude by an act of bad faith—the repeal of this charter after property rights have been acquired under it.

I do not think there has ever been any proposition relating to the crossing of the Isthmus, either by land or by water, which provided that the war vessels of the United States must stand at either end of the canal and wait if we shall happen to be at war with any South American republic. The Government of the United States is asked to charter this company, and if it does so, then I say that it can not, with any show of reason or justice, undertake to repeal that charter on the ground of public policy; and gentlemen who now advocate the passage of this bill would then cry out shame to the Congress that would destroy property rights that it had fostered and created. Whose public policy? The public policy of this Government?

We go to the governments of South America and of Europe and say, "Here is a charter providing for a canal across the Isthmus;" and then we turn around and say that that charter shall be repealed because of our public policy alone. Suppose we should repeal this charter after the company has sold out to some other country. What then? Why, we have marched up the hill, and can march down, if we choose. The company and canal will be under the protection of England or France. Who shall say when we are at war and when we are not? Who shall admit vessels to go through the canal when we are at war and who shall exclude them?

This bill ought to be amended, and if it can not be properly amended now, then, where there is so much at stake and so much difference of opinion, this House is too near the end of the present session and the attendance is too small to pass it. I do not mean by that remark that I am going to be factious or call a quorum, but I say the attendance in this House now is too small to consider and pass a bill of this importance. A few men are asked to legislate here upon a question that will affect every State and every hamlet in the Union, and they are asked to take this measure just as it is simply because the gentleman who framed it is very able.

I am, as I have said, as much in favor of the scheme as any man can be, and my constituents want it, but I want it and they want it on a basis that will be American, and with such concessions as will admit the United States to a voice in its control in the future; and it is because I am in favor of the canal that I oppose this scheme that will either defeat the building of the canal or exclude the United States from all participation in its control.

I hope to see the bill put in proper shape and passed and become a law, and I want to see the name of the United States in it somewhere; but I shall not be surprised at all if this company reject the charter and refuse to accept it whenever the bill is so framed as to retain to this Government any right to influence the action of the company.

Mr. LANHAM. I ask unanimous consent that all debate upon the pending bill be now closed.

Mr. RYAN. Will that include debate upon the amendment?

Mr. LANHAM. Upon the bill and amendments.

Mr. FULLER. There is only one amendment pending.

Mr. RYAN. I desire to offer an amendment to the amendment of the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. FULLER].

Mr. FULLER. The amendment to which the gentleman refers has not yet been offered.

Mr. RYAN. Well, I desire to offer an amendment to the amendment which the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. FULLER] proposes to offer.

Mr. LANHAM. I ask unanimous consent that all general debate upon the bill and amendments be now closed.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair does not understand that the gentleman desires to cut off the five-minute debate.

Mr. LANHAM. I ask unanimous consent that all debate on the bill and amendments be closed in ten minutes.

Mr. STOCKDALE. I object to that.

Mr. RYAN. I hope the gentleman will not undertake to cut off the five-minute debate.

Mr. LANHAM. How much time does the gentleman want?

Mr. RYAN. About five minutes.

Mr. JACKSON. I want about five minutes, if the gentleman from Texas pleases.

Mr. LANHAM. Then, Mr. Chairman, I move that all general debate be now closed.

The motion was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The question now is on the amendment of the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. FULLER].

ALFRED PLEASONTON.

Mr. HOOKER. Mr. Speaker, before that amendment is voted upon, I ask consent of the gentleman having charge of this bill to let the committee rise for a moment in order that I may present a privileged report and have it returned to the Senate.

Mr. DUNN. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HOOKER. I move that the committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

The committee accordingly rose, and the Speaker *pro tempore* [Mr. MCMILLIN] resumed the chair.

Mr. HOOKER. Mr. Speaker, I submit a report from a committee of conference.

The report was read, as follows:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 2972) authorizing the President to appoint and retire Alfred Pleasonton with the rank and grade of colonel, having met, after full and free conference have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate and agree to the same.

CHARLES E. HOOKER,
D. B. HENDERSON,
JOSEPH WHEELER,
Conferees on the part of the House.

C. K. DAVIS,
F. M. COCKRELL,
Conferees on the part of the Senate.

Mr. HOOKER. I move that the report of the committee of conference be adopted.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The Chair will call the attention of the gentleman to the fact that no statement accompanies the report, as the rule requires; but if there be no objection, the report will be accepted without it.

There was no objection.

Mr. HOOKER. I will simply say that the House passed a bill retiring General Pleasonton with the rank of colonel, but the Senate refused to agree to it, and finding the Senate conferees obstinate on that point, the conferees on the part of the House agreed to accept the Senate amendment.

The conference report was adopted.

Mr. HOOKER moved to reconsider the vote by which the conference report was adopted; and also moved that the motion to reconsider be laid on the table.

The latter motion was agreed to.

MARITIME CANAL COMPANY OF NICARAGUA.

The Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calender resumed its session.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment of the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. FULLER].

Mr. MCMILLIN. Let us have the amendment again read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Strike out all after the word "company," in line 30, of section 2, and add to the said section the following: "The directors hereinafter described, with the approval of the majority of the stockholders, may adopt regulations and by-laws not inconsistent with this act; but no amendment to or change in the by-laws shall be made except by a majority vote of the stockholders, either personally or by proxy, and at a meeting called for the purpose. At least twenty days' notice of any such meeting shall be published in a newspaper of general circulation in the city where the principal office of the company is located."

The question being taken on agreeing to the amendment, there were—ayes 23, noes 8.

Mr. TURNER, of Kansas, and Mr. LAWLER. No quorum.

Tellers were ordered; and Mr. TURNER, of Kansas, and Mr. DUNN were appointed.

The committee again divided; and the tellers reported—ayes 17, noes 5.

Mr. LAWLER. No quorum.

Mr. LANHAM. I move that the committee now rise.

Mr. O'NEILL, of Pennsylvania. Does the gentleman mean to have it understood by this motion that we are not to go into committee again to go on with the call of members for the bringing up of unobjectionable private bills?

Mr. LANHAM. As I have already said this morning, I believe it is the intention of some gentlemen here to prevent any bill being passed; that has been stated very deliberately.

Mr. O'NEILL, of Pennsylvania. I propose that we go on and test the disposition of gentlemen in reference to private bills which may be called up. There are a great many such bills which are unobjectionable and ought to be passed; and if we go on with the call of the roll in Committee of the Whole many of such bills may be considered. I do hope the committee will not rise.

Mr. LANHAM. But we are without a quorum, and the point is insisted upon.

Mr. O'NEILL, of Pennsylvania. That call applies only to the pending bill, and I very much regret it, for I think it is a bill which should be passed. But, Mr. Chairman, there are individual citizens who are asking for legislation which can not be objected to.

Mr. LANHAM. How are we going to reach such bills when the point of "no quorum" is insisted upon?

Mr. O'NEILL, of Pennsylvania. Other business may intervene and the question of no quorum may be waived.

The question being taken, the motion of Mr. LANHAM that the committee rise was agreed to.

The committee accordingly rose; and Mr. MCMILLIN having taken the chair as Speaker *pro tempore*, Mr. ROGERS reported that the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar, having had under consideration the bill (S. 1305) to incorporate the Maritime Canal Company of Nicaragua, had come to no resolution thereon.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

A message from the Senate, by Mr. MCCOOK, its Secretary, announced that the Senate had disagreed to the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 1786) to regulate appointments in the Marine-Hospital Service of the United States; asked a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses, and had appointed as conferees on the part of the Senate, Mr. DOLPH, Mr. SAWYER, and Mr. COCKRELL.

The message also announced that the Senate had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the bill (H. R. 6514) for the allowance of certain claims reported by the accounting officers of the United States Treasury Department.

LEAVE TO PRINT.

Mr. RYAN. I ask unanimous consent to extend in the RECORD my remarks made to-day in Committee of the Whole on the bill in relation to the Nicaragua Canal.

There being no objection, leave was granted.

SAMUEL FELS.

Mr. STONE, of Kentucky. I ask unanimous consent that the Committee of the Whole House be discharged from the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 6246) for the relief of Samuel Fels, and that the bill be now considered.

The bill was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay to Samuel Fels, of McCracken County, Kentucky, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $2,333.62 for tobacco purchased by him from an agent of the United States Government, and afterwards recovered and taken from him by the owner.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. Is there objection to the present consideration of this bill?

Mr. DINGLEY. Let the report be read.

The report of the Committee on War Claims (by Mr. STONE, of Kentucky) was read, as follows:

That the proof in this case shows that the claimant purchased five hogsheads of tobacco from John E. Woodward, as sold by him under military orders of General E. A. Paine, then commanding the Western District of Kentucky, and paid said Woodward therefor $2,333.62; that on February 20, 1865, E. A. Lindsay, by his suit against Mr. Fels in the Jefferson County circuit court of Kentucky, established his right to said tobacco as the owner thereof at the time it was seized and sold by order of General Paine. The court decided that the orders of General Paine in seizing and selling said tobacco were illegal, and that no title passed to Mr. Fels; and the claimant was forced to and did pay the owner of said tobacco, E. A. Lindsay, its value, being $2,504.85.

Your committee are of the opinion that Mr. Fels bought (and paid for) said tobacco in good faith from the military authorities of the United States without notice of said Lindsay's ownership thereof or claim thereto, and that he should be reimbursed for the amount he paid for it.

Your committee report back the bill and recommend its passage.

Mr. ALLEN, of Mississippi. I desire to ask the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. STONE] how much of this money the Government received.

Mr. STONE, of Kentucky. Something over $2,300—the whole amount for which the tobacco was sold.

Mr. ALLEN, of Mississippi. The report does not show that that amount went to the Government; it says the tobacco was sold for that.

Mr. STONE, of Kentucky. The report does show that Mr. Fels paid $2,333.62 for the tobacco at a Government sale. Then the original owner of the tobacco brought suit against Mr. Fels in the circuit court at Louisville, and secured judgment against him for the value of the tobacco, $2,504, which Mr. Fels was obliged to pay, making nearly $5,000 in all which he paid for the tobacco.

Mr. ALLEN, of Mississippi. He paid this money, it seems, to somebody who sold the tobacco illegally; but is there any proof that the Government ever got the money?

Mr. STONE, of Kentucky. Yes, sir; this tobacco was sold by order of General Paine——

Mr. ALLEN, of Mississippi. Oh, a great many things were sold during the war by order of somebody; but the question is whether this money was received by the Government.

Mr. STONE, of Kentucky. The Government did receive the proceeds of this sale.

Mr. ALLEN, of Mississippi. Where is the proof of that?

Mr. STONE, of Kentucky. With the papers in the War Department and upon the records of the court in Louisville, Ky. [Cries of "Vote!"]

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

Mr. JACKSON. I understand this is the sum paid to General Paine.

Mr. STONE, of Kentucky. It is.

Mr. JACKSON. And no more?

Mr. STONE, of Kentucky. And no more.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair hears no objection.

There being no objection, the bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time; and being engrossed, it was accordingly read the third time, and passed.

Mr. STONE, of Kentucky, moved to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed; and also moved that the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table.

The latter motion was agreed to.

BRIG TALLY-HO.

Mr. ROCKWELL. Mr. Chairman, I ask by unanimous consent to call up for consideration the bill (H. R. 6757) to refer the claim of the owners of the brig Tally-Ho to the Court of Claims.

The CHAIRMAN. The bill and report will be read subject to objection.

The bill was read, as follows:

Be it enacted etc., That the claim of the legal owners of the brig Tally-Ho, her cargo and freight, and of personal effects on board her, alleged to have been sunk by collision with the United States steam vessel of war Pinta, on or about the 3d day of October, 1883, be referred to the Court of Claims, to hear and determine the same to judgment, with right of appeal as in other cases.

Whereas the legal owners of said brig, cargo, freight, and personal effects, or some of them, did, on the 29th day of July, 1884, file in said Court of Claims, in the case referred to said court by the Secretary of the Navy, and then numbered on the docket of said court Department case numbered 16, their petition setting forth their losses by said collision, and whereas evidence has been taken upon said petition, both by said petitioners and by the United States, and said evidence has been filed in said court, the claim above referred to said court may be heard and determined by said court upon said petition already filed therein, and the said evidence already taken and filed by either party upon said petition may be used and referred to in said hearing and determination of said claim in all respects as if originally taken and filed for the purposes of the hearing and determination thereof provided for by this act.

The report (by Mr. MANSUR) was read, as follows:

The United States steam vessel of war Pinta, on the night of October 3, 1883, collided with and sunk the coal-brig Tally Ho, off the coast of Massachusetts. The Navy Department ordered a court of inquiry, which on investigation decided that the war vessel was at fault. Thereupon the Secretary of the Navy referred the case to the Court of Claims for investigation under the provisions of the second section of the act of March 3, 1883 (22 Stat. at Large, page 485), commonly known as the "Bowman act." Whereupon the legal owners of the said brig on the 27th of July, 1884, filed in the Court of Claims their petition setting forth the loss of said brig by said collision.

Pending a trial of the case, and after much evidence had been taken and filed in the cause, the said Court of Claims decided in another case, also pending in said court, of a collision between a United States vessel and the schooner Abbie Pitman, which case had also been referred under the "Bowman act," that collision cases could not be referred to the Court of Claims under that act, and, consequently, that the court had no jurisdiction over the case of the Abbie Pitman (20 Court of Claims Reports, page 253). This decision will necessarily require the dismissal of the claim in the case of the Tally Ho, but the bill now proposed, if it becomes a law, will enable the court to take jurisdiction of that case and proceed with the hearing and determination of the same upon its merits, in the same manner as if the reference of the case to the Court of Claims had been authorized by an act of Congress before any proceedings had been had therein in said court, and will permit the claimants to use the testimony already taken in the case.

Your committee recommend that the bill do pass.

Mr. WASHINGTON. I will not object to this bill if the gentleman from Massachusetts will consent we shall go on with the regular call and when his name is reached he will not ask to call up another bill. I am on the list myself, and as it is made up alphabetically, I am low down, and my people would like to have a chance as well as others.

Mr. ROCKWELL. I am willing to agree to that.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

Mr. KILGORE. This vessel and cargo were supposed to be worth how much?

Mr. ROCKWELL. By reference to the petition filed in the Court of Claims it appears the amount is about $15,000.

Mr. KILGORE. I understand the proposition here is to make the Government liable in damages for the negligence of its employés.

Mr. ROCKWELL. The proposition is simply to send the matter to the Court of Claims.

Mr. KILGORE. I understand the proposition here is to establish the principle that the Government of the United States is liable in damages for the negligence of its employés?

Mr. ROCKWELL. Let me answer the gentleman.

Mr. KILGORE. I can not agree to that. If any such principle were adopted it would impoverish the Government.

Mr. ROCKWELL. Let me answer.

Mr. KILGORE. I will hear the gentleman's answer, but it will have no effect, as I shall object.

Mr. ROCKWELL. As the report of the committee shows, this claim was referred to the Court of Claims. It is a case where the United States steamer ran into a coal-barge and ran it down, and never stopped to see whether anybody was injured or not.

Mr. KILGORE. They should have been tried and put in the penitentiary.

Mr. ROCKWELL. The Secretary of the Navy thought the best way for him to get rid of it was to let the matter be referred to the Court of Claims.

Mr. KILGORE. The Government of the United States should not be held responsible for the negligence of its employés.

Mr. ROCKWELL. I confess that might be a fair argument to apply to the House in discussing such a question, and I should be perfectly willing to meet the gentleman at any time upon that argument. But it ought not to be applied, and should not interfere here. It should not interfere with the passage of a bill where the Secretary of the Navy says that the officers of the Government were themselves to blame, and where the court was unable to take jurisdiction under the Bowman act.

Besides, Mr. Speaker, this is by no means a new question. There have been several precedents for it. It is not a new thing. It has been done several times before, and I can cite to the gentleman several instances where Congress has passed similar bills of relief. It is not out of the way at all. It is a bill based upon the idea that where a Government officer has been so negligent as not to respect the rights of a citizen, then Congress steps in and says that the citizen so aggrieved shall have some remedy. The gentleman will hardly deny that there should be a remedy for such wrongs. We ought to have some such relief on our coast; you ought to have it on the coast of Texas. I think, therefore, in view of the facts, that there can be no reasonable objection to this bill.

Mr. KILGORE. I want to say to the gentleman that if Congress has done this before, then Congress ought to draw the line now. If it ever did it before, it has done wrong. It ought not to have passed any such bill. And another thing I will say to the gentleman from New York——

Mr. ROCKWELL. Massachusetts, if you please.

Mr. KILGORE. Massachusetts; excuse me. [Laughter.] Congress does not derive its authority to legislate from precedents, but it derives it from the Constitution.

Mr. ROCKWELL. I am perfectly willing to concede that.

Mr. KILGORE. And precedent does not have any effect upon Congress, and ought not to have any, except possibly in determining the construction of a doubtful clause in the Constitution.

Mr. ROCKWELL. I am perfectly willing to concede all of that. Now, Mr. Speaker——

Mr. KILGORE. Now, we can shorten this, as there are other people who want to have recognition to ask unanimous consent. I am bound to kick upon this thing. [Laughter.]

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The gentleman from Texas objects.

Mr. ROCKWELL. I trust then, in view of the action of the gentleman, that I will not be bound by any promise I have made when my name is called on the list, if we shall proceed in that order.

Mr. LAWLER was recognized.

Mr. LANHAM. I move, Mr. Speaker——

Mr. TAULBEE. Let me interrupt the gentleman to make a request before he submits a motion, which I presume is a motion to adjourn. I wish to ask consideration of a bill carrying only $60, two months' labor, to a man employed by the Government, and who the Secretary of the Treasury said ought to have been paid, and would have been paid, but Congress failed to provide for it.

PATRICK C. M'QUEENY.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The Chair had recognized the gentleman from Illinois to ask unanimous consent.

Mr. O'NEILL, of Pennsylvania. I want to ask unanimous consent too. I have some bills here involving small amounts——

Mr. LAWLER. I ask unanimous consent to discharge the Committee of the Whole House from the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 9949) for the relief of Patrick C. McQueeny.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The bill will be read subject to objection.

The bill was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay to Patrick C. McQueeny, late sergeant Company B, Seventeenth Regiment United States Infantry, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $50, being for additional bounty due him.

There being no objection, the bill was considered, ordered to be engrossed and read a third time; and being engrossed, it was accordingly read the third time, and passed.

Mr. LAWLER moved to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed; and also moved that the motion to reconsider be laid on the table.

The latter motion was agreed to.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED.

Mr. KILGORE, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that they had examined and found duly enrolled a bill of the following title; when the Speaker signed the same, namely:

A bill (H. R. 10896) making appropriations to supply deficiencies in the appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1888, and for prior years, and for other purposes.

BATTELLE & EVANS.

Mr. JOSEPH D. TAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to discharge the Committee of the Whole House from the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 506) for the relief of Battelle & Evans, and put it upon its passage.

The bill was read at length.

Mr. ROGERS. Let the report in that case be read, subject to the right of objection.

The report was read.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. RICHARDSON rose.

Mr. MONTGOMERY. I object, unless there is some understanding in reference to what course is to be taken in regard to these matters.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. For what purpose does the gentleman from Tennessee rise?

Mr. RICHARDSON. I did not rise to object, but simply to state that I think we ought to go into Committee of the Whole and proceed in the regular order with the Private Calendar. Some of us whose names are on the list hope to be reached during the day.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. Does the gentleman move to go into Committee of the Whole?

Mr. RICHARDSON. I do not.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. It can only be done, as the gentleman is aware, by a motion.

Mr. RICHARDSON. I know.

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Speaker, I will ask unanimous consent that when the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole to consider business on the Private Calendar, the Nicaragua bill be laid aside, and that we may then proceed as heretofore determined upon.

Mr. KILGORE. I object.

Mr. RICHARDSON. I hope what I rose to say will not interfere with the consideration of the bill of the gentleman from Ohio which has been read.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

Mr. JOSEPH D. TAYLOR. This bill does not take any considerable sum from the Treasury. It involves only a few hundred dollars, a small claim, going to a widow who needs the money badly.

Mr. HOOKER. I rise to a parliamentary inquiry. Is it necessary that there should be unanimous consent to go into Committee of the Whole?

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The Chair will state that no motion has been made to go into Committee of the Whole. The gentleman from Texas asked unanimous consent to lay aside the unfinished business in Committee of the Whole on which the point of "no quorum" was raised.

Mr. LANHAM. Because unless we can get rid of the Nicaragua bill there is no use of going into Committee of the Whole. It will confront us at once as soon as we go into committee.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. Is there objection to the consideration of the bill called up by the gentleman from Ohio?

Mr. MONTGOMERY. I object.

Mr. WASHINGTON. I will have to ask the gentleman from Ohio to state that when his name is called, if we go on in the regular order, he will give up his right, or else I shall be compelled to object.

Mr. JOSEPH D. TAYLOR. I desire to have my bill considered now; it will take but a moment, and I shall object to anything else.

Mr. WASHINGTON. If the gentleman will waive his right I shall not object.

Mr. MONTGOMERY. I object.

Mr. JOSEPH D. TAYLOR. I will waive the right to which the gentleman refers.

Mr. KILGORE. I do not understand the exact purpose of this bill or the amount it involves.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The bill will be again read.

Mr. KILGORE. That is not the information I want. The bill does not contain any information as to the amount involved.

Mr. JOSEPH D. TAYLOR. It involves a very small amount, to pay for hide and tallow. The beef was paid for, and this is only to pay for the hide and tallow.

Mr. KILGORE. How much?

Mr. JOSEPH D. TAYLOR. I can not say. A few hundred dollars.

Mr. MONTGOMERY. I have a case here in which the beef has not been paid for yet [laughter], and shall retain my objection until there is a unanimous agreement that the members be called if we can not go into Committee of the Whole for unanimous consent for the consideration of bills.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. Is there objection?

Mr. KILGORE. I move that the House take a recess until 8 o'clock this evening.

The question was put, and the motion was not agreed to.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. JOSEPH D. TAYLOR]?

Mr. MONTGOMERY. There is objection.

Mr. TAULBEE. I would like to present a bill to pay a laborer $60 for work done which the Secretary of the Treasury would have paid but Congress failed to make an appropriation.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The Chair will state to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. TAULBEE] that a gentleman on the left of the Chair has been recognized, and there being objection to the measure called up by him the Chair will be compelled to recognize another gentleman on that side, as there have been recognitions on the right of the Chair. [Cries of "Regular order!"]

Mr. TAULBEE. I appeal to gentlemen on the other side to let this bill pass, as it only involves $60. It is for work done by a laborer, and the Secretary of the Treasury had not an appropriation to pay for it.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The regular order has been demanded.

Mr. TAULBEE. I ask the gentleman from Ohio to withdraw it for the purpose of considering this bill. [After a pause.] The gentleman has withdrawn the demand for the regular order.

Mr. RYAN. If the demand for the regular order be withdrawn we are entitled on this side to recognition.

Mr. ALLEN, of Mississippi. I expect we had better have the regular order.

Mr. TAULBEE. I understood the gentleman to say he withdrew it, so far as this bill was concerned.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The Chair will state the condition of business. The Committee of the Whole House reported the Nicaragua Canal bill as not having been completed——

Mr. LANHAM. I move that the House do now adjourn.

Several MEMBERS. Oh, no; let us take a recess.

The question was put, and the Speaker *pro tempore* announced that the noes seemed to have it.

A division was demanded.

The House divided; and there were—ayes 19, noes 33; so the House refused to adjourn.

Mr. BACON. I now move that the House take a recess until 8 o'clock this evening.

The question was put; and the Speaker *pro tempore* announced that the ayes seemed to have it.

A division was demanded.

The House divided; and there were—ayes 42, noes 6.

Mr. WASHINGTON. No quorum.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The Chair will appoint the gentleman from New York [Mr. BACON] and the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. WASHINGTON] as tellers.

Mr. WASHINGTON (to Mr. BACON). Withdraw that motion. We are not going to sit here every Friday evening to pass pension bills and not have any of our bills passed.

Mr. RICHARDSON (pending the count). I rise to make a request. As it is evident there is no quorum here, I ask unanimous consent that the roll be called in alphabetical order for recognition in the House under the same regulations and conditions that applied to the call of the roll in Committee of the Whole on Friday, beginning where we left off on last Friday, and continuing up to the time to take a recess this evening at 5 o'clock.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. Is there objection?

Mr. KILGORE. I object.

Mr. RICHARDSON. I insist that under the rule a gentleman must rise to object.

Mr. KILGORE (rising). I object, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. TAULBEE. I would like now to get that little bill passed. It is only $60, and it is for a laborer.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The Chair will state that that is not in order while the House is dividing.

Mr. TAULBEE. Is it in order for the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. WASHINGTON] to withdraw the point of no quorum until this bill shall have passed? [Laughter.]

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The gentleman from Tennessee can withdraw the point; but if he does, the effect will be that the House will take a recess.

Mr. TAULBEE. Well, this bill is to pay a laborer for work done during the month of July. There was a law authorizing the work, but the appropriation bill when passed, after the performance of the labor, failed to make provision to pay for it. The amount is only $60. The Secretary of the Treasury has written a letter, which is incorporated in the report, saying that the only remedy is for Congress to give relief.

Several MEMBERS. Regular order.

Mr. OATES. I ask unanimous consent that I may have leave to print remarks in the RECORD on the tariff, a subject upon which I have not spoken during this session.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The Chair is of the opinion that the general leave heretofore given would authorize the gentleman to print his remarks.

Mr. OATES. That order was made, I know, during the pendency of the bill, but I did not know that it was a continuing order.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The Chair thinks the gentleman will be entitled to print under that order, but to save all question the Chair will put the request to the House.

Mr. OATES. Before the question is put I desire to say, because I do not want to abuse any of the privileges of the House, that what I want to print is not my own production, but is an essay, or pamphlet, written on the subject of the tariff by George W. Stone, chief-justice of the supreme court of the State of Alabama, which fully meets my approval in every respect.

Mr. DINGLEY. If we are going to permit the printing in the RECORD of essays upon the tariff, then we shall soon have a pretty large RECORD.

Mr. OATES. Well, I adopt this production.

Mr. DINGLEY. I shall have no objection if the same privilege is given for the printing of other essays on the other side, but I think we had better not enter upon that course. I am not going to make a formal objection myself, but I simply suggest that if the privilege is granted in one case, it must be granted in others, and it will probably lead to a great abuse.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE, of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, it may be a matter of some importance, as the question has come up, to know just what is the privilege under the order heretofore made. There was a general order made allowing the printing of speeches on the tariff, and it has been taken advantage of, I do not mean to say improperly, to print a letter of the President and also a letter of the Republican candidate for the Presidency, and a letter of Mr. McPherson, and other documents. I do not wish to be understood as criticising any gentleman who has so construed the permission and taken advantage of it to print these documents, but I think it is a matter of some importance that the House should now settle what is the privilege existing under that order.

Mr. RYAN. I have no doubt that the order is in operation and will be during the entire session.

Mr. OATES. I brought this to the attention of the House because I did not want to do anything that was not fully within the rules of the House. I will state, however, that the production which I propose to print is as much, or rather more, a legal argument than a political one.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. OATES].

Mr. O'NEILL, of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, not desiring to object to the request of the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. OATES], I simply wish to say that when he took the floor I hoped, and I think members generally hoped, that he was going to bring up his resolution for the final adjournment of the House, to which I think there would be no objection. [Laughter.]

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. OATES]?

Mr. FARQUHAR. If the document that has been mentioned constitutes the "speech" which the gentleman wants to print, I object. We do not want any legal arguments on the tariff.

Mr. OATES. No; I am satisfied you do not.

Mr. FARQUHAR. Only two documents have appeared so far in the RECORD in this connection—the letter of President Cleveland and the letter of ex-Senator Harrison. Those are subject to the frank of members, but if we are to go into a matter of printing outside pamphlets we might as well print the Tariff Bulletin and the documents of the Democratic campaign committee at once.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. Does the gentleman object?

Mr. FARQUHAR. I do.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE, of Kentucky. While the question is up, I think we ought to have some understanding as to whether the order of the House allowing speeches on the tariff to be printed still continues. If it does, I suppose the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. OATES] has the right to make such a speech as he pleases; and if it does not, we all ought to understand that fact.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The Chair intimated awhile ago an opinion that the order did continue, but before making a formal ruling on the point the Chair would like to examine the question a little more fully, and will withhold his decision if the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. BRECKINRIDGE] does not insist upon it now.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE, of Kentucky. I would prefer that the Chair should take time to look into the matter.

Mr. JOSEPH D. TAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Kentucky withdraws his objection to the consideration of the bill which I desired to call up awhile ago.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. Since the objection was made a motion to take a recess has intervened, and the House is now dividing upon that question.

Mr. JOSEPH D. TAYLOR. I ask unanimous consent that that be dispensed with, and that this bill be now considered. [Laughter.]

Mr. WASHINGTON. I withdraw the point of no quorum.

Mr. JOSEPH D. TAYLOR. I renew it.

Mr. ALLEN, of Mississippi. I move that the House adjourn.

The question was taken on the motion to adjourn, and the Speaker *pro tempore* declared that the ayes seemed to have it.

The question being taken on the motion to adjourn, it was disagreed to; there being—ayes 27, noes 34.

Mr. JOSEPH D. TAYLOR. I withdraw the point that no quorum voted.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The gentleman from Ohio withdraws the point that no quorum voted. The Chair will announce the result.

Mr. OATES. What proposition is that?

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. On the motion to take a recess.

Mr. OATES. I renew the point that no quorum voted.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The point being renewed, the Chair will appoint the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. OATES] to act as a teller in conjunction with the gentleman from New York.

Mr. OATES (before the count by tellers was concluded). I call for the yeas and nays on the motion for a recess.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. On the motion for a recess, the tellers reported—ayes 42, noes 6. The gentleman from Alabama demands the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Speaker, I desire to inquire whether it is not the fact that, in the event no quorum should appear on the vote by yeas and nays, no legislative business can be done during the rest of this day.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The Chair is of opinion that such would be the effect.

Mr. LANHAM. That being so, and there evidently being no quorum present, I move that the House adjourn.

The question being taken on the motion to adjourn, there were—ayes 24, noes 27.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE, of Kentucky. I call for the yeas and nays on the motion to adjourn.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. JACKSON. I rise to a parliamentary inquiry. If the motion to adjourn should prevail, will it dispense with the session to-night for pension legislation?

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The Chair will state that it would have that effect.

Mr. JACKSON. Then all who vote for adjournment are in favor of dispensing with the session to-night.

The question was taken on the motion to adjourn; and it was decided in the negative—yeas 25, nays 43, not voting 256; as follows:

YEAS—25.

Allen, Miss.	Grimes,	Montgomery,	Sowden,
Anderson, Miss.	Hooker,	Neal,	Stockdale,
Breckinridge, Ky.	Hutton,	Oates,	Stone, Ky.
Clements,	Kilgore,	Peel,	Turner, Ga.
Dunn,	Lanham,	Richardson,	
Forney,	Latham,	Rogers,	
Gay,	Martin,	Sayers,	

NAYS—43.

Bacon,	Farquhar,	McComas,	Post,
Baker, N. Y.	Fitch,	McMillin,	Rockwell,
Bayne,	Fuller,	Merriman,	Ryan,
Bliss,	Gest,	Milliken,	Scull,
Bound,	Haugen,	Morrill,	Stahlnecker,
Bunnell,	Henderson, Iowa	Nelson,	Taylor, J. D., Ohio
Butler,	Hiestand,	Nutting,	Vandever,
Campbell, T. J., N. Y.	Hitt,	O'Neill, Pa.	Walker,
Conger,	Jackson,	Penington,	Wheeler,
Dingley,	Lawler,	Peters,	Woodburn.
Dougherty,	Lyman,	Plumb,	

NOT VOTING—256.

Abbott,	Culberson,	Jones,	Rice,
Adams,	Cummings,	Kean,	Robertson,
Allen, Mass.	Cutcheon,	Kelley,	Romeis,
Allen, Mich.	Dalzell,	Kennedy,	Rowell,
Anderson, Iowa	Dargan,	Kerr,	Rowland,
Anderson, Ill.	Darlington,	Ketcham,	Russell, Conn.
Anderson, Kans.	Davenport,	Laffoon,	Russell, Mass.
Arnold,	Davidson, Ala.	La Follette,	Rusk,
Atkinson,	Davidson, Fla.	Lagan,	Sawyer,
Baker, Ill.	Davis,	Laidlaw,	Scott,
Bankhead,	De Lano,	Laird,	Seney,
Barnes,	Dibble,	Landes,	Seymour,
Barry,	Dockery,	Lane,	Shaw,
Belden,	Dorsey,	Lee,	Sherman,
Belmont,	Dunham,	Lehlbach,	Shively,
Biggs,	Elliott,	Lind,	Simmons,
Bingham,	Enloe,	Lodge,	Smith,
Blanchard,	Ermentrout,	Long,	Snyder,
Bland,	Felton,	Lynch,	Spinola,
Blount,	Finley,	Macdonald,	Spooner,
Boothman,	Fisher,	Maffett,	Springer,
Boutelle,	Flood,	Mahoney,	Steele,
Bowden,	Foran,	Maish,	Stephenson,
Bowen,	Ford,	Mansur,	Stewart, Tex.
Breckinridge, Ark.	French,	Mason,	Stewart, Ga.
Brewer,	Funston,	Matson,	Stewart, Vt.
Brower,	Gaines,	McAdoo,	Stone, Mo.
Browne, T. H. B., Va.	Gallinger,	McClammy,	Struble,
Browne, Ind.	Gear,	McCormick,	Symes,
Brown, Ohio	Gibson,	McCreary,	Tarsney,
Brown, J. R., Va.	Glass,	McCullogh,	Taulbee,
Brumm,	Glover,	McKenna,	Taylor, E. B., Ohio
Bryce,	Goff,	McKinley,	Thomas, Ky.
Buchanan,	Granger,	McKinney,	Thomas, Ill.
Buckalew,	Greenman,	McRae,	Thomas, Wis.
Burnes,	Grosvenor,	McShane,	Thompson, Ohio
Burnett,	Grout,	Mills,	Thompson, Cal.
Burrows,	Guenther,	Moffitt,	Tillman,
Butterworth,	Hall,	Moore,	Tracey,
Bynum,	Hare,	Morgan,	Townshend,
Campbell, F., N. Y.	Harmer,	Morrow,	Turner, Kans.
Campbell, Ohio,	Hatch,	Morse,	Vance,
Candler,	Hayden,	Newton,	Wade,
Cannon,	Hayes,	Nichols,	Warner,
Carlton,	Heard,	Norwood,	Washington,
Caruth,	Hemphill,	O'Donnell,	Weaver,
Caswell,	Henderson, N. C.	O'Ferrall,	Weber,
Catchings,	Henderson, Ill.	O'Neal, Ind.	West,
Cheadle,	Herbert,	O'Neill, Mo.	White, Ind.
Chipman,	Hermann,	Osborne,	White, N. Y.
Clardy,	Hires,	Outhwaite,	Whiting, Mich.
Clark,	Hogg,	Owen,	Whiting, Mass.
Cobb,	Holman,	Parker,	Whitthorne,
Cockran,	Holmes,	Patton,	Wickham,
Cogswell,	Hopkins, Ill.	Payson,	Wilber,
Collins,	Hopkins, Va.	Perkins,	Wilkins,
Compton,	Hopkins, N. Y.	Perry,	Wilkinson,
Cooper,	Houk,	Phelan,	Williams,
Cothran,	Hovey,	Phelps,	Wilson, Minn.
Cowles,	Howard.	Pidcock,	Wilson, W. Va.
Cox,	Hudd,	Pugsley,	Wise,
Crain,	Hunter,	Randall,	Yardley,
Crisp,	Johnston, Ind.	Rayner,	Yoder,
Crouse,	Johnston, N. C.	Reed,	Yost.

So the House refused to adjourn.

Mr. ALLEN, of Mississippi (at the conclusion of the first roll-call). Mr. Speaker, is it in order to ask unanimous consent to dispense with the second call?

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The Chair thinks it would be very unusual.

The roll-call having been completed,

Mr. LANHAM. I ask unanimous consent to dispense with the reading of the names.

There being no objection, it was ordered accordingly.

Mr. LANHAM. I ask unanimous consent that the pairs be inserted in the RECORD without being read by the Clerk.

There being no objection, it was ordered accordingly.

The following-named members were paired on all political questions until further notice:

Mr. DARGAN with Mr. GROUT.

Mr. TOWNSHEND with Mr. SPOONER.

Mr. HOLMAN with Mr. JOHNSTON, of Indiana.

Mr. COBB with Mr. ANDERSON, of Kansas.

Mr. CARLTON with Mr. FUNSTON.

Mr. MCCREARY with Mr. CROUSE.

Mr. CARUTH with Mr. HUNTER.

Mr. HAYES with Mr. KERR.

Mr. BLOUNT with Mr. RUSSELL, of Connecticut.

Mr. FORAN with Mr. HIESTAND.

Mr. MAISH with Mr. LEHLBACH.

Mr. NEAL with Mr. HAYDEN.

Mr. BRICE with Mr. GAINES.

Mr. JONES with Mr. BOWDEN.

Mr. ELLIOTT with Mr. BINGHAM.

Mr. COLLINS with Mr. ALLEN, of Massachusetts.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE, of Arkansas, with Mr. BROWNE, of Indiana.

Mr. SPRINGER with Mr. HENDERSON, of Illinois.

Mr. CAMPBELL, of Ohio, with Mr. KENNEDY.

Mr. COMPTON with Mr. GOFF.

Mr. OUTHWAITE with Mr. MCKINLEY.

Mr. HATCH with Mr. STEWART, of Vermont.

Mr. WILSON, of West Virginia, with Mr. MCCOMAS.

Mr. RANDALL with Mr. LODGE.

Mr. BLAND with Mr. BUTTERWORTH.

Mr. SCOTT with Mr. GROSVENOR.

Mr. MCMILLIN with Mr. BURROWS.

Mr. CRISP with Mr. REED.

Mr. COX with Mr. CANNON.

Mr. MATSON with Mr. HOVEY.

Mr. WILKINS with Mr. LONG.

Mr. MILLS with Mr. KELLEY.

Mr. FRENCH with Mr. STEPHENSON.

Mr. O'NEALL, of Indiana, with Mr. FINLEY.

Mr. MCCLAMMY with Mr. OSBORNE.

Mr. DAVIDSON, of Florida, with Mr. WEBER.

Mr. HENDERSON, of North Carolina, with Mr. FLOOD.

Mr. HOGG with Mr. SCULL.

Mr. ENLOE with Mr. PUGSLEY.

Mr. STEWART, of Georgia, with Mr. HARMER.

Mr. WILSON, of Minnesota, with Mr. ATKINSON.

Mr. BOOTHMAN with Mr. MCKINNEY.

Mr. CULBERSON with Mr. BAKER, of Illinois.

Mr. STONE, of Missouri, with Mr. WILLIAMS.

Mr. TAULBEE with Mr. FARQUHAR.

Mr. LAWLER with Mr. SEYMOUR.

Mr. DUNN with Mr. ROWELL.

Mr. ANDERSON, of Illinois, with Mr. DALZELL.

Mr. MACDONALD with Mr. JOHN R. BROWN.

Mr. O'NEILL, of Missouri, with Mr. CONGER.

Mr. CHIPMAN with Mr. ARNOLD.

Mr. LANDES with Mr. MCCORMICK.

Mr. VANCE with Mr. MOFFITT.

Mr. MANSUR with Mr. SAWYER.

Mr. WILKINSON with Mr. NICHOLS.

Mr. FISHER with Mr. BROWER.

Mr. ERMENTROUT with Mr. GALLINGER.

Mr. RAYNER with Mr. DE LANO.

Mr. NORWOOD with Mr. PARKER.

Mr. GLOVER with Mr. COOPER.

Mr. DIBBLE with Mr. BELDEN.

Mr. DOCKERY with Mr. WARNER.

Mr. COWLES with Mr. THOMPSON, of Ohio.

Mr. SIMMONS with Mr. BUNNELL.

Mr. NEWTON with Mr. FELTON.

Mr. GLASS with Mr. KETCHAM.

Mr. LATHAM with Mr. GEST.

Mr. SHIVELY with Mr. OWEN.

Mr. MCSHANE with Mr. LAIRD.

Mr. MAHONEY with Mr. BROWN, of Ohio.

Mr. MCADOO with Mr. BRUMM.

Mr. BACON with Mr. CASWELL.

Mr. LYNCH with Mr. YARDLEY.

Mr. WHITING, of Michigan, with Mr. HOUK.

Mr. RUSSELL, of Massachusetts, with Mr. COGSWELL.

Mr. PIDCOCK with Mr. PHELPS.

Mr. DARLINGTON with Mr. MOORE.

Mr. CUTCHEON with Mr. TARSNEY.

Mr. HOWARD with Mr. HOPKINS, of Illinois.

Mr. MORSE with Mr. WHITING, of Massachusetts.

Mr. BLANCHARD with Mr. THOMAS, of Illinois.

Mr. GRANGER with Mr. ROCKWELL.

Mr. BELMONT with Mr. DAVENPORT.

Mr. O'FERRALL with Mr. MASON.

Mr. BIGGS with Mr. MORROW.

Mr. CLARDY with Mr. WADE.

Mr. STEWART, of Texas, with Mr. DUNHAM.

Mr. FORD with Mr. GUENTHER.

Mr. SNYDER with Mr. YOST.
Mr. DAVIDSON, of Alabama, with Mr. PATTON.
Mr. RUSK with Mr. O'DONNELL.
Mr. GREENMAN with Mr. SHERMAN.
Mr. BYNUM with Mr. STEELE.
Mr. CANDLER with Mr. BREWER.
Mr. BOUTELLE with Mr. WISE.
Mr. SPINOLA with Mr. THOMAS, of Wisconsin.
Mr. TIMOTHY J. CAMPBELL with Mr. WEST.

The result of the vote was announced as above stated.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The question recurs on the motion that the House take a recess until 8 o'clock, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. NELSON. I make the point that the roll-call having disclosed the fact of no quorum, the only business in order is either a motion to adjourn or a motion for a call of the House. I submit that the motion for a recess is not now in order.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The Chair was about to state the status of the business of the House. Of course the rule stated by the gentleman applies in all cases where the absence of a quorum is disclosed.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. Speaker, three weeks ago, although a bill in which I was interested was on the very first page of the Calendar, I stood here and consented to the arrangement for a call of the roll, that members as reached might bring up their bills. The roll has now been called half through, and those members whose names have been reached are now seized with a sudden spirit of economy, and are trying to break up that arrangement. [Laughter.] I do not think it is fair. I submit we should now go on by unanimous consent, as I presume we can do, and call the roll in accordance with the agreement which was made three weeks ago.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The Chair will state to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. WHEELER] that as the record discloses the fact that no quorum is present nothing is now in order except a motion to adjourn or a motion for a call of the House—a proceeding which looks to the procurement of a quorum.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE, of Kentucky. I move a call of the House.

Mr. ALLEN, of Mississippi. Pending that I move we adjourn.

Mr. JACKSON. I make the point of order that no business has intervened——

A MEMBER. A motion for a call of the House has been made.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. What is the point of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. JACKSON]?

Mr. JACKSON. I was about to make the point that no business had intervened since the vote upon the motion to adjourn, but I am now disposed to think the point would not be well taken.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The Chair agrees with the gentleman. [Laughter.]

The question being taken on the motion to adjourn, it was disagreed to; there being—ayes 30, noes 32.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The question recurs on the motion of the gentleman from Kentucky for a call of the House.

Mr. LANHAM. I rise to a parliamentary inquiry. The roll-call having disclosed the fact that there is no quorum present, can any other business be disposed of during this legislative day; in other words, can any business be transacted at the session of this evening?

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The evening session is but a continuation of the session of the day, and it has been uniformly decided, so far as the present occupant of the chair is aware—certainly it has been decided in a very large number of cases—that when the absence of a quorum has been disclosed by a yea-and-nay vote, it is not in order to entertain during the remainder of the same legislative day any other business except a motion to adjourn or a motion for a call of the House, looking to the procurement of a quorum.

Mr. LANHAM. Then I think we had better adjourn. Certainly we can do no good by meeting to-night if that is all we can do.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The House has just declined to adjourn, and the motion of the gentleman from Kentucky for a call of the House is the only business that can now be transacted.

Mr. DUNN. Is it in order to move to reconsider the vote by which the House refused to adjourn?

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. Although that motion would seem to defeat the object of the rule, the Chair is inclined to think that it would be in order, but would prefer to examine the question before deciding it.

Mr. DUNN. I am inclined to think that the House, on a reconsideration, might determine to adjourn in view of the fact that we can transact no business. I move to reconsider that vote.

Mr. RICHARDSON. And I move to lay that motion on the table.

Mr. OATES. I rise to a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. OATES. Is it in order to move to reconsider a motion for an adjournment? If the Chair will permit me, I think it is not; because if it was in order, that motion could be repeated indefinitely.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The Chair has just stated that it would seem like a defeat of the rule itself; but will examine the precedents. [After a pause.] On an examination the Chair sustains the point of order of the gentleman from Alabama that it is not in order to reconsider a vote on adjournment, and in support of the ruling the Chair will have read from the Digest.

The Clerk read as follows:

A motion to reconsider a vote by which the House refused to adjourn is not in order.—*Journal second session, Forty-fifth Congress.*

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The question recurs on the motion of the gentleman from Kentucky for a call of the House.

Mr. ALLEN, of Mississippi. I move to lay that motion on the table.

Mr. LANHAM. Pending that, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. That motion has just been voted down.

Mr. LANHAM. But there has been some intervening business—a motion to reconsider that vote and a decision of the Chair, for instance.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The Chair thinks that the gentleman may reach his object by voting down the motion for a call of the House. Besides, the Chair thinks that a ruling by the Chair on a motion not in order would not be such intervening business as comes within the meaning of the rule to permit the motion to adjourn to be repeated.

The question being taken on the motion of Mr. BRECKINRIDGE, of Kentucky, for a call of the House, it was rejected.

Mr. LANHAM. I now renew the motion that the House adjourn.

The question was taken; and on a division there were—ayes 38, noes 20.

Mr. JACKSON. Let us have the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, there being 12 in favor of and 30 opposed to the motion, the affirmative being more than one-fifth of the whole vote.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 32, nays 30, not voting 262, as follows:

YEAS—32.

Allen, Miss.	Hiestand,	Montgomery,	Sayers,
Breckinridge, Ky.	Hooker,	Neal,	Sowden,
Campbell, T. J., N. Y.	Hutton,	Oates,	Stockdale,
Clements,	Kilgore,	Peel,	Stone, Ky.
Dougherty,	Lanham,	Penington,	Tillman,
Dunn,	Martin,	Rice,	Turner, Ga.
Forney,	McMillin,	Richardson,	Walker,
Grimes,	Merriman,	Rogers,	Wheeler.

NAYS—30.

Bayne,	Fitch,	McComas,	Ryan,
Bliss,	Fuller,	Milliken,	Scull,
Bound,	Gest,	Morrill,	Stahlnecker,
Bunnell,	Haugen,	Nutting,	Taylor, J. D., Ohio
Butler,	Henderson, Iowa	O'Neill, Pa.	Vandever,
Conger,	Jackson,	Peters,	Woodburn.
Dingley,	Lawler,	Post,	
Farquhar,	Lyman,	Rockwell,	

NOT VOTING—262.

Abbott,	Clardy,	Hall,	Matson,
Adams,	Clark,	Hare,	McAdoo,
Allen, Mass.	Cobb,	Harmer,	McClammy,
Allen, Mich.	Cockran,	Hatch,	McCormick,
Anderson, Iowa	Cogswell,	Hayden,	McCreary,
Anderson, Miss.	Collins,	Hayes,	McCullogh,
Anderson, Ill.	Compton,	Heard,	McKenna,
Anderson, Kans.	Cooper,	Hemphill,	McKinley,
Arnold,	Cothran,	Henderson, N. C.	McKinney,
Atkinson,	Cowles,	Henderson, Ill.	McRae,
Bacon,	Cox,	Herbert,	McShane,
Baker, N. Y.	Crain,	Hermann,	Mills,
Baker, Ill.	Crisp,	Hires,	Moffitt,
Bankhead,	Crouse,	Hitt,	Moore,
Barnes,	Culberson,	Hogg,	Morgan,
Barry,	Cummings,	Holman,	Morrow,
Belden,	Cutcheon,	Holmes,	Morse,
Belmont,	Dalzell,	Hopkins, Ill.	Nelson,
Biggs,	Dargan,	Hopkins, Va.	Newton,
Bingham,	Darlington,	Hopkins, N. Y.	Nichols,
Blanchard,	Davenport,	Houk,	Norwood,
Bland,	Davidson, Ala.	Hovey,	O'Donnell,
Blount,	Davidson, Fla.	Howard,	O'Ferrall,
Boothman,	Davis,	Hudd,	O'Neall, Ind.
Boutelle,	De Lano,	Hunter,	O'Neill, Mo.
Bowden,	Dibble,	Johnston, Ind.	Osborne,
Bowen,	Dockery,	Johnston, N. C.	Outhwaite,
Breckinridge, Ark.	Dorsey,	Jones,	Owen,
Brewer,	Dunham,	Kean,	Parker,
Brower,	Elliott,	Kelley,	Patton,
Browne, T. H. B., Va.	Enloe,	Kennedy,	Payson,
Browne, Ind.	Ermentrout,	Kerr,	Perkins,
Brown, Ohio	Felton,	Ketcham,	Perry,
Brown, J. R., Va.	Finley,	Laffoon,	Phelan,
Brumm,	Fisher,	La Follette,	Phelps,
Bryce,	Flood,	Lagan,	Pidcock,
Buchanan,	Foran,	Laidlaw,	Plumb,
Bucknlew,	Ford,	Laird,	Pugsley,
Burnes,	French,	Landes,	Randall,
Burnett,	Funston,	Lane,	Rayner,
Burrows,	Gaines,	Latham,	Reed,
Butterworth,	Gallinger,	Lee,	Robertson,
Bynum,	Gay,	Lehlbach,	Romeis,
Campbell, F., N. Y.	Gear,	Lind,	Rowell,
Campbell, Ohio	Gibson,	Lodge,	Rowland,
Candler,	Glass,	Long,	Russell, Conn.
Cannon,	Glover,	Lynch,	Russell, Mass.
Carlton,	Goff,	Macdonald,	Rusk,
Caruth,	Granger,	Maffett,	Sawyer,
Caswell,	Greenman,	Mahoney,	Scott,
Catchings,	Grosvenor,	Maish,	Seney,
Cheadle,	Grout,	Mansur,	Seymour,
Chipman,	Guenther,	Mason,	Shaw,

Sherman,	Stone, Mo.	Turner, Kans.	Wickham,
Shively,	Struble,	Vance,	Wilber,
Simmons,	Symes,	Wade,	Wilkins,
Smith,	Tarsney,	Warner,	Wilkinson,
Snyder,	Taulbee,	Washington,	Williams,
Spinola,	Taylor, E. B., Ohio	Weaver,	Wilson, Minn.
Spooner,	Thomas, Ky.	Weber,	Wilson, W. Va.
Springer,	Thomas, Ill.	West,	Wise,
Steele,	Thomas, Wis.	White, Ind.	Yardley,
Stephenson,	Thompson, Ohio	White, N. Y.	Yoder,
Stewart, Tex.	Thompson, Cal.	Whiting, Mich.	Yost.
Stewart, Ga.	Tracey,	Whiting, Mass.	
Stewart, Vt.	Townshend,	Whitthorne,	

So the motion was agreed to.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

Pending the announcement of the vote on the motion to adjourn, leave of absence was granted, by unanimous consent, as follows:

To Mr. GAY, for the remainder of the session.

To Mr. HOPKINS, of Illinois, indefinitely, on account of important business.

To Mr. TURNER, of Kansas, indefinitely, on account of political business.

To Mr. SYMES, indefinitely, on account of important business.

The result of the vote was then announced as above recorded.

And accordingly (at 3 o'clock and 50 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until Monday at 12 o'clock.

PRIVATE BILLS INTRODUCED AND REFERRED.

Under the rule private bills of the following titles were introduced and referred as indicated below:

By Mr. NELSON: A bill (H. R. 11585) to remove the charge of desertion from Thomas Calahan—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. STONE, of Kentucky: A bill (H. R. 11586) for the relief of Stephen Williams—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

PETITIONS, ETC.

The following petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk, under the rule, and referred as follows:

By Mr. CONGER: Memorial of the Grand Army of the Republic of Iowa, urging sufficient appropriations for supplying head-stones for the graves of ex-Union soldiers and sailors—to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. HARMER: Petition of Charles F. Hansell, for reissue of pension—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LYMAN: Petition of the Grand Army of the Republic of Iowa, for an appropriation for head-stones for deceased Union soldiers—to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. NELSON: Petition for the relief of Thomas Calahan, Company L, Fifth United States Artillery—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. REED: Petition of 48 citizens of Saco, Me., for the relief of Miss Anna Ella Carroll—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. W. L. WILSON: Petition of Jonathan J. Pettit, of Jefferson County, West Virginia, for reference of his claim to the Court of Claims—to the Committee on War Claims.

SENATE.

MONDAY, *October* 15, 1888.

Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. J. G. BUTLER, D. D.

The Journal of the proceedings of Friday last was read and approved.

SARAH A. WOODBRIDGE—VETO MESSAGE.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore* laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States; which was read:

To the Senate:

I return without approval Senate bill No. 3276, entitled "An act granting restoration of pension to Sarah A. Woodbridge."

The first husband of this beneficiary, Anson L. Brewer, was an additional paymaster in the Army, and died February 2, 1866, from injuries received in an explosion of a steamer.

His widow, the beneficiary, was pensioned at the rate of $25 a month from the date of her husband's death until October 21, 1870, when she remarried, becoming the wife of Timothy Woodbridge.

Two children, who were minors at the time she was pensioned, became sixteen years of age in April, 1870, and July, 1874, respectively.

Upon the remarriage of the beneficiary her pension stopped under the law.

It is now proposed to restore her to the pension-roll, notwithstanding the fact that her second husband is still alive.

Many cases have occurred in which pensions have been awarded by special acts to the widows of soldiers who, having remarried, were a second time made widows and rendered destitute by the death of their second husbands. I have not objected to such charitable legislation.

But I think this is the first time that it has been proposed to grant a pension after such remarriage when the second husband still survives.

It seems to me that such a precedent ought not to be established. If in pension legislation we attempt to determine the cases of this description, in which the second husband can not or does not properly maintain the soldier's widow whom he has married, we shall open the door to much confusion and uncertainty as well as unjust discrimination.

I am glad to learn from a statement contained in the committee's report that this beneficiary, though in a condition making the aid of a pension very desirable, has a small income derived from property inherited from her mother.

GROVER CLEVELAND.

EXECUTIVE MANSION, *October* 12, 1888.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. Shall the bill pass, the objections of the President of the United States to the contrary notwithstanding?

Mr. DAVIS. I move that the bill and message be referred to the Committee on Pensions.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. BLAIR. Would remarks on the motion to refer be in order?

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The message having been referred, it can be recalled and the Senator then be recognized.

Mr. BLAIR. In connection with the reference of the veto message I wish to take the opportunity to offer a few remarks bearing upon the subject.

Mr. HOAR. Will my friend from New Hampshire allow me to put a question to the Senator from Alabama before he proceeds, which will take but one moment?

Mr. BLAIR. I will give way for that purpose.

INDEBTEDNESS OF PACIFIC RAILROADS.

Mr. HOAR. I desire, with the leave of the Senate, to call the attention of the Senator from Alabama [Mr. MORGAN] to the bill providing for funding and arranging the debt of the Union Pacific Railroad Company. That is a corporation in which, within the last four or five years, a very large number of persons in the State of Massachusetts, and among them my own immediate neighbors and friends, invested.

There was a time when a gentleman whose authority stands very high in railroad matters announced publicly that the stock of the Union Pacific Railroad Company would be a good 6 per cent. dividend, paying stock at par, and the holders of that stock who held it for speculative purposes sold an enormous amount of it, which was purchased by trustees, widows, and persons of small means, as being the only permanent investment they knew of which promised such a dividend as that. One banker in my own city is said to have placed $3,000,000 of that stock at that time among this class of persons.

Of course everybody knows that it has been for the last six weeks impossible to expect the attention of the Senate to that subject at this session; but I desire to ask the Senator from Alabama whether it might not be well to set the bill down for a hearing on the first Tuesday of the next session, or the first Wednesday. Of course it will then be in control of the committee and of the Senate, if they desire further to make any disposition of it. But I suggest whether it would not be well to get that order now.

Mr. ALLISON. I hope that no order will be made respecting any public business which will interfere with the consideration of the bill now before the Senate as the unfinished business. With that limitation, I have no objection.

Mr. HOAR. Subject, of course, to that limitation.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. President——

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BLAIR] is entitled to the floor.

Mr. MORGAN. I desire to respond to the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. BLAIR. I suppose briefly.

Mr. MORGAN. Yes.

Mr. BLAIR. Very well; I give way for that purpose.

Mr. MORGAN. Probably five or six weeks since, in the absence of the Senator from Maine [Mr. FRYE] who is chairman of the Select Committee on the Pacific Railways, I asked the Senator to state a time during the present session when we might proceed to consider that bill, and it was intimated privately to me that it was impossible to properly consider that bill during the present session of Congress. The importance of it has been well stated by the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. HOAR], and it is a very urgent matter that that bill shall be considered by both Houses of Congress. A very large amount of money is at stake upon it, for which the United States is responsible and upon which it is making very large payments now every time interest on the bonds matures.

It is very fortunate, I think, that we are so near to a proper consideration of this question at least as that the committees of both Houses have unanimously agreed upon the same bill, and while there may be errors in the measure and it may be something that the Senate will debate at some little length, I conceive that we have at last fixed upon a principle by which these debts can be settled and the country be satisfied. So I shall very cheerfully indeed accord with the Senator from Massachusetts in asking the Senate to fix the first Tuesday in the December session of this body for the consideration of that bill, at the close of the morning hour.

Mr. HOAR. Subject to the tariff bill.

Mr. MORGAN. Subject, of course, as the Senator from Iowa has said, to the tariff bill, though, I suppose, we are ready to proceed with now and dispose of the tariff bill immediately. I think we are from all the indications.

Mr. HOAR. I suggest to the Chair to submit the request for unanimous consent that that order may be made.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. It requires the consent of two-thirds of the Senators present. The Senator from Massachusetts asks that Senate bill 3401, known as the Union Pacific Railroad funding bill, may be made a special order for the Tuesday after the first Monday of December next, at 2 o'clock in the afternoon. Is there objection? The Chair hears none.

PRESIDENTIAL APPROVALS.

A message from the President of the United States, by Mr. O. L. PRUDEN, one of his secretaries, announced that the President had, on the 10th instant, approved and signed the following acts and joint resolutions:

An act (S. 2519) to make enlisted men of the Signal Corps responsible for public property;

An act (S. 602) for the relief of James Millinger;

An act (S. 544) to authorize the construction of a highway bridge across that part of the waters of Lake Champlain which separates the islands of North Hero and South Hero, in the county of Grand Isle, in the State of Vermont;

An act (S. 2613) to amend an act approved June 15, 1882, changing the boundaries of the fourth collection district of Virginia;

An act (S. 249) to prevent the manufacture or sale of adulterated food or drugs in the District of Columbia;

An act (S. 3168) regulating admissions to the Institution of the Association for Works of Mercy in certain cases, and for other purposes;

An act (S. 3098) concerning the settlement of the boundary lines between Connecticut and Rhode Island;

An act (S. 122) granting a pension to Samuel Lane;

An act (S. 330) granting a pension to Marion Vangordon;

An act (S. 654) granting a pension to Caroline Motz;

An act (S. 1264) granting a pension to Martha V. Coleman;

An act (S. 1766) granting a pension to Stephen Butler;

An act (S. 2321) granting a pension to John V. Hennessy;

An act (S. 2606) granting a pension to John B. Timberman;

An act (S. 3141) granting an increase of pension to Jonas Doering;

Joint resolution (S. R. 110) in aid of the sufferers from yellow fever; and

Joint resolution (S. R. 10) relating to the inclosure of certain points of especial interest on the battle-field of Gettysburgh.

MARY ANN DOUGHERTY VETO MESSAGE.

Mr. BLAIR. Mr. President, I am not familiar with the facts in the case which has been the foundation of the veto message laid before the Senate this morning, but upon the motion to refer it to the committee for further consideration I desire to offer a few observations at this time.

The President of the United States is certainly quite right in saying that it is not usual to grant a pension to the wife of a second husband, who was the widow of a soldier, during the lifetime of the second husband, but circumstances of a character which seem to make it equitable and just to grant a pension in such a case may, I think, be easily conceived. Such cases have arisen before this, and I presume that there must have been—an investigation will show how that was—circumstances in this particular case which seemed to take it out of the ordinary rule.

In connection with this general subject of the veto of private pension bills by the President, I wish to take advantage of the propriety of so doing on this occasion to offer some matter which should have been offered earlier in the session, bearing on a previous veto, still under consideration by the Senate, in the case of Mary Ann Dougherty. I submit the veto message in full in connection with what I am about to say, but I call special attention to certain remarks made by the Executive. Alluding to Mrs. Dougherty, after having stated the general grounds upon which the veto is based, the Executive proceeds to say what, it seems to me, was superfluous and unnecessary, since it can not possibly bear upon the question at issue between the United States and the applicant for a pension:

To the Senate:

I return without approval Senate bill No. 1547, entitled "An act granting a pension to Mary Ann Dougherty."

A large share of the report of the Senate committee to which this bill was referred, and which report is adopted by the committee of the House, as is usual in such cases, consists of a petition signed by Mary Ann Dougherty, addressed to the Congress, in which she states that she resides in Washington, having removed here with her husband in 1863 from New Jersey; that shortly after their arrival in this city her husband, Daniel Dougherty, returned to New Jersey and enlisted in the Thirty-fourth Regiment New Jersey Volunteers; that she obtained employment in the United States arsenal making cartridges, and that while so engaged she was injured by an explosion.

She also states that she had a young son killed by machinery in the navy-yard, and that at the grand review of the Army after the close of the war another son, six years old, was stolen by an officer of the Army, and has not been heard of since. She further says that her husband left his home in 1865 and has not been heard of since, and that she believes he deserted her on account of her infirmities.

It is alleged in the report that she received a pension as the widow of Daniel Dougherty until it was discovered that he was alive, when her name was dropped from the rolls.

The petition of this woman is indorsed by the Admiral and several other officers of the Navy and a distinguished clergyman of Washington, certifying that they know Mrs. Dougherty, and believe the facts stated to be true.

There is no pretense made now that this beneficiary is a widow, though she at one time claimed to be, and was allowed a pension on that allegation. Her present claim rests entirely upon injuries received by her when she was conceded not employed in the military service. If the pension now proposed is allowed her it will be a mere act of charity.

Her husband, Daniel Dougherty, is now living in Philadelphia, and is a pensioner in his own right for disability alleged to have been incurred while serving in the Thirty-fourth New Jersey Volunteers. Of this fact this beneficiary has been repeatedly informed. And yet she states in her petition that her husband deserted her in 1865, and has not been heard of since.

It is alleged in the Pension Bureau that, in 1878, she succeeded in securing a pension as the widow of Daniel Dougherty, through fraudulent testimony and much false swearing on her part.

The police records of the precinct in which she has lived for years show that she is a woman of very bad character, and that she has been under arrest nine times for drunkenness, larceny, creating disturbance, and misdemeanors of that sort.

It happens that this claimant, by reason of her residence here, has been easily traced, and her character and untruthfulness discovered. But there is much reason to fear that this case will find its parallel in many that have reached a successful conclusion.

I can not spell out any principle upon which the bounty of the Government is bestowed through the instrumentality of the flood of private pension bills that reach me. The theory seems to have been adopted that no man who served in the Army can be the subject of death or impaired health except they are chargeable to his service. Medical theories are set at naught and the most startling relation is claimed between alleged incidents of military service and disability or death. Fatal apoplexy is admitted as the result of quite insignificant wounds, heart disease is attributed to chronic diarrhea, consumption to hernia, and suicide is traced to army service in a wonderfully devious and curious way.

Adjudications of the Pension Bureau are overruled in the most peremptory fashion by these special acts of Congress, since nearly all the beneficiaries named in these bills have unsuccessfully applied to that bureau for relief.

This course of special legislation operates very unfairly.

Those with certain influence or friends to push their claims procure pensions, and those who have neither friends nor influence must be content with their fate under general laws. It operates unfairly by increasing in numerous instances the pensions of those already on the rolls, while many other more deserving cases from the lack of fortunate advocacy are obliged to be content with the sum provided by general laws.

The apprehension may well be entertained that the freedom with which these private pension bills are passed furnishes an inducement to fraud and imposition, while it certainly teaches the vicious lesson to our people that the Treasury of the National Government invites the approach of private need.

None of us should be in the least wanting in regard for the veteran soldier, and I will yield to no man a desire to see those who defended the Government when it needed defenders liberally treated. Unfriendliness to our veterans is a charge easily and sometimes dishonestly made.

I insist that the true soldier is a good citizen, and that he will be satisfied with generous, fair, and equal consideration for those who are worthily entitled to help.

I have considered the pension-list of the Republic a roll of honor bearing names inscribed by national gratitude, and not by improvident and indiscriminate alms-giving.

I have conceived the prevention of the complete discredit which must ensue from the unreasonable, unfair, and reckless granting of pensions by special acts, to be the best service I can render our veterans.

In the discharge of what has seemed to me my duty as related to legislation and in the interest of all the veterans of the Union Army, I have attempted to stem the tide of improvident pension enactments, though I confess to a full share of responsibility for some of these laws that should not have been passed.

I am far from denying that there are cases of merit which can not be reached except by special enactment; but I do not believe there is a member of either House of Congress who will not admit that this kind of legislation has been carried too far.

I have now before me more than one hundred special pension bills which can hardly be examined within the time allowed for that purpose.

My aim has been at all times, in dealing with bills of this character, to give the applicant for a pension the benefit of any doubt that might arise and which balanced the propriety of granting a pension, if there seemed any just foundation for the application; but when it seemed entirely outside of every rule, in its nature or the proof supporting it, I have supposed I only did my duty in interposing an objection.

It seems to me that it would be well if our general pension laws should be revised with a view of meeting every meritorious case that can arise. Our experience and knowledge of any existing deficiencies ought to make the enactment of a complete pension code possible.

In the absence of such a revision, and if pensions are to be granted upon equitable grounds and without regard to general laws, the present methods would be greatly improved by the establishment of some tribunal to examine the facts in every case and determine upon the merits of the application.

GROVER CLEVELAND.

EXECUTIVE MANSION, *July* 5, 1888.

I also submit the report of the Senate committee, and of the House committee, upon the same case, together with a copy of the report of Senator Sewell in the last Congress in favor of the passage of the same bill:

[In the Senate of the United States, March 8, 1888.—Ordered to be printed.]

Mr. BLODGETT, from the Committee on Pensions, submitted the following report (to accompany bill S. 1547):

The Committee on Pensions, to whom was referred the bill (S. 1547) granting a pension to Mary Ann Dougherty, have examined the same, and adopt the report presented by the Senate in the first session of the Forty-ninth Congress, and recommend the passage of the bill. The following is the report:

The committee, having said petition under consideration, which is hereto appended and made a part of this report, and having in addition thereto examined the papers in her application for pension, are of the opinion that it is a deserving case, and one which merits the attention and aid of Congress.

The following is the petition referred to:

"*To the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States in Congress assembled:*

"As a petitioner for your favorable consideration of my claim for pension, I do most respectfully represent that I am a resident of Washington, D. C. I came here with my family in 1863 from Mount Holly, N. J., when, shortly after, my husband, Daniel Dougherty, returned thereto and enlisted in Company G, of the Thirty-fourth Regiment New Jersey Volunteers. I obtained employment in the United States arsenal making cartridges for the United States Army then in the field; that on or about the 28th day of June, 1864, while so employed and in the line of duty, as above stated, an explosion occurred, which killed and injured a number of the employés.

"Your petitioner was one of the victims. I was severely burned and internally injured, besides being mentally injured by the fall from the height to which I was thrown through the force of the explosion. My flesh was burned, as scars will show, and I inhaled the fire. My collar-bone was also broken. I was unconscious when found, and became insane from the injuries received.

"My son (the eldest), a bright boy, was killed by machinery in the United States navy-yard at Washington, where he was at the time employed, as the records of the Navy Department will show.

"At the close of the war, on the third day of the grand review of the Army, in the year 1865, my oldest surviving boy of six years was stolen by an officer of the Army and has not been heard of since.

"My husband, who served in the organization aforesaid, left his home in 1865,

and has not been heard from since. He deserted me, as I believe, on account of my infirmities.

"I have been accustomed to a comfortable home, and might have continued well and happy but for the war and its consequences. Prior thereto I was in perfect health, both mentally and physically.

"That, in view of the facts as aforesaid, she earnestly begs your consideration and prays that she may be placed upon the pension-rolls of the United States, subject to its provisions and limitations thereof.

"MARY ANN DOUGHERTY."

[Mary Ann Dougherty.—April 17, 1888.—Committed to the Committee of the Whole House and ordered to be printed.]

Mr. PIDCOCK, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, submitted the following report, to accompany bill S. 1547:

The Committee on Invalid Pensions, to whom was referred the bill (S. 1547) granting a pension to Mary Ann Dougherty, have had the same under consideration, and beg leave to submit the following report:

The facts in the case are substantially set forth in Mrs. Dougherty's petition, which is as follows:

"*To the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States in Congress assembled:*

"As a petitioner for your favorable consideration of my claim for pension, I do most respectfully represent that I am a resident of Washington, D. C. I came here with my family in 1863 from Mount Holly, N. J., when, shortly after, my husband, Daniel Dougherty, returned thereto and enlisted in Company G, of the Thirty-fourth Regiment New Jersey Volunteers. I obtained employment in the United States arsenal making cartridges for the United States Army then in the field; that on or about the 28th day of June, 1864, while so employed and in the line of duty, as above stated, an explosion occurred, which killed and injured a number of the employés.

"Your petitioner was one of the victims. I was severely burned and internally injured, besides being mentally injured by the fall from the height to which I was thrown through the force of the explosion. My flesh was burned, as scars will show, and I inhaled the fire. My collar bone was also broken. I was unconscious when found, and became insane from the injuries received.

"My son (the eldest), a bright boy, was killed by machinery in the United States navy-yard at Washington, where he was at the time employed, as the records of the Navy Department will show.

"At the close of the war, on the third day of the grand review of the Army, in the year 1865, my oldest surviving boy, of six, was stolen by an officer of the Army, and has not been heard of since.

"My husband, who served in the organization aforesaid, left his home in 1865 and has not been heard from since. He deserted me, as I believe, on account of my infirmities.

"I have been accustomed to a comfortable home, and might have continued well and happy but for the war and its consequences. Prior thereto I was in perfect health both mentally and physically.

"That, in view of the facts as aforesaid, she earnestly begs your consideration and prays that she may be placed upon the pension-roll of the United States, subject to its provisions and limitations thereof.

"MARY ANN DOUGHERTY.

"The undersigned respectfully represent that they are acquainted with Mary Ann Dougherty, believe the facts stated in the aforesaid petition to be true, and join her therein and ask consideration of same from your honorable body.

"DAVID D. PORTER, *Admiral.*
"Mrs. GEORGE U. MORRIS.
"S. NICHOLSON,
"*Commodore, United States Navy.*
"W. A. LEONARD,
"*Rector of St. John's Parish.*
"E. C. WEAVER,
"*Late Captain United States Volunteers.*
"GEORGE W. ROUZER,
"*Correspondent Army and Navy Journal.*
"GEO. BANCROFT."

The claimant received a pension as the widow of said Daniel Dougherty, and continued to draw the same until it was discovered that the soldier was alive, when her name was dropped from the rolls. This pension was not obtained through fraud on her part.

There is no question of her abandonment by the soldier. Her injuries, as well as the afflictions under which she has passed, have completely shattered her nervous system, and for years she has been an object of charity in the city of Washington. Persons of the highest character have interceded in her behalf with your committee, and testified to her good character.

Believing that the relief asked for by this poor unfortunate woman should be granted, your committee report favorably on the accompanying bill, and ask that it do pass.

[In the Senate of the United States, July 20, 1886.—Ordered to be printed.]

Mr. SEWELL, from the Committee on Pensions, submitted the following report, to accompany petition and bill S. 2868:

The Committee on Pensions, to whom was referred the petition of Mary Ann Dougherty, asking for a pension, have examined the same, and report as follows:

The committee having said petition under consideration, which is hereto appended and made a part of this report, and having in addition thereto examined the papers in her application for pension, are of the opinion that it is a deserving case, and one which merits the attention and aid of Congress.

The following is the petition referred to:

"*To the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States in Congress assembled:*

"As a petitioner for your favorable consideration of my claim for pension, I do most respectfully represent that I am a resident of Washington, D. C. I came here with my family in 1863 from Mount Holly, N. J., when, shortly after, my husband, Daniel Dougherty, returned thereto and enlisted in Company G of the Thirty-fourth Regiment New Jersey Volunteers. I obtained employment in the United States arsenal making cartridges for the United States Army then in the field; that on or about the 28th day of June, 1864, while so employed and in the line of duty as above stated, an explosion occurred which killed and injured a number of the employés.

"Your petitioner was one of the victims. I was severely burned and internally injured besides being mentally injured by the fall from the height to which I was thrown through the force of the explosion. My flesh was burned, as scars will show, and I inhaled the fire. My collar bone was also broken. I was unconscious when found and became insane from the injuries received.

"My son (the eldest), a bright boy, was killed by machinery in the United States navy-yard at Washington, where he was at the time employed, as the records of the Navy Department will show.

"At the close of the war, on the third day of the grand review of the Army, in the year 1865, my oldest surviving boy, of six years, was stolen by an officer of the Army, and has not been heard of since.

"My husband, who served in the organization aforesaid, left his home in 1865 and has not been heard from since. He deserted me, as I believe, on account of my infirmities.

"I have been accustomed to a comfortable home, and might have continued well and happy but for the war and its consequences. Prior thereto I was in perfect health both mentally and physically.

"That, in view of the facts as aforesaid, she earnestly begs your consideration and prays that she may be placed upon the pension-rolls of the United States, subject to its provisions and limitations thereof.

"MARY ANN DOUGHERTY.

"The undersigned respectfully represent that they are acquainted with Mary Ann Dougherty, believe the facts stated in the aforesaid petition to be true, and join her therein and ask consideration of same from your honorable body.

"DAVID D. PORTER, *Admiral.*
"Mrs. GEORGE U. MORRIS,
"S. NICHOLSON,
"*Commodore, United States Navy.*
"W. A. LEONARD,
"*Rector of St. John's Parish.*
"E. C. WEAVER,
"*Late Captain, United States Volunteers.*
"GEORGE W. ROUZER,
"*Correspondent Army and Navy Journal.*
"GEO. BANCROFT."

The committee find that claimant made application for pension as the widow of Daniel Dougherty, and in 1878 received certificate for same; that shortly thereafter evidence was discovered showing that the husband was not dead, and had made a claim (No. 322,398) for a pension. The name of the claimant was thereupon dropped from the pension-rolls of the Department.

Since that period she has been trying ineffectually to obtain relief. But very poor, and suffering at times from absolute want, ignorant of the proper method of procedure, her bones broken and her system completely shattered by the explosion at the United States arsenal, wherein she was serving the Government, and in the line of duty when it occurred; her eldest son killed while working in the navy-yard; and insane for four years from the injuries received, and the afflictions under which she had passed, as set forth in detail in the foregoing petition, and her mind affected more or less from that time to the present, she has been unable of her own motion to get her case in shape to present to Congress for assistance. Kind friends have done this for her, and the names of Admiral Porter, Commodore Nicholson, Hon. George Bancroft, Rev. W. A. Leonard, and others to her petition are sufficient by their high character, to certify to her integrity and the merits of her claim.

The committee therefore report the accompanying bill, placing her name on the pension-roll at — dollars a month, and earnestly recommend its passage.

I do not care on this occasion to go particularly into the discussion of the general subject of the veto of special pension acts. That has been pretty thoroughly discussed already. It has been made apparent to the country that they are of comparatively trifling importance; that the entire amount saved annually by the vetoes of the Executive in those cases is hardly more than $50,000 a year. It has also, I think, been shown in a great many instances, and I have charged that in all cases where the vetoes were upon the merits and I charge it now upon the floor of the Senate, they have each and all been unjust. I say it has been shown in a very large number of them affirmatively that the action of the Executive has been unwise, ill-considered, ill informed, and exceedingly and unnecessarily severe in its operation upon these applicants—severe not only in the deprivation of pension which they should receive, but in the defamation of character which has attended them as individuals and has been heaped unsparingly upon the soldiery of the country at large.

Mrs. Dougherty came to me, as she came to the members of the committee, with reference to the slanders and libels contained in the veto message upon her personal character. The chairman of the committee [Mr. DAVIS] some time since introduced and laid before the Senate the evidence then existing as to the character of this woman and the justice of her claim. He was called to another part of the country by reason of illness, if I recollect aright, in his family connections, and left a request that I should follow the matter up a little further, or as much further as I should be able to do, in the way of the collection of such evidence as might be brought to me bearing upon the charges of the Executive, these unnecessary and irrelevant charges of the Executive, even if they were true.

I have done so not to the extent that I see, from what I learn, the inquiry might be well and more successfully pursued, but as far as I could. Most of the work has been done by Mrs. Dougherty herself, who has evidently suffered mentally under these charges as acutely as could any woman in the land.

I believe from my investigation and knowledge of the matter that the charges were entirely unjust. I believe this poor woman to possess an excellent personal character, and that she has always possessed an excellent personal character; that she has been wrongfully and ruthlessly and wickedly assailed. However, the Executive may have been himself misled; there has been that carelessness and indifference in dealing with the reputation of this woman which deserves reparation, to say the least.

I ought in this connection to say further that at a time subsequent to the original discussion the Senator from Missouri on my left [Mr. COCKRELL] rose in the Senate and with great vigor charged that the allegations of fact upon which the favorable reports of the House and Senate committees had been based were untrue; that this woman's case was substantially and really a fraud from beginning to end; and he dared the further investigation of the claim. Therefore, although it would have been well for the Senator to have adduced his proof as well as to have made his charge, as the woman had been already assailed, it is doubly proper that I should lay before the Senate such matter as has come to my possession and leave the Senate and the country to judge between these parties, the assailant and the defendant.

If in this work I seem a little tedious to the Senator, who is smiling,

let me assure him that neither he nor the Senate has dealt with a more important matter at this session or is likely to do so. To my mind, the question of doing rank and infernal injustice to this woman is as serious as the question of the tariff, or the re-election of the President for another term, or the election of any other candidate to occupy that same high office; and I think that the Senator will be willing to give his attention without his sneers to what I have to offer. If not, I shall seriously misconceive the pleasure of the American people if they do not yield a more reasonable consideration to this matter than those who have made these charges.

I will first read what I believe was already put before the Senate on a former occasion, the original petition sent by several distinguished citizens of this country. It is as follows:

To the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States in Congress assembled:

As a petitioner for your favorable consideration of my claim for pension, I do most respectfully represent that I am a resident of Washington, D. C. I came here with my family in 1863 from Mount Holly, N. J., when, shortly after, my husband, Daniel Dougherty, returned thereto and enlisted in Company G, of the Thirty-Fourth Regiment New Jersey Volunteers. I obtained employment in the United States arsenal making cartridges for the United States Army then in the field; that on or about the 28th day of June, 1864, while so employed and in the line of duty, as above stated, an explosion occurred, which killed and injured a number of employés.

Your petitioner was one of the victims. I was severely burned and internally injured, besides being mentally injured by the fall from the height to which I was thrown through the force of the explosion. My flesh was burned, as scars will show, and I inhaled the fire. My collar bone was also broken. I was unconscious when found and became insane from the injuries received.

My son (the eldest), a bright boy, was killed by machinery in the United States navy-yard at Washington, where he was at the time employed, as the records of the Navy Department will show.

At the close of the war, on the third day of the grand review of the Army, in the year 1865, my oldest surviving boy of six years was stolen by an officer of the Army and has not been heard of since.

My husband, who served in the organization aforesaid, left his home in 1865 and has not been heard from since. He deserted me, as I believe, on account of my infirmities.

I have been accustomed to a comfortable home, and might have continued well and happy but for the war and its consequences. Prior thereto I was in perfect health, both mentally and physically.

That, in view of the facts as aforesaid, she earnestly begs your consideration and prays that she may be placed upon the pension-rolls of the United States, subject to its provisions and limitations thereof.

MARY ANN DOUGHERTY.

The undersigned respectfully represent that they are acquainted with Mary Ann Dougherty, believe the facts stated in the aforesaid petition to be true, and join her therein and ask consideration of same from your honorable body.

DAVID D. PORTER, *Admiral.*
MRS. GEORGE U. MORRIS.
S. NICHOLSON,
Commodore United States Navy.
W. A. LEONARD,
Rector of St. John's Parish.
E. C. WEAVER,
Late Captain United States Volunteers.
GEORGE W. ROUZER,
Correspondent Army and Navy Journal.
GEO. BANCROFT.

This is a paper that has been filed in the Pension Office. The George Bancroft referred to here was supposed at first to have been the historian. It is another gentleman of the same name, who is well known to citizens of the city of Washington. He is a man of high character and is concerned in the musical service of several of the churches here, and has been well known for many years.

In this connection I read the following certificate, and I invite the fullest investigation of the genuineness of these signatures, about which something was heard on former occasions:

WASHINGTON ARSENAL, *Washington, D. C., March* 9, 1880.

To all whom it may concern:

We, the undersigned, hereby certify that Mary A. Dougherty was employed at this arsenal and that while at her work on the second day of July, 1864, was severely burned by an explosion of powder. At said explosion several were killed.

JOHN MURPHY,
First-class Private of Ordnance.
F. WHYTE,
Captain, United States Army.
R. B. CLARK,
JOSEPH CAMPBELL,
Acting Sergeant Ordnance Department.
JAMES HARTWELL,
Sergeant of Ordnance.
GEO. W. McKEE,
Captain and Brevet Major, Commanding.

It will be observed that the date of this is in the year 1880, sixteen years after the occurrence. The genuineness of these signatures, I see, has been called in question in the public prints. I noticed some time since in the Philadelphia Times an assertion that these ordnance officers, at least Major McKee and Sergeant Campbell, repudiate the genuineness of their signatures. That was the substance of the statement made in the paper, but it is evidently merely a mistake on their part if they have done so. It will be observed that the certificate was made some sixteen years after the occurrence, and some of the details may have passed their mind since the year 1880, when it was made. I have had this paper examined at the Ordnance Department, or, at least, the signature of Major McKee especially, the one to which my attention was particularly called, and I have received the following certificate:

ORDNANCE OFFICE, WAR DEPARTMENT,
Washington, D. C., August 7, 1888.

SIR: I have the honor to acknowledge receipt of your letter of this date, inclosing a certificate, dated Washington Arsenal, D. C., March 9, 1880, signed by "George W. McKee, captain and brevet major, commanding," and five others, to the effect that Mary A. Dougherty was employed at said arsenal and while at work was severely burned by an explosion, etc., and requesting from me a certificate by myself or officers who may be able to recognize the handwriting of the signers, as to the genuineness of the signatures.

In reply I beg to say that I am familiar with Major McKee's signature, and have compared this with his signature on official papers in this office, and believe that his signature to the paper of Mary A. Dougherty is genuine. In regard to the other signatures on said paper I can not certify.

Respectfully, your obedient servant,

S. V. BENÉT,
Brigadier-General, Chief of Ordnance.

Hon. HENRY W. BLAIR,
Acting Chairman Committee on Pensions, United States Senate.

Others who are acquainted with several of the prominent signatures have assured me that they are genuine. There is not the slightest reason on the face of the earth to cast any suspicion on the genuineness of any of these signatures. If there is lack of recollection upon the part of any of them at the present time, it is easily to be accounted for by the lapse of seven or eight years or more since the certificate was given.

I caused a letter to be written to Major McKee who is at the Allegheny arsenal, at Pittsburgh. The letter was written by Mrs. Dougherty at my request, and this answer was received:

ALLEGHENY ARSENAL, *Pittsburgh, Pa., August* 23, 1888.

MADAM: I am in receipt of your letter asking if I could not refresh my memory with regard to the employés injured at the Washington arsenal explosion in 1864. Such a long time has elapsed it would be impossible for me to do so. I am sorry I can not assist you, if you are justly entitled to a pension, but the facts are as I have stated above.

Very respectfully,

GEO. W. McKEE.

Mrs. MARY ANN DOUGHERTY,
Washington, D. C.

This is an unquestionably genuine signature. The Senator from Missouri can compare it with that on the certificate and see that they are evidently the same signature.

I have here an affidavit by Mr. John Jordan, who is a resident of this city:

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, *City of Washington:*

Before me, S. A. Terry, a notary public in and for the District aforesaid, personally appeared John Jordan, who being duly sworn, deposes and says as follows: I am thirty years of age, and have known Mrs. Mary Ann Dougherty for over twenty-five years. The first I remember of her was when she was boarding at Mr. Jonabal's. I remember distinctly after that time that she was working at the arsenal, and was working there at the time of the explosion. I remember hearing my mother talk years ago of Mrs. Dougherty being hurt at the time of the explosion. I, however, did not see her wounds at the time, and can not say from personal knowledge that she was wounded there. I fully recollect that she was working there at the time and always understood she was injured by said explosion.

JOHN JORDAN.

Subscribed and sworn to before me this 3d day of September, A. D. 1888.
[SEAL.] S. A. TERRY, *Notary Public.*

I next read a certificate by Mr. H. B. Moulton of this city, well known to many as being a citizen of this city who takes a lead and often is before the committees of Congress in reference to prohibitory legislation for the District. He is a prominent gentleman, well known to thousands throughout the country. He says:

WASHINGTON CITY, D. C., *July* 26, 1888.

MY DEAR SIR: At the request of Mrs. Mary Ann Dougherty, I hereby certify that in the year A. D. 1864, I was the foreman of the laboratory in the United States arsenal, located in this city, and among the employés of that department of work was one Mrs. Mary Ann Dougherty; that in the month of June of that year an explosion occurred in which over twenty ladies were killed, and many others injured, and among the injured was Mrs. Mary Ann Dougherty.

Very respectfully,

H. B. MOULTON.

Hon. H. W. BLAIR,
United States Senate.

Subscribed and sworn to before me this 26th day of July, A. D. 1888.
[SEAL.] S. A. TERRY, *Notary Public.*

I will say that I have mislaid a more extended affidavit of Mr. Moulton, in which he goes on to say that he has frequently met this lady since that time. He was himself injured in the explosion. He met her soon after the explosion, when she had got out and he himself was about, and they talked over the subject between them, and from time to time since then he has met her and the subject of her injury has been frequently alluded to. He identifies her person fully as that of the woman who was injured in the explosion, and whom he has known ever since, and at whose request and in whose presence he made these statements. I have also the following:

WASHINGTON, D. C., *July* 11, 1888.

To whom it may concern:

It affords me pleasure to recommend the bearer, Mary Ann Dougherty, to the charitably disposed as worthy, meritorious, and of good moral character. Any courtesy extended to her will be appreciated and worthily bestowed.

Very respectfully,

GEO. BANCROFT, 611 *P street, northwest.*

I have another statement from him. Mr. Bancroft has been engaged and I think is now engaged as a claim agent in the prosecution of claims of this and perhaps of other kinds against the Government. He is a man whom I have seen personally several times, and he appears to be a very respectable gentleman, as I stated before. He says that for many years he has known this woman; that she has been in reduced circumstances; that he has had occasion from time to time to assist her with charity; and that he believes her to be a thoroughly worthy, upright woman, not an intemperate woman and not guilty of any immoralities.

I may say in passing that there appears to have been a little confusion

as to the dates when the explosion took place. I have been informed that there were two explosions at nearly the same time. I have not authenticated that statement, but think that it may have been true. I will read in connection with this remark a certificate made by the clerk of the Committee on Pensions, who at my request made some inquiries:

This is to certify that I have examined the files of the Evening Star, published at Washington, D. C., in reference to its report of the explosion which occurred at the United States arsenal at Washington, D. C., on the 17th of June, 1864.

In said report it is stated that two of the witnesses before the coroner's inquest, namely, Thomas B. Brown, superintendent of the building where the said accident occurred, and his assistant, Andrew Cox, both testified that all the books and rolls containing the names of the persons employed in said building were burned.

J. B. POTTER,
Clerk Committee on Pensions, United States Senate.

JULY 27, 1888.

The explosion in which Mrs. Dougherty was injured has been stated in one paper to be on or about July 2, and in another June 28. I think there must have been either more than one explosion or a failure in memory in fixing the date. It will be observed, too, that the records of the arsenal in one of these explosions were shown to be lost, by the matter taken from the Evening Star, and a statement which I have from one witness who was blown up with the rest was to the effect that the records of the arsenal at the time of the injury to Mrs. Dougherty were also destroyed, but the witness, Mr. Moulton, kept the roll. He had charge of the roll itself and knew positively in reference to the name of this particular, identical Mary Ann Dougherty being borne upon that roll, and being injured in the explosion. I have the following affidavit:

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, *ss:*

I, Elizabeth McConnell, being duly sworn in due form of law, deposes and says that she is a resident of this District, and has resided here for about forty years; that she is well acquainted with Mrs. Mary Ann Dougherty, and has known her since long before the explosion in the arsenal in 1864. That Mrs. Dougherty was injured in said explosion, and I have known her ever since said explosion; my brother, Sergeant Campbell, lived in the arsenal, and I visited said grounds frequently. That Mrs. Dougherty now present is the identical person who was injured in said explosion.

MRS. ELIZABETH McCONNELL.

Subscribed and sworn to before me this 20th day of September, A. D. 1888.
[SEAL.] S. A. TERRY, *Notary Public.*

It has been denied in the public prints, whether by Sergeant Campbell himself on account of lapse of memory I can not say, that the certificate signed by Major McKee and Sergeant Campbell was a genuine certificate. Here is the sister of Sergeant Campbell himself who signed that certificate and the sergeant who was employed in the arsenal at that very time when the explosion took place, who says she visited the arsenal often where her brother was, and swears positively to the identity of this very Mrs. Dougherty who was present when this affidavit was given, and which was brought to me. Here, I say, is the sister of the same Sergeant Campbell who establishes the essential facts which are controverted by the Senator from Missouri in his defiance to the committee and to all mankind to show that this case was otherwise than an absolute fraud upon the facts. I am glad to see that these papers now attract the attention of the Senator from Missouri, because I do not think that he would defame a woman unnecessarily even by telling the truth without an apology.

I will read the following:

GENERAL AFFIDAVIT.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, *County of Washington, ss:*

In the matter of claim for pension and vindication of the character of Mary Ann Dougherty, pending before Congress.

On this 27th day of August, A. D. 1888, personally appeared before me, a notary public in and for the aforesaid county, duly authorized to administer oaths, James W. Rock, aged 39 years, whose post-office address is 819 Sixth street southwest, Washington, county of Washington and District of Columbia, well known to me to be reputable and entitled to credit, and who, being duly sworn, declares in relation to aforesaid case as follows:

On the 28th day of June, 1864, he was an employé of the Government and at work in the arsenal at the time of the explosion on that day. He remembers Mary Ann Dougherty, who was therein employed making cartridges, and recollects distinctly that she was severely injured in the accident and while in the discharge of her duties; that for some time thereafter she was confined to her house and bed under medical treatment therefor and to deponent's knowledge has never fully recovered therefrom; that she lost a son in the Government service, who was killed at the navy-yard in this city; that she is in reduced circumstances, an invalid, deserving, and merits the consideration of your honorable body. He further declares that he has no interest in said case and is not concerned in its prosecution.

JAS. W. ROCK.

CHAS. W. DARR.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, *County of Washington, ss:*

Sworn to and subscribed before me this day by the above-named affiant, and I certify that I read said affidavit to said affiant, including the words erased and the words added and acquainted him with its contents before he executed the same. I further certify that I am in no wise interested in said case nor am I concerned in its prosecution, and that said affiant is personally known to me and that he is a creditable person.

[SEAL.] CHAS. W. DARR, *Notary Public.*

I call the attention of the Senate to this item of evidence bearing upon the very bitter assertion of the Senator from Missouri the other day, that this woman did not have any son blown up or killed in the navy-yard; that that claim was a fraud designed, as I suppose he would say, to excite the sympathy of the soft-hearted, and perhaps soft-headed, committees of Congress on the subject of pensions. But here is the evidence bearing upon that point, and perhaps there is more.

I will say, in passing, in reference to this matter of the boy being killed at the navy-yard, who at the time was the only support of this woman, who had several children and was herself already disabled, as previously stated, by a prior explosion, that a lady of the highest respectability in this city who was befriending Mrs. Dougherty went to the navy-yard, and she has informed me that she found the utmost difficulty in receiving even the ordinary courtesies to anybody from the officers there, and came away with the impression that the officers were exceedingly reluctant that information should be derived from any official source bearing in favor of this Mrs. Dougherty and against the declarations made by the Executive in regard to her. All the way through it has come to me from those who have been making these investigations, two persons or more, that like interference from some source has resulted in reluctance in giving the testimony which otherwise might be much more full and complete, the expression being used that the Dougherty case had become a political issue.

I will read a little fuller statement in the form of a letter. I am sorry I mislaid the affidavit, which was the same in substance, but a little more full:

WASHINGTON CITY, D. C., *July* 31, 1888.

Hon. H. W. BLAIR, *United States Senator:*

In answer to your letter of inquiry of the 27th instant I would say that the Mary Ann Dougherty who called upon me a few days ago in regard to the veto of her pension claim, and to whom I gave the statement addressed to you, is the identical woman who was in the year A. D. 1864 employed in the United States arsenal in this city. I knew her then, and remember her distinctly now, having frequently seen her and spoken with her from year to year since the explosion, in which I have always understood she was injured. I have been a resident of Washington since that time. When the explosion occurred I was clerk in the building in which it took place, and was myself severely injured. After my recovery I was made foreman. As clerk I kept the list of the employés, and there was no other person of that name employed there. Her husband was or had been, as I understood, in the Army.

Very respectfully,

H. B. MOULTON.

I have here something bearing upon this Mr. Moulton:

[Duplicate.]

WASHINGTON CITY, D. C., *July* 26, 1888.

MY DEAR SIR: At the request of Mrs. Mary Ann Dougherty I hereby certify that in the year A. D. 1864 I was the foreman of the laboratory in the United States arsenal located in this city, and that among the employés of that department of work was one Mrs. Mary Ann Dougherty; that in the month of June of that year an explosion occurred in which over twenty ladies were killed and many others injured, and among the injured was Mrs. Mary Ann Dougherty.

Very respectfully,

H. B. MOULTON.

Hon. H. W. BLAIR, *United States Senate.*

WASHINGTON, D. C., 604 B STREET, S. W., *July* 26, 1888.

I certify that H. B. Moulton was employed as foreman in the laboratory at Washington arsenal at the time he states. At that time and during the war I was employed as chief clerk at the arsenal, and was personally acquainted with Mr. Moulton.

The paymaster at that time was Military Storekeeper E. N. Stebbins, and his vouchers ought to be on file in the Second Auditor's office of the Treasury Department.

I am seventy-three years of age and am blind, and consequently unable to recognize Mrs. Dougherty.

F. WHYTE,
Captain United States Army, retired.

I have already made observation with reference to the vouchers. I understand that there has been search in the Treasury Department or Navy Department or somewhere where they ought to be, and I have been told that these vouchers were not found; but it appears altogether probable that in the explosions, as shown to have been the case in one instance, vouchers and papers were destroyed, which accounts for many of the mistakes about this case.

I have here a letter from a witness who sends a certificate:

WASHINGTON, D. C., *August* 27, 1888.

This is to certify that Mrs. May M. Doherty was a fellow employé at the time of the explosion at the arsenal, June 28, 1864, and was severely injured by said explosion.

She is a deserving woman and in reduced circumstances, being a widow. She has lost her son in the Government service, having been killed at the navy-yard in this city.

JAS. W. ROCK,
819 *Sixth street, southwest., city.*

The probability is that the common reports of the death of the husband leads this gentleman into a mistake as to his survivorship in some distant part of the country drawing the pension this woman ought to have if justice was done between the two parties. I have here a statement of facts drawn by Mrs. Dougherty, or by some one in her behalf, which is signed by James Mulloy, who certifies these facts are true. He is, or has recently been, in the employment of the police department of this city.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, *City of Washington, ss:*

The affidavit was drawn and informally executed, and I will read it as it is:

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, *City of Washington, ss:*

Personally came before me, a notary public in and for the aforesaid city and District, ——— ———, aged — years, a citizen of the city of Washington, District of Columbia, reputable and entitled to credit, and who, being duly sworn, declares as follows:

That he became acquainted with Mrs. Mary Ann Dougherty in the year of 1862, and lived a near neighbor to her, and knows that she was employed in the United States arsenal in 1864, and knows that at the time of the explosion in June, 1864,

she was so engaged, and was one of the victims of said explosion. He further declares that he can well remember that after the explosion her son, a bright, intelligent youth, was given employment in the navy-yard, and that he was accidentally killed, while in the discharge of his duty, in the year of 1865; and further, that he has personal knowledge of the fact that at the time of the three days' review in May, 1865, she had a little son who disappeared, and to the best of his knowledge and belief, has not been heard—

So that she lost two of her sons in the way described—

from since. All that is herein stated is given from memory, of all the facts and circumstances; and he further declares that he has known the Mary A. Dougherty ever since, and can positively identify her as the same that was blown up in the arsenal, and suffered as herein stated. I have no personal interest in this matter, but give this testimony as an act of justice, and I am willing to be interrogated by any one whom this may concern.

Sworn to and subscribed to before me on this — day of August, 1888.

This is, as I said before, drawn by some one who knew the facts, and this man could state them with the expectation that his statement would be sworn to. It failed to be formally executed. I have here in his handwriting, the same as his signature, the following:

I hereby certify that the bearer, Mrs. Mary A. Dougherty—I have known her since 1865, and believe what she sets forth in the within to be true, and that she is truthful and honest, so far as I know.

Yours, respectfully,

JAS. MULLOY.

I will read a letter from Mr. Bancroft:

WASHINGTON, D. C., *July* 26, 1888.

DEAR SIR: Considerable controversy seems to be afloat regarding an act recently passed for the relief of one Mary Ann Dougherty, vetoed by the President, to whose petition therefor my name was signed, and not that of Hon. George Bancroft, the historian. Believing then, as I do now, that for her troubles and the injuries she had received while in the employ of the Government, I signed said petition after observing the names of the distinguished gentlemen that preceded mine, without ever thinking the act would be attributed to another. I am still of the opinion the case is meritorious, and instead of meeting with the vituperation of the Executive deserves the consideration of your honorable body.

Very respectfully,

GEO. BANCROFT.

Hon. C. K. DAVIS,
United States Senator.

Mr. Bancroft informs me that in the preparation of this case, the collecting of these papers, he was connected with the transaction before the Department, and since that Mrs. Dougherty herself or friends outside of his office have been the active parties, but he has known her and collected the correspondence with the office.

I have here a letter which I will read from Mrs. Kate Marr, 1827 Ninth street, in this city:

MRS. WEAVER:

Mrs. Mary Ann Dougherty has been here; she is very sick and will go to the hospital for a few days. She wishes me to ask you if you will not go at once to the man whom you could not see on account of his being sick, the one who saw her boy killed. Get his affidavit and take it to Senator BLAIR by 2 or anyhow 3 p. m. to-day. She was due at the Capitol to-day but is not able to go. If more affidavits are necessary, she can obtain one from a Mrs. Moddus with whom she boarded when she worked at the arsenal, and she will be grateful for the kindness.

MRS. KATE MARR, 1827 *Ninth street.*

This is addressed to Mrs. Weaver, who is at the head of the Woman's Christian Temperance organization in this city, and was interested in this case, who, among others, made inquiries at the navy-yard. Here is a letter addressed by Mrs. Marr to myself:

TUESDAY.

SIR: Mrs. Mary Ann Dougherty, whom you have so kindly befriended in her efforts for relief, sent word to me this morning begging that I would write, stating that she was ill and not able to see you. I advised her to go to the hospital for a few days, as I found her afterwards in a very bad condition. The poor creature was a servant in my employ at one time, and I have always felt the greatest interest in her and sympathy for her; indeed, going far enough to find excuses for her failing that always seems to me more the lingering evidence of insanity than a nearer cause. I do sincerely hope that her matter will right itself, and feel encouraged.

Very respectfully,

MRS. KATE THYSON MARR,
1827 *Ninth street northwest.*

Senator BLAIR.

I do not know what the failing here referred to is. I know that it has been said to me that Mrs. Dougherty's mind was so affected by her sufferings at the time of the explosion and since that there are recurring periods when she manifests some mental aberration.

I will now read a certificate by quite a number of residents of the city who have known her:

We, the undersigned friends and old neighbors of Mrs. Mary A. Dougherty, hereby testify to her good moral character from a knowledge of her for many years.

The police officer has written this addition to his former certificate in his own hand:

From all I know of Mrs. M. A. Dougherty I believe to be a woman of good moral character.

JAMES MULLOY.
JOSEPH WILLIAMS, 2130 *Seventh Street Road.*
JAMES A. FULTON, *Seventh street Road.*
ROBERT CONDON, *Seventh Street Road.*
J. H. DAHL, *Seventh Street Road.*
JACOB MADERT, 1822 *Seventh street.*
THOMAS B. TURNER, 1702 *Seventh street.*
M. T. BRIDWELL, 363 *M street, S. W.*
JOHN F. QUIGLEY, 1102 *Seventh street, S. W.*

Then further:

I have known Mrs. Mary A. Dougherty for more than fifteen years, and have known her in connection with her pension claim. She has always been a truthful, honorable woman, and what I learned of her in the beginning has been reiterated ever since, and corroborated by others. I have always known her as feeble in body and mind, and from what I have learned is certainly the result of an injury received as claimed. Anything Mrs. Dougherty would tell me I would not dare to doubt.

LAVINIA C. DUNDORE,
717 *M street, N. W.*

I think that is the name—a good handwriting anyway.

I concur.

E. S. MORSE, 717 *M street, N. W.*
MRS. MARY GOCKLER, 721 *M street.*
MISS MARY STEWART, 1503 *Fifth street, N. W.*
MR. M. G. FOX, 1137 *Seventh street, N. W.*
M. FOLEY, 811 *Seventh street, N. W.*
W. K. MARTIN, 321 *I street, S. E.*
C. B. DOWDEN, 928 *Seventh, N. W.*

I will say here in passing that Mrs. Dougherty came to me a few days ago and informed me that Mrs. Logan, the widow of General Logan, would come to the Capitol and give me a statement or certificate in reference to the good character and good name of Mrs. Dougherty. It was a very stormy day and Mrs. Logan, as I understand, must have left the city the day following the one I was to have seen her, in order, as I learn from the public prints, to leave the country on a visit to Europe. I do not know anything further in regard to it. I know Mrs. Dougherty came to me feeling very much rejoiced that she would be able to bring to me, before it was necessary to present this to the Senate, a statement from Mrs. Logan. Mrs. Dougherty informed me that on a former occasion General Logan had acted very kindly to her in many ways, and I have come to believe pretty much what Mrs. Dougherty tells me without anybody back of her. I will read another affidavit:

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, *Washington City, ss:*

Statement made this the 14th day of August, 1888, by Martha A. Martin, residence No. 321 I street, northeast, Washington, D. C., in the pension claim of Mary Ann Dougherty, now pending in the United States Senate and which was recently vetoed by the President of the United States.

Have known Mrs. Dougherty since 1867. My husband kept a drug store and Mrs. Dougherty came there to get medicine. I heard it said at that time, when I first knew her, that she was one of the victims of the arsenal explosion, which occurred at the Washington arsenal in June, 1864. I have seen the scars upon her person which Mrs. Dougherty says are the result of said explosion. I was acquainted with several other persons who were in said explosion and they have told me that Mrs. Dougherty was injured in said explosion. Mrs. Dougherty commenced work for me in 1877 and remained with me for two years, and since that time she has visited me often, and I have gladly afforded her food and shelter when she was out of work and had nowhere else to go. was keeping the O-street eating-house for the market people during the time that Mrs. Dougherty worked for me.

My son was nine years in the Navy as druggist, and was three years on the Wyandotte receiving-ship at the Washington navy-yard. I have heard him frequently speak of the accident at the navy-yard which resulted in the death of the son of Mrs. Dougherty, and have heard other persons speak of said accident, and have no doubt of the fact.

Mrs. Wells, whose husband was a surgeon in the Navy, and was stationed at the Washington navy-yard, has said to me that Mrs. Dougherty's son was killed there. Surgeon Wells and his wife are now both dead. I also knew George Sylvester, M. D., who was the physician who attended Mrs. Dougherty; and he came to my husband's drug store for medicine, and I have heard him speak of the said accident when Mrs. Dougherty received her injury. I believe that Mrs. Dougherty is a virtuous and respectable woman. I know nothing to the contrary. She is a poor, unfortunate person, and justly merits the charitable consideration of Congress.

MARTHA A. MARTIN.

Subscribed and sworn to before me this 14th day of August, A. D. 1888.
[SEAL.] R. B. NIXON, *Notary Public.*

WASHINGTON, D. C., *September* 11, 1888.

Hon. Senator BLAIR:

SIR—

This is a statement drawn up by Mrs. Dougherty. It is not in her hand-writing, but I have also her statement in her own handwriting. The people who have drawn these papers are lacking in clerical skill somewhat. I read oftentimes more than one document at the expense of a little repetition; but I do not feel any apprehension that the facts will be too definitely understood if I repeat.

WASHINGTON, D. C., *September* 11, 1888.

Hon. Senator BLAIR:

SIR: May I be permitted to approach you upon the subject of my unfortunate claim for a pension, which I might have obtained without the vilification that has been heaped upon me by the President's veto (had I been in a sane condition).

I beg to impress upon your mind that I am no common character. I was born in the county of Limerick, Ireland, on the 25th day of March, 1840, and was sent to the United States by my honored parents, for a twofold purpose, *i. e.*, that of an improvement in my health, and finish my education; my destination was Mount Holly Seminary, Mount Holly, N. J., where I remained until in the year 1853, when without the sanction of my parents I married my husband, Daniel Dougherty, the ceremony having been consummated at St. Mary's Roman Catholic Church.

I will say before proceeding further with this letter that Mrs. Dougherty, as I am informed by herself, is the daughter of a prominent physician in the old country. She came here, as she states, for the completion of her education, and for the benefit of her health, in her younger days. That she has had an unfortunate life, it is not necessary to observe, but she uses in the first part of this letter the expression that she is no common character, and I think the woman is a woman of as bright original promise as the average of women in this country.

At the breaking out of the war I was living in affluence, the fact of which I can produce evidence. Reverses came, and we came to Washington, and my husband enlisted in a regiment of New Jersey volunteers. Now, I had six children, four boys and two girls, all depending for support. Necessity forced it, and I sought and obtained a situation in the United States arsenal. I worked there for some months, when, about the latter part of the month of June, 1864, there was an explosion occurred, in which I was severely injured, receiving a

fracture of my skull, a broken collar-bone, and a severe burning to my flesh. The explosion herein alluded to can not be forgotten, as there is a monument erected in Congressional Cemetery to the memory of the unfortunate ladies torn to pieces at the time of my injury.

Sympathy for me led to the appointment of my eldest son to a situation in the navy-yard, where, in the line of duty, in the spring of 1865 he was accidentally killed by machinery.

My husband returned from the war a wreck of his former self, and we were living near the boundary in May, 1865, during the "Grand Army review." My second surviving son, a bright boy of six years, was kidnapped by some one, supposed to be an officer in General Thomas's corps, and though efforts were made, and the President, Andrew Johnson, offered a reward, I have never heard of him since.

As to my character, the President of the United States, I had thought, should be the last man to assail it, as I have had no personal knowledge of him, prior to the time when I went into the White House, holding in my hand a horse-shoe, and the President's first remark was, "What have you in your hand?" "A horse-shoe," I exclaimed, for "luck, nothing more," and then the President said to me, "I will remember your case and act consistently."

Now my character has been impeached as a ground for the veto. I was arrested, as all are liable to, but the records of the courts must show that I have been exonerated, and I am at a loss to know why I was not investigated before the veto of the President.

There are others whom I know could give positive evidence to the facts of my misfortunes, but they have personal considerations, as they hold office and fear—their names are sacred.

I wish to wrong no one, and even would help an enemy in distress, but at the same time I will protect and defend my family name, which is beyond reproach.

Very respectfully,

MRS. MARY ANN DOUGHERTY.

Hon. Senator BLAIR:

This matter has been condensed. We could say more if the situation demands it.

M. A. D.

As I said, this statement is not in her handwriting, but I have a statement in her handwriting. Some friends seem to have assisted in putting it as they thought in a more legible hand, I suppose.

In this connection I will read her own communication to me. This was drawn with the idea on her part in one or two places that there should be the insertion of some of the documents that I have been reading, but I will pursue the reading as it is.

MARY ANN DOUGHERTY.

I was born on the 25th of March, 1840, in the County Limerick, Ireland, and was brought to this country at an early age for the benefit of my health and to finish my education. I was put in Mount Holly (N. J.) seminary, and was married from that place in 1853, in St. Mary's Church, to Daniel Dougherty, and when I left there to come to Washington I had a family of six—four boys and two girls. When about three months in this city my husband enlisted in the New Jersey volunteers, and I heard nothing from him until after my injuries in the arsenal.

As I have just mentioned, I had obtained employment in the United States Government arsenal, through Colonel Benton, then in charge, and was there about three months when the explosion occurred, and I was so injured by this explosion as to be unable to work, and my son was put to work in the United States navy-yard to keep my family from starving. He was there but a short time when he was killed by an accident, and then, at the close of the war—the third day of the grand review—my second surviving son was taken by an officer of General Thomas's regiment by force, and I have never seen him since.

As for being such a character as represented by the President, I can say that I was arrested but once with any charge against me, that of beating a police officer with his own club while he was misusing his wife, and two others—which were dismissed—for selling liquor to soldiers of the Army during the war.

Which means these two other charges of selling liquor which she explains further on, and it seems she was dismissed without blame.

After getting better, before I was able to work, I went back to the arsenal where I worked about a year when the work was about finished. At the second time I went to the arsenal Major White was paymaster, and my name should be on the pay-roll at that time.

All these misfortunes were such that I was mentally prostrated and I was put in St. Elizabeth's.

I will call the attention of the Senator from Missouri to the fact that it appears this woman was before the explosion and has been up to her partial recovery employed, and for a while afterwards.

Mr. COCKRELL. About a year?

Mr. BLAIR. Yes.

I went back to the arsenal, where I worked about a year.

I suppose there was work done in that arsenal after the books were destroyed, and probably she did some of it. She says she did.

All these misfortunes were such that I was mentally prostrated, and I was put in St. Elizabeth's Insane Asylum and staid but a few weeks, when I was put in Providence Hospital, and from there I went to my home, which was being taken care of by my brother.

When able to work I went to the family of Dr. Harword, now in Philadelphia, and have been working in the families of several prominent people, well known here, and who will vouch for what I say here.

Perhaps the Senator can hunt that up. She says here that her name should be on the pay roll, but I will suggest to the Senator that he will find that probably one-half the miscellaneous pay-rolls used in the Army during the war have been destroyed, and I am informed that to a very large extent the pay-rolls, papers, and vouchers which had become useless by reason of the lapse of time have been destroyed in these very Departments.

[Here comes the application for a pension.] I have been from then until now trying to get a pension, and I am almost worn to death looking for evidence for my benefit.

I most earnestly hope and pray that I may succeed to it now, for I fear this will set me crazy again—the libeling of an honest woman by a man who has no business to say such things.

Yours, very respectfully,

MARY ANN DOUGHERTY.

I have another paper drawn by her in which she goes over the same ground.

MARY ANN DOUGHERTY—HER ARRESTS AND THE CAUSES.

I do as you bid me in writing out the statement of my arrests and the reasons therefor—

Before I forget it, as there is a good deal in this matter, I want to say that the police records have been very carefully examined all through every book, with the assistance of the clerk, by Mrs. Charlotte Smith quite recently, for I did not know that she knew anything about this case until I obtained this evidence, and she informs me that in going through this very large number of volumes of records down to the present time there is a variety of names very similar to that of this Mrs. Dougherty, and that serious charges are made against many of them and for aught I know they were proved, but this identical Mrs. Mary Ann Dougherty that we are trying to get a pension for seems to have carried all the way through an entirely innocent and unquestionable reputation—arrested, as she says, but exonerated in every instance; the first time for assisting to prevent a brutal and drunken police officer from killing his wife, and in the other two instances she now gives an account:

I do as you bid me in writing out the statement of my arrests and the reasons therefor. You know already the assault on the officer (for beating his wife) with his own club, in which case I was acquitted. This was the first.

When my husband left for the war I had no means of support, and my children had to be fed and my rent paid; so, as I saw others doing, I bought a half gallon of liquor, which was hardly in the house and before I had sold a drop, when an officer came in and took it from me, and I had to go with him and take my little children with me, as there was no one in the house to care for them. In the morning the case was dismissed, and when I returned to my home I found it had been robbed, as I had left no one in charge. (The police could watch where the liquor went but could not protect a person's property.)

After this, I applied to Colonel Benton, and through his kindness I succeeded in getting work in the United States arsenal. About a month after getting my situation, one evening a soldier came to my door and asked for a glass, which I gave him, thinking he wanted to get a drink at the pump opposite. He then took from his pocket a flask and then treated a companion, which was witnessed by an officer, who arrested them and me, and again I was obliged to stay all night with my little ones in a cell. In the morning the soldier swore I had sold him no liquor, and this case was dismissed.

In the next case I was employed at the Deaf and Dumb Institute and had come into town to make some purchases, and then went to a store to pay a bill, and when I left I forgot an umbrella (which belonged to my employer, Mr. Ballard) and the goods I had bought. I returned for them and was told that I had left nothing there; and when I attempted to remonstrate with the storekeeper he beckoned for a police officer, who arrested me under the impression that I was another person well known to the police; and this time also I was dismissed. (I have never seen the goods nor umbrella from that time since.)

This is the substance of my crimes (?).

You have asked me about my children. One boy is buried in Mount Olivet Cemetery, one in Mount Holly, N. J., and my son Johnny, who was killed in the navy-yard—I don't know where he is buried. I have one son now with my brother in the State of New Jersey, and my husband stole two from me while I was on a visit with him in Philadelphia, and I have never since seen them.

I have been to the reform school, and Mrs. Shallenberger says she will get a letter from the priest and send it to you, but I will go out Sunday again to make sure of it and bring it to you.

I have been unable to write before, as I have the rheumatism in my arm and fingers.

I hope this is satisfactory, and that you can make use of it.

Yours, most truly,

MARY ANN DOUGHERTY.

And inclosed is this:

I have heard no more about my husband and children until I received the dispatches of the death of my husband (whether he intended to get rid of me or not), and since then I have been trying to get enough to find my two children, but I am getting worse off, and now the President has fixed me altogether and I will have to wait till I get my money before I can look for them.

Mrs. Weaver, the lady I have referred to as prominent in the Woman's Christian Union of this city, gives me this statement:

WASHINGTON, D. C., *July* 7, 1888.

To whom it may concern:

This is to certify that I have known Mrs. Mary Ann Dougherty several years. Has been a servant in my family, and I believe her to be strictly honest and virtuous. She is industrious, and I believe the stories lately circulated to be without foundation. She has had a great deal of trouble, and has been more sinned against than sinning.

MRS. M. A. WEAVER.

Again:

WASHINGTON, *April*, 1888.

This is to certify that Mrs. Dougherty has lived with me for some time, until illness compelled her to leave, and we found her capable and honest. I sincerely hope she will find a home among good people.

ELIZABETH SHALLENBERGER.

I have here written on a piece of paper which relates to something connected with the case, dated December 24, 1879, something in regard to an application for employment on the back of it. It seems that as long ago as that she was making very consistent statements in regard to the loss of her children in seeking employment; but I read this particularly as a certificate from a clergyman who may be known in the city:

WASHINGTON, D. C., *July* 8, 1888.

This is to certify that Mrs. Mary Ann Dougherty was employed as a servant in our family four years ago and served in that capacity several months. We found her industrious and faithful in her duties.

MELVILLE BALLARD.

I have known Mrs. Dougherty for some time past, and believe that she is deserving and can be trusted.

JOHN VAUGHAN LEWIS.

ST. JOHN'S CHURCH, *December* 24, 1879.

The pastor of St. John's Church in this city at that time. As it appeared from these papers that Mrs. Dougherty is a Catholic, I insisted that she should bring me some testimony from the clergy of her own denomination, for I suppose everybody understands that no Catholic clergyman will give his certificate or his indorsement from personal

knowledge or from investigation in a case of this kind unless he knows he is right; and she has brought me the following:

GONZAGA COLLEGE, *Washington, D. C., July* 11, 1888.

From the many references shown me by Mrs. Mary Ann Dougherty, I should judge her to be a person of a trustworthy character and capable of performing whatever she undertakes in her line of usefulness.

P. J. O'CONNELL, S. J.

Another pastor of hers to whom she has ordinarily confessed she told me, and who has known her longer and known her better, sends me the following from the same college:

WASHINGTON, D. C., *September* 16, 1888.

To whom it may concern:

Mrs. Mary Ann Dougherty, whose case can not fail to arouse the sympathy of every one who hears it, has been spoken well of to me by truthful persons who have known her for years and who have employed her. I think the aid she asks from Government is fairly and justly due her.

E. A. MCGURK, S. J.,
Pastor St. Aloysius.

Mr. President, I have read these items of evidence at length because I think they ought to go upon the records of this country along with the veto which assailed this woman. I think that it can hardly be claimed that this woman is not vindicated. That the assault upon her reputation grows out of no primary malevolence towards her it would be entirely unfair to claim; but the thing has happened that this woman has been injured, she has been deprived of her pension when in a reasonable discretion she ought to have had it. Beyond that, she has been deprived of her character that has stood well in this community evidently for a quarter of a century, and I submit that it calls upon all those who have been instrumental in doing this injury that they make reparation. I trust the Executive will do so in as public a manner as he attacked her by a communication to both Houses of Congress to place upon the eternal files of this Government forever as an antidote to the injury which has been perpetrated by the veto, an injury to reputation as well as a deprivation of an all-important pecuniary right which this woman was entitled to in the judgment of the Congress of the United States.

I might in this connection make some other remarks bearing upon the general topic of these vetoes, but I wish this matter to be considered without politics and apart from politics. It is a personal affair which ordinarily could be adjusted in the courts, but which could not in this case be adjusted in the courts. It is a matter that appeals to everything just and natural in the most ordinary human nature, and that there may be no excuse for the reiteration of these charges or efforts of ingenuity and investigation in some way to impeach or weaken the force of this irrefragable testimony as to this particular woman, no effort to conceal the force of the testimony and to do this woman the justice that evidently upon the basis of these facts belongs to her, and that there may be no excuse to mix this case up with the politics of the country, I will forbear upon this occasion the general remarks which at some time I shall be glad to offer to the Senate.

Mr. COCKRELL. Mr. President, the President of the United States, as a matter of course, in vetoing this bill had no personal feeling in the matter, and could not have been actuated by any personal ill will. He vetoed it because he believed it was right to do so and because he believed that it was a fraud.

Some time ago the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. DAVIS] made an onslaught upon the President on this very case, and it was then that I challenged the Committee on Pensions to bring in a report in favor of passing this bill over the President's veto, and to-day that challenge stands unanswered.

Now, in order to avoid that the Senator from New Hampshire has come in here with a volume of hearsay testimony. He quotes what two of the ministers of the Catholic Church say, and comments upon it by asserting that they are always very careful in such matters. That is true, and now in each one of these certificates they do not speak upon any personal knowledge, and they so state.

Mr. BLAIR. To what does the Senator refer?

Mr. COCKRELL. To those two letters the Senator read from Catholic clergymen.

Mr. BLAIR. But the facts are sworn to by witnesses who assert facts positively.

Mr. COCKRELL. I am talking about the two Catholic priests whose letters the Senator read. Here is one:

GONZAGA COLLEGE, *Washington, D. C., July* 11, 1888.

From the many references shown me by Mrs. Mary Ann Dougherty I should judge her to be a person of a trustworthy character and capable of performing whatever she undertakes in her line of usefulness.

P. J. O'CONNELL, S. J.

He does not know a thing about it; but she has gone there and spread a parcel of names before him, and to get rid of her he gives that kind of a certificate.

Mr. BLAIR. Will the Senator assent to an interruption?

Mr. COCKRELL. Certainly.

Mr. BLAIR. Let me say to the Senator that this woman tells me as to the certificate of the priest last read that he has very frequently been her confessor, and the other priest knows her well. It is not to be expected that these priests have employed this woman in their families or can give certificates as to her character from that process of association as the other parties did; and the Senator knows, as we all know, that no Catholic priest would ever seemingly indorse any bad woman.

Mr. COCKRELL. There is no seeming indorsement about it at all. He just says she has presented good names and good testimonials, and ought to be a good woman. The statement of the other priest is to the same effect. All this is mere trash, the veriest bosh, the veriest secondary and hearsay testimony ever submitted.

Now, mark the point. This woman in her long and diffusive letters to the Senator states that she was employed in the arsenal several months before the explosion in which she was injured, but she recovered; and she was employed in there again for a year. That settles this case. If she was in that arsenal, her name is upon the records and pay-rolls; and the attempt to make the impression that those records were destroyed is entirely wiped out by the fact she alleges that she was there a year afterwards.

Mr. BLAIR. Will the Senator allow me to interrupt him?

Mr. COCKRELL. Certainly.

Mr. BLAIR. There is nothing but the naked, bare assertion of the Senator from Missouri to show that her name is not upon the record.

Mr. COCKRELL. Well, I am not through yet; wait——

Mr. BLAIR. Except the fact that the records were burned up.

Mr. COCKRELL. That is just what I wanted the Senator to state. I have some papers that I will read in a few minutes, and they will show where her name is.

Mr. SPOONER. Will the Senator allow me to ask him a question?

Mr. COCKRELL. Certainly.

Mr. SPOONER. I do not remember the details or the facts bearing upon this case, but I would like to ask the Senator what there is in the case bearing on this woman's right to a pension which involves her character. If she was not employed there, if she was not entitled to a pension for that reason, in what way did it become either necessary or proper by way of veto to impeach her character and place upon the record these charges against her moral character?

Mr. COCKRELL. She based her claim to a pension upon the ground that she was a Government employé in the arsenal and was injured in that explosion.

Mr. SPOONER. Very well.

Mr. COCKRELL. Now I will show that that is false.

Mr. SPOONER. Very well.

Mr. COCKRELL. And a fraud, and that all the rest of her conduct is in accordance with that fraud.

Mr. SPOONER. There comes the point of my question. Concede it to be false, and that for that reason the woman was not entitled to a pension, the point as I understand it made by the Senator from New Hampshire is that the veto should have proceeded upon that ground without any slander or impeachment of the woman and her antecedent and moral character.

Mr. COCKRELL. There is no slander of the women, not a particle. The President did not tell half the truth about her character.

Mr. BLAIR. He did not tell any of it.

Mr. COCKRELL. He told only a part, and not half the truth about her.

Mr. BLAIR. He did not tell any of the truth about her.

Mr. COCKRELL. He stated only a part, and every word he said was the truth—every solitary word. There never was such an effort made on the face of the green earth to bolster up a fraud as this is.

Now, I speak plainly. The Senator from New Hampshire has nailed the point. He tried to make the impression that the arsenal records were destroyed in the explosion, but now Mrs. Dougherty comes in and says she was there twelve months after the explosion. Mark that point. She now says she had a son killed afterwards in the navy-yard. She can tell where all the other sons who are dead are buried, but unfortunately the grave of that son can not be found. She does not know where he was buried. How did it happen that she knows so well where the others were buried and not that son? I say the son was never killed there. I reiterate and repeat everything I said with redoubled emphasis when I challenged the Senate Committee on Pensions to bring in the evidence. I have got this case narrowed down to the exact point.

The name "George Bancroft" signed to her affidavit is not the name of the distinguished historian, but he is a claim agent, a pension agent, a pension shark.

Mr. BLAIR. I assert he is as honest a man as either of us.

Mr. COCKRELL. All right; I have his record right here. I hold in my hands a report of the Committee on Expenditures in the Interior Department accompanied by the testimony—House report 189, Forty-fifth Congress, third session, the investigation of the frauds that were attempted upon the soldiers of this country by a pack of claim agents very soon after the arrears of pension bill was passed. Here is a circular that was issued and sent to every soldier in the country whose name and address could be found. This circular is on pages 8 and 9; I will not read it all.

To the pensioners of the country:

The undersigned pensioners of Washington, D. C., having been more thoroughly identified with the prosecution of the arrears of pension bill than any others resident here, desire to present you notice of the fact that Capt. R. A. Dimmick, of this city, who came here three years ago for the sole purpose of securing the passage of this measure, the credit is entirely due for management

and organization in pressing the matter upon the attention of Congress and in educating the public, the press, State Legislatures, and other bodies; and while others who have no claim to credit are now seeking to create an impression that they have been first and foremost in this work, it is our duty to recognize Captain Dimmick not only as the prosecutor of this measure, but as the one without whose effort the measure would never have been pressed upon Congress. He put in the first petition from New York, and has been the means of having nearly every petition and every letter sent to Congress the past three years, and his work has covered from Maine to California. He has placed before the country over one hundred thousand pamphlets, petitions, and documents, and his compilation of statistical information, embracing the most unanswerable arguments, being the result of much study and work, has been the main means of enlightening the public and Congress as to the justice and merits of the claim. Senators, Representatives, and other officials here frequently call for these pamphlets.

He has done an immense work against heavy opposition and discouraging circumstances in various ways, and has frequently been obliged to assume necessary obligations, being at present indebted to the extent of $152, which we trust pensioners will not only relieve him of, but come forward and show in a generous manner their appreciation of his work; for not a pensioner in the land to-day would be entitled to receive the benefit of this law had it not been for his labors. Our assertions are fully corroborated by the attorneys of this city. As we have sought an act of justice and obtained it through the especial instrumentality of Captain D——, let us now perform an act of justice toward him in appreciation of the effort, knowing, as we do, that he has never received any compensation for the labors of the past three years. Let it not be said that pensioners were ungrateful to one to whom they owe so much, and a debt which can never be paid. We have started the movement here towards a generous testimonial by those pensioners whose homes will now be made more comfortable and happier, and not only appeal to you to return the inclosed subscription blank filled out in accordance with your appreciation of the benefits you will receive, but induce all others interested, who have the spirit of manhood and generosity, to do likewise.

Your fellow-pensioners,

J. C. S. BURGER, *War Department.*
H. H. BROWER, *Interior Department.*
W. L. TREMBLY, *War Department.*

On the back of this circular is the following:

"CERTIFICATION.

"WASHINGTON, D. C., *January* 27, 1879.

"As a matter of justice I desire to state that three years ago this month Capt. R. A. Dimmick came direct from New York to my house, and remained with me for some time, and that on his arrival he announced his intention, that he had come on for the express and sole purpose of prosecuting the arrears-of-pension bill before Congress; that he has worked unremittingly on behalf of this measure until the present, often engaged until midnight and often from midnight until morning. I do not hesitate to state that the pensioners, as well as many others of this city, know that Captain Dimmick has done an immense work with but small means, and with difficulty securing help to assist him here, even from those interested, the large majority of whom have never lent even a helping hand. I am free to say that, from the knowledge I have of the prosecution, there is not a pensioner in the land who will reap the benefit of this law but owes to Captain Dimmick, especially, a great debt of gratitude; for without his constant efforts and organization and direction of the prosecution, it is well known that not a pensioner would ever have received his just dues from the Government.

"GEO. BANCROFT."

The undersigned, pension attorneys, of Washington, D. C., desire to state that to Capt. R. A. Dimmick, of this city, is entirely due the management and direction of the prosecution of the arrears of pension bill which has become a law, and to him especially every pensioner is indebted for the success which has crowned his efforts.

T. W. TALLMADGE.
L. LOWE.
GEO. BANCROFT & CO.
L. BINGHAM & CO.
McNEILL & BIRCH.
WILLIAM CONARD & CO.
R. W. WALKER.
E. P. HALSTEAD.
R. S. & A. P. LACY.
L. H. BURSLEY.

And that circular was sent out under the name of George Bancroft, and thousands probably thought it was Hon. George Bancroft, the patriot and historian. This is the man who has been engaged in that kind of business, sending out circulars to pensioners, inviting them to make subscriptions to be paid to a fellow claim agent. So much for George Bancroft.

Now, we come down to Mary Ann Dougherty and her work in the arsenal. She was there two or three months before the explosion, and she was there a year afterwards, she says.

Mr. BLAIR. Will the Senator have the whole of that document printed?

Mr. COCKRELL. Not the whole of the document, only those two letters.

Mr. BLAIR. The Senator said he was not reading it all.

Mr. COCKRELL. The Reporter will print the whole of it. We have now got the whole case in a nut-shell. She was there in the explosion; she was blown up; and she afterwards got well and went back to work at the arsenal over a year, so she alleges. Then her son went to the navy-yard after she was blown up, and was killed there. There certainly ought to be a record of his employment. This is the first time that I have ever been able to get the date of his employment there.

Now we come to Mary Ann Dougherty. Rolls are kept and are in the Auditor's Office to-day which show who was there, who was drawing money. Not only that, but Congress passed a law appropriating $2,000 for the benefit of the persons who were injured by the arsenal explosion, and that money was paid and receipts taken from every one who was injured. I say that if Moulton and these other humanitarians who are manifesting so much sympathy for this poor woman permitted that $2,000 to be paid out without her getting any of it they were frauds, too. What were they doing that they did not see that Mary Ann Dougherty got her share or that $2,000? It was appropriated by Congress after the explosion, and a record was kept of those who received any part of it, of those who were injured. Now I will read:

ORDNANCE OFFICE, WAR DEPARTMENT,
Washington, D. C., July 19, 1888.

SIR: I have the honor to return letter from Senator COCKRELL, asking for information in regard to Mary Ann Dougherty, whose pension bill (S. 1547) was vetoed by the President July 5, 1888, and to report:

In the petition herewith embodied in the Senate report accompanying Senate bill 1547, Mary Ann Dougherty states:

* * * * * * * *

"I obtained employment in the United States arsenal, making cartridges for the United States Army then in the field; that on or about the 28th day of June, 1864, while so employed and in the line of duty, as above stated, an explosion occurred, which killed and injured a number of the employés.

"Your petitioner was one of the victims. I was severely burned and internally injured, besides being mentally injured, by the fall from the height to which I was thrown through the force of the explosion. My flesh was burned, as scars will show, and I inhaled the fire. My collar bone was also broken. I was unconscious when found, and became insane from the injuries received."

* * * * * * * *

The records of this office have been carefully examined. It is true that on the 17th of June, 1864 (not the 28th June, as stated in the memorial) an explosion occurred at the Washington arsenal in this city (now the Washington barracks) by which twenty-one employés were killed and many were wounded.

A close examination of the monthly pay-rolls of the arsenal from October, 1863, to December, 1864, nine months before and six months after the date of explosion, fails to show the name of Mary Ann Dougherty on the rolls as an employé.

On July 4, 1864, the President approved joint resolution appropriating $2,000 for the relief of the sufferers by a late accident at the United States arsenal in Washington, D. C., to be distributed to the persons injured by the explosion. The commanding officer of the arsenal made the distribution.

The commanding officer of the arsenal made the distribution, and this was after the explosion. The law was not passed until the 4th of July. The explosion occurred on the 17th of June, consequently it must have been nearly a month after the explosion before this money was paid out.

The commanding officer of the arsenal made the distribution. His accounts, now on file in the Second Auditor's office, have been carefully examined, and the name of Mary Ann Dougherty does not appear among the one hundred and twenty persons relieved by the distribution of the money.

There is nothing to be found in the records to show that Mary Ann Dougherty was then employed or was injured at the arsenal, as claimed by her in the inclosed memorial.

Very respectfully, your obedient servant,

S. V. BENÉT,
Brig. Gen., Chief of Ordnance.

Hon. SECRETARY OF WAR.

Mr. President, these are indisputable facts. They will overcome all the hearsay that can be piled up by these pitiful solicitations of Mary Ann Dougherty to kindly disposed people in this city. There is nothing in it. She never was employed in the arsenal, and her son never was, so far as I have been able to ascertain, killed at the navy-yard.

I have a letter of the Secretary of War, but I will not consume the time in reading it, which simply states that he transmits the letter of the Chief of Ordnance, which I have read.

I have also a letter here from the Secretary of the Navy in regard to this boy being killed, which is as follows:

NAVY DEPARTMENT, *Washington, July* 21, 1888.

SIR: I have the honor to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of the 17th instant in reference to the pension bill of Mrs. Mary Ann Dougherty, vetoed by the President, and asking to have a thorough search made, and advise you "whether any son of Mrs. Dougherty was employed in the navy-yard, and, if so, when and for what time and his full name, and whether any one of that name was ever killed in the navy-yard by machinery or otherwise, and, if so, when and where and under what circumstances, etc., and give me (you) any further information in regard to the subject-matter."

So far as can be judged from the petition to Congress of Mary Ann Dougherty, a copy of which you furnished for my information, her son, if she had one so employed in the navy-yard, was so employed at some time in the years 1863, 1864, or 1865. The name of her son is not stated, and as, during the war, there was a very large number of employés at the navy-yard, it would be almost impossible without better information to ascertain whether she had a son among the number.

The commandant of the navy-yard was directed to inquire and report whether the records of the yard showed that a lad by the name of Dougherty was killed by machinery in the yard at any time between 1863 and 1866, or whether any one employed in the navy-yard had knowledge of such a circumstance. I inclose herewith, for your information, a copy of the report of Captain Meade, commandant of the yard, and copies of the several papers which accompanied it. These do not sustain the statement that a boy by the name of Dougherty lost his life at the navy-yard.

If, however, Mrs. Dougherty will furnish the Department with the name of her son, and state as well as she can recollect at what time he was employed, and when and the circumstances under which he was killed in the navy-yard, further examination and inquiry will be directed to be made.

Very respectfully,

W. C. WHITNEY,
Secretary of the Navy.

Hon. F. M. COCKRELL,
United States Senate.

Here is a letter of Captain Meade:

UNITED STATES NAVY-YARD, WASHINGTON,
Commandant's Office, July 20, 1888.

SIR: The records of this yard seem to be very imperfect between the years 1860 and 1867; but from all I can gather, no such person as Dougherty was "killed by machinery" during the time specified in your telegram of the 19th instant. No one here has any recollection of such accident between 1863 and 1866.

I inclose all the letters on the subject except the surgeon's. He says there is no record in his office of such an occurrence.

Very respectfully,

R. W. MEADE,
Captain United States Navy, Commandant.

Hon. SECRETARY OF THE NAVY,
Navy Department.

This is from A. G. Kellogg, commander, United States Navy:

EQUIPMENT OFFICE, NAVY-YARD, *Washington, July* 20, 1888.

SIR: Referring to the telegram dated the 19th instant, from the honorable Secretary of the Navy, making inquiry as to a boy named Dougherty, said to have been killed by machinery in this yard some time between 1863 and 1866, I respectfully state that there is no record of such an occurrence in this Department; neither have I been able to learn of any upon inquiry among the old employés, one of whom was Mr. James Wilson, who at that time was foreman of the anchor shop.

Very respectfully,

A. G. KELLOGG,
Commander, United States Navy, Equipment Officer.

Capt. R. W. MEADE, U. S. N.,
Commandant.

Here is another from Commander McCormick:

ORDNANCE OFFICE, UNITED STATES NAVY-YARD,
Washington, D. C., July 20, 1888.

SIR: Referring to your indorsement of yesterday on the Department's telegram, regarding an accident to a boy named Dougherty, I beg leave to inform you that no mention is made in the records of this Department of any such accident, and persons employed here during the period named have no recollection of it.

I am, sir, your obedient servant,

A. H. McCORMICK,
Commander United States Navy, Inspector of Ordnance.

Capt. R. W. MEADE, U. S. N.,
Commandant Navy-Yard, Washington, D. C.

Another letter from William H. Butler:

CHIEF ENGINEER'S OFFICE, UNITED STATES NAVY-YARD,
Washington, July 20, 1888.

I remember a man by the name of "Noble" fell while rigging a smoke-stack of ordnance foundry in this yard about thirty years ago, and he died soon after the fall and before he was removed from the yard. I was well acquainted with him and worked with him frequently. I never heard of him as Dougherty, and I do not remember of a man by the name of Dougherty being killed in the navy-yard about that time.

WILLIAM H. (his x mark) BUTLER.

Witness of signature:
GEO. F. WATERS.

Here is one from Christopher Lewis:

CHIEF ENGINEER'S OFFICE, UNITED STATES NAVY-YARD,
Washington, July 20, 1888.

I came to work in the navy-yard in the year 1854. I remember hearing of a man having been killed by falling from the ordnance smoke-stack about a year before I came to work in the yard as an employé.

I was driving for a man by the name of Riley in 1853, and my work brought me in the yard frequently, and I was shown where the man fell soon after the occurrence. I was told at that time that the man who was killed was named Noble Dougherty.

CHRISTOPHER (his x mark) LEWIS.

Witness of signature:
GEO. F. WATERS.

Mr. BLAIR. It shows that there was a man killed named "Noble Dougherty."

Mr. COCKRELL. Yes.

Mr. BLAIR. When?

Mr. COCKRELL. The man states—

I came to work in the navy-yard in 1854.

This was before the other Dougherty came there.

Mr. BLAIR. Eighteen hundred and sixty-four I suppose is meant.

Mr. COCKRELL. This says 1854.

Mr. BLAIR. There is no subject-matter of investigation back that far.

Mr. COCKRELL. This statement goes back to the time when this man first came there to show how long he had been connected with the navy-yard.

Mr. BLAIR. Does he state when Noble Dougherty was killed?

Mr. COCKRELL. Yes.

I was driving for a man by the name of Riley in 1853, and my work brought me in the yard frequently, and I was shown where the man fell soon after the occurrence. I was told at that time that the man who was killed was named Noble Dougherty.

Mr. BLAIR. The other testimony is to the effect that this smoke-stack fell during the war, so that your date is evidently wrong. It should be 1864 instead of 1854.

Mr. COCKRELL. All right; it is immaterial about that.

Mr. BLAIR. If the Senator will permit me I will reply.

Mr. COCKRELL. Certainly, I will hear the Senator if he wishes to speak.

Mr. BLAIR. At 2 o'clock I wish to say a few things.

Mr. COCKRELL. Here is a letter from J. A. H. Wilmuth:

UNITED STATES NAVY-YARD, *Washington, D. C., July* 20, 1888.

SIR: I respectfully report that log-book J (from 1863 to January 1, 1865) is missing. It has never been in my charge since I have been in the office.

Very respectfully, your obedient servant,

J. A. H. WILMUTH, *Mate, U. S. N.*

Capt. R. W. MEADE, U. S. N.,
Commandant.

Now, Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. FRYE in the chair). The hour of 2 o'clock having arrived the Chair is obliged to lay before the Senate the unfinished business, being the bill (H. R. 9051) to reduce taxation and simplify the laws in relation to the collection of the revenue.

Mr. ALLISON. I do not wish to interfere with the Senator from Missouri in his elucidation of this question or with the Senator from New Hampshire, and of course I will not interrupt them.

Mr. COCKRELL. I shall only detain the Senate for a few minutes.

Mr. BLAIR. I shall want four or five minutes to reply.

Mr. COCKRELL. I hold in my hand a letter from the Secretary of War of August 20.

WAR DEPARTMENT, *Washington City, August* 20, 1888.

SIR: I have the honor to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of the 2d instant, inclosing a clipping from the Pittsburgh Dispatch relative to the case of Mrs. Mary Ann Dougherty, and requesting to be furnished with such information as the records of this Department afford relative to Captain Whyte and H. B. Moulton, who are mentioned in the article, and also that application be made to the Navy Department for information relative to a son of Mrs. Dougherty, who is alleged to have been employed in the Washington navy-yard and subsequently crushed to death in the machinery in one of the shops.

In reply, I beg to inclose a report of the 9th instant, from the acting Chief of Ordnance, giving the desired information relative to Captain Whyte and Mr. Moulton.

With reference to Mrs. Dougherty's son and his alleged employment in the Washington navy-yard, a letter was sent to the Secretary of the Navy, under date of the 13th instant, inclosing a copy of your letter and an extract from the newspaper clipping, with the request that he would communicate with you upon the subject.

With reference to your request for any information which can be obtained as to whether the George Bancroft who signed the petition of Mary Ann Dougherty is a nephew of the historian Bancroft, I beg to state that it is believed that the person referred to is George Bancroft, formerly a clerk in the Internal Revenue Bureau of the Treasury Department, and at present a member of the firm of George Bancroft & Co., pension claim agents, No. 635 G street, northwest, this city.

This George Bancroft is borne on the Blue Book as having been born in England and appointed from Iowa. He was in the division of which Mr. Charles A. Bates was chief. Mr. Bates is still a chief of division in the Internal Revenue Bureau, and can doubtless furnish other information in regard to Mr. Bancroft.

The inclosure contained in your letter is returned herewith as requested.

Very respectfully,

R. MACFEELY,
Acting Secretary of War.

Hon. F. M. COCKRELL,
United States Senate, 1518 E street, northwest, Washington, D. C.

That inclosure was taken from the Pittsburgh Dispatch, to which the Senator has referred, and which I will have the Reporter copy and insert in my remarks.

Mr. BLAIR. What is the substance of that article in the Dispatch? I did not refer to it. I referred to the Philadelphia Times. What is this article about?

Mr. COCKRELL. It is an interview with Major McKee. I will ask the Reporter to copy it and insert it in my remarks.

The article is as follows:

[The Pittsburgh Dispatch, Pittsburgh, Sunday, July 29, 1888.]

NOT ON THE BOOKS—A VERY CURIOUS FEATURE OF THE NOW FAMOUS MARY ANN DOHERTY CASE—HER NAME NOWHERE TO BE FOUND AMONG THE VOUCHERS OF THE PAY-ROLLS OF THE WASHINGTON ARSENAL—HER STORY STRAIGHT AS A STRING, BUT THE WHOLE BUSINESS SHOWS A REPREHENSIBLE LOOSENESS OF AFFAIRS.

WASHINGTON, *July* 28.

The one curious and mysterious feature of the Mary Ann Doherty case is that no record of the woman's name can be found on the books of the Second Auditor's Office, where the vouchers of the pay-rolls of the arsenal are kept. When Senator COCKRELL said, in uttering his defiance to Senator DAVIS, that he would undertake to show from the records that no such person was employed in the arsenal in 1864, many thought that it was a mere bluff. But COCKRELL is not that kind of a man. He is famous for posting himself in regard to the smallest details of a case, yet no one seemed to know whether the Senator had searched the records or not.

At the Second Auditor's Office to-day no one knew of the search having been made in regard to the Doherty case. Thereupon the Dispatch correspondent procured from Secretary Fairchild a note to the Second Auditor, directing that a thorough search be made for the name of Mary Ann Doherty among the vouchers of 1864. As the examination was about to begin it was learned that a week ago Mr. John Cook, chief clerk of the Ordnance Department, had made some investigation of the matter. Repairing to Mr. Cook the correspondent was informed that at the instance of Senator COCKRELL he (Mr. Cook) had, with another clerk, made a most searching examination of the vouchers from October, 1863, to December, 1864, and that the name Mary Ann Doherty was not to be found. Neither was it among the list of names of beneficiaries from the $2,000 appropriated for the relief of those wounded by the explosion.

The undoubted fact of the absence of the name from existing records was the chief basis of the President's veto of the bill passed by both branches of Congress.

Now for the other side. Mary Ann herself, who is 53 years old, tells a very straight story, and Captain Whyte is convinced that he and other officers signed the certificate dated March 9, 1880, only after they had ample evidence from persons acquainted with the facts that there was nothing fraudulent in the application of Mrs. Doherty. H. B. Moulton, a lawyer of unquestioned veracity, made affidavit that he was foreman of the cartridge department at the arsenal June 17, 1864, when the explosion occurred; that Mary Ann Doherty worked under him, and that he knew her; that she was badly injured by the explosion. He has no doubt that the Mary Ann applying for a pension is the Mary Ann who was blown up.

There was plenty of evidence that not long after the explosion the young son of this Mrs. Doherty was given a situation at the navy-yard, at the solicitation of citizens, on account of the injuries and impoverished condition of the mother, and that this boy, who was about 9 years of age, was caught in the machinery of one of the shops and crushed to death.

Mrs. Doherty's story is indorsed by Admiral Porter, George A. Bancroft, a nephew of the historian, and other gentlemen of equal reputation, who learned the story years ago, before this application for a pension was thought of. Yet with all this testimony, involving H. B. Moulton's positive assertion of the employment of Mrs. Doherty at the arsenal at that time, no such name appears on the pay-rolls, and that is unaccountable, except upon two theories, either that she was appointed the 1st of June and was blown up before the first day—in which case her name would not appear on the rolls—or else, admitting Moulton's affidavit to be correct, she was known to Moulton as Mary Ann Doherty and drew her pay under another name.

One fact that seems to have been generally overlooked is that the case was given among others to a subcommittee of the Committee on Pensions, of which Senator BLODGETT, of New Jersey, is chairman. Senator BLODGETT investigated the case and made a favorable report. It was upon the strength of this report that the bill was passed, and therefore BLODGETT is really responsible for all the

wrangling that has been indulged in, the epithets that have been hurled at the President, and the almost bloody encounter in the field of honor between BLAIR, the Puritan, and BUTLER, the Fire-eater.

It has certainly become a very interesting as well as perplexing case, and all the more interesting because both sides are preparing to fight it out on the lines already marked. As for Mary Ann Doherty personally, she is not an attractive individual. She has worked herself into a condition of excitement over her pension which unfits her for work. She does nothing but gad about—often none too sober—and bore every one she meets with her story. But that has nothing to do with the truth or justice of the matter, and so the battle will be fought just as though she were the most charming woman in the world.

I will next read a letter of General Macfeely, Acting Secretary of War, dated the 21st of August, inclosing a copy of the communication from the Chief of Ordnance, which simply shows that Captain Whyte is a retired officer of the Army and was chief clerk at the arsenal, and that Moulton was employed at the arsenal.

WAR DEPARTMENT, OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Washington, August 21, 1888.

SIR: In response to your telegram of this date I have the honor to inclose herewith a copy of a report of the 9th instant from the Acting Chief of Ordnance in the case of Mary Ann Dougherty, which was inadvertently omitted from Department letter of the 20th instant.

Very respectfully,

R. MACFEELY,
Acting Secretary of War.

Hon. F. M. COCKRELL,
United States Senate, 1518 R street, northwest, Washington, D. C.

ORDNANCE OFFICE, WASHINGTON, *August* 9, 1888.

Respectfully returned to the Secretary of War.

The Captain Whyte referred to is a retired officer of the Army, and at the time of the explosion (June 17, 1864) he was the chief clerk at the Washington arsenal. In regard to H. B. Moulton, our records show that he was employed at the Washington arsenal in the capacity of laboratorian during the months of May, June, August, September, October, November, and December, 1864, at wages of $2, $2.25, $2.50, and $2.75 per day, respectively. The records prior to May, 1864, were not examined, nor were they after December, 1864.

The names of all Government employés at the arsenal would necessarily appear on the monthly pay-rolls, and the absence of the names of any persons from the pay-rolls would be evidence that they were not employed at the arsenal.

CHAS. S. SMITH,
Captain Ordnance Department, United States Army,
Acting Chief of Ordnance.

These papers prove beyond the power of controversion that Mary Ann Dougherty was never employed in that arsenal and was never blown up in the arsenal, and never received one dollar of the $2,000 appropriated and paid out to the one hundred and twenty persons who were injured in that explosion, and there the records stand, and they can not be impeached or overthrown by the hearsay, flimsy, whimsical statements that have been introduced here of men, women, and children in the city of Washington.

Mr. GEORGE. The Senator will permit me to ask him, are the rolls of employés in the Department for the year and month in which this explosion took place in this arsenal now perfect?

Mr. COCKRELL. They are, and the names of the one hundred and twenty people who received the $2,000 are all there upon the rolls.

Mr. BLAIR. The Senator will permit me a word right there. He has produced no evidence whatever that at the particular period covered by the explosion the records exist at all. He has produced general letters, but no records within that time.

Mr. COCKRELL. I have produced a letter that a search of the rolls in the Department shows that her name is not upon them, and that a search of the roll containing the 120 names of persons to whom the $2,000 was distributed shows that it does not contain her name; and that is all anybody can state.

Mr. BLAIR. The Senator simply proves that this woman has received an additional wrong in not getting her share of the compensation awarded.

Mr. COCKRELL. It is wonderful with Moulton and all her friends at her back and $2,000 distributed out that she did not get any share of it. That is too thin.

Mr. BLAIR. I will reply to the Senator.

Mr. COCKRELL. Do.

Mr. BLAIR. The Senator has demonstrated a capacity that no human being ever possessed before or undertook to claim; that is, that he can prove a negative. We have brought here the affirmative evidence of witness after witness of the highest character, unimpeached and unimpeachable, and they swear to personal and direct knowledge of every fact that was alleged in this woman's petition, and to every fact that is in controversy in this case before the Senate. The Senator knows that, and although he has exhibited a great deal more of modesty and of quietude of manner in the way in which he has offered this testimony than he did when he made the charges the other day, I submit that even now there is a greater amount of vigor in the manner in which he undertakes to perpetrate this fraud upon the country in the innocence of his soul than there ought to be.

How is the testimony of these witnesses to be impeached? How are you to meet the testimony of the Admiral of the Navy and the dozen other high citizens of this country who made their certificates to the essential truth of all the facts contained in this woman's petition, which contained all the facts in controversy here before the Senate? How are you to meet the assertions of Major McKee and Sergeant Campbell, and four or five others, several of whom had personal knowledge and were there at the time, and swear that this identical woman worked for the Government and was blown up and her life almost destroyed, and that she suffered from insanity for years afterwards, being able, however, in view of the destitution of her children, to render some service for about a year, but from the explosion until now an injured, a suffering, and poor, distressed, unfortunate woman, who is deserving of sympathy instead of this effort of a great Government to fugle itself into four more years of position by assailing a laboring woman, sick and poor woman, like Mrs. Dougherty.

I did not anticipate just this style of meeting a case of this kind before the Senate. Let me remind the Senator from Missouri that if his sneers are sincere, the President himself did not put his veto upon the ground that the woman's assertions of fact were not true; but when he was met in the Senate and in the country, before he was met in the Senate with the protest of all decent people that he had no right to villify this woman, even though she was an outcast, assuming the truth of all that has been charged and not proven, and which has been asserted after it was demonstrated to be false—assuming the truth of the whole of it, the President is an infamous libeler when he uses the great constitutional power he has to hand this poor woman's name down to remotest posterity defamed and libeled unnecessarily. Her character was not in issue at all, and when this was called to the attention of the Senator and the President how did they meet it? They go to work and undertake to prove that this woman is a fraud, and after all this testimony has been offered they come in with this infamous charge sustained by negation, without any evidence at all.

I suppose there is a better nature in every man; and if I fail to find that better nature, if I fail to reach it in the Executive, I shall infer that it is a minus quantity and not there. I come here and discard all secondary evidence, all general comments, all outside matters, and confine myself to the evidence in this particular case, and I have produced here nothing but legal evidence, such as is made use of in the establishment of claims before the Departments—the positive, direct, sworn testimony of witnesses who knew about this case, and who are not to be discarded and put aside by the fact that certain records of this Government have been carelessly kept or carelessly guarded, blown up or destroyed by fire. When I produce that kind of testimony, confined to the specific issue, how does the Senator meet it? He gets up and denounces not only this woman and her case as a fraud, but everybody connected with it as having come here and lied under oath, or lied in another way quite as guilty, by their letters and affirmations in writing.

Here are persons whose characters are assailed besides Mrs. Dougherty. Mrs. Weaver is or has been at the head of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of this city, a woman of as good character as there is on the face of the earth, and she told me, as I understood her, that in her efforts to get information in regard to the death of this boy in the navy-yard she was treated discourteously by the officers, and was informed that this was getting to be a political issue and they must keep quiet. Mrs. Dougherty told me in regard to an all-important piece of testimony of a man who knew of the facts about the explosion, now employed under this Government, that he did not dare to tell the truth about it, because he had been warned by emissaries of the Government to keep still, that it was a political issue, and they must be careful what they said or they would lose their places. The disgrace, the mantling disgrace of this whole line of statements of this kind that come to me is shameful. I hope to Heaven they are not true. There could be no motive whatever for these parties to come to me with asseverations of this kind.

Now, what does it amount to that certain officials do not find the records in the Treasury Department? I doubt whether if they were there they would find them. I doubt very much if they were there that they would find them. I doubt whether they would find records of this kind without some difficulty and prolonged search, and it would be the easiest thing in the world to overlook them if they were under their very eyes.

I have come to believe, what I would not at one time have stated but for this persistence in face of the proof I have adduced, that there has been an amount of connivance and trickery and fraud perpetrated by those in the employment of the Government to victimize this woman, and put her in the wrong as against the veto of the President, that would shame the very denizens of the pit itself.

The Senator inadvertently dropped out the word and told me the date was 1854, as though it was not a mistake in the writing as to when the falling of the smoke-stack occurred. The other witnesses speak of it as something that occurred during the war, as I recollect.

But he would put that occurrence long before the occurrence of another fact in controversy here. But here it seems was a man who remembered "Noble Dougherty," who was injured in this way by the falling of the smoke-stack, and the name is Dougherty. It would be marvelous if the name had been preserved in the records in any case, but here is this man's recollection, a recollection coming from the other side, and along with that is the testimony of half a dozen witnesses who knew personally about this matter; and this evidence, which will appear in the RECORD to-morrow, I commend to the careful examination of every lawyer, yes, of every person of ordinary common sense who can get access to it.

The Senator says he does not find anything down there in the records of the surgeon. In my belief—I do not know anything in regard to that—it does not follow that the boy was ever taken care of. Possibly under the pressure of affairs in this Dougherty family he may have been dumped into the water and be lying at the bottom of the Potomac to-day. The woman says she does not know where he was buried, and the Senator sneers at her because in her insanity, in her illness and confinement in an asylum and under the treatment of the physicians there, at her home and elsewhere, she does not know what has become of the body of her child. God may have buried that boy's body, and it may be found in the future under the guardianship of the same great Being who buried Moses on the mountain top; and the Senator may find possibly that this defamation to which he has made himself a party will be a very serious matter in some other tribunal where the boy will confront him and those who do injury to his mother, as does the Senator in his effort to defend his chief.

The Senator begins a reply to this evidence by reading from some old manuscript or document the complimentary allusions made by soldiers in the employment of the Government to the services of one Captain Dimmick in obtaining the passage of the arrears-of-pension law. He does seem to have been exceedingly efficient, and these men sent out their request for contributions to a testimonial, Mr. George Bancroft indorsing it on the back. Do you suppose these soldiers, in their efforts to procure suitable testimonials to Captain Dimmick, himself a soldier, would attempt to palm off on the whole United States of America the name of a single man and the name of one man only, George Bancroft, whose indorsement was not that of an honest man, calculated to give credence and support to their circular? The Senator says, undoubtedly the whole country believed that that was George Bancroft, the historian. Is it any disgrace to this man to wear the name of George Bancroft, the historian? Is he to go about the country explaining that he is not George Brancroft, the historian?

There is nothing upon the face of the paper signed by Mr. Bancroft in this case which would make it improper for a man to affix or sign his name to it. I thought it very likely it was George Bancroft, the historian. I sent for him, and he did not pretend that he was somebody else; he put on no airs. I then made inquiry outside, and I found that this same George Bancroft is a man of most excellent character in the city of Washington, whose associates are among the religious people, the churches of this city, and who stands, so far as I can learn, as well as any of them or any of us, and there is not the slightest reason on the face of the earth to suppose that he is in any way misconducting himself in connection with this case; moreover, the evidence shows that he had nothing to do with getting it up, more than to present it to the Department.

And so it comes to pass that these officers of the Government who claim to have personal knowledge that this woman has been blown up and was injured, and then these various other officers who know this by repute, having lived here in the city, understanding about it, make their certificate in regard to it, and the Senator would reply to all that mass of evidence by saying this man is not George Bancroft, the historian. He may be a much better man, though I have high respect for George Bancroft, the historian, and no more honorable name exists in that great American history which he has written than the name of the author at the beginning of it.

But the Senator took out the Pittsburgh Dispatch and was going to read it, but his astute eye was arrested, and I thought he was not going to read it, and did not read it. He said he would have it printed—some of it—and I desired to know if it was to go into the RECORD. So I took the paper from the Senator myself, and now I will read it.

The Pittsburgh Dispatch. Pittsburgh, Sunday, July 29, 1888.

It will be borne in mind that this bears on the effort of the Department after the tumult had been raised to discredit the testimony of McKee and the rest of them, and to get them to say they never signed any such paper, and that it was a fraud, an imposition. A big business for the Administration! Undoubtedly that is where the large part of the surplus has gone to. [Laughter.]

NOT ON THE BOOKS—A VERY CURIOUS FEATURE OF THE NOW FAMOUS MARY ANN DOUGHERTY CASE—

There was a twang in the Senator's tone. I can not imitate that, but I will ask the Senate to consider that the twang is in as well as the contents of the paper.

[The Pittsburgh Dispatch. Pittsburgh, Sunday, July 29, 1888.]

NOT ON THE BOOKS—A VERY CURIOUS FEATURE OF THE NOW FAMOUS MARY ANN DOUGHERTY CASE—HER NAME NOWHERE TO BE FOUND AMONG THE VOUCHERS OF THE PAY-ROLLS OF THE WASHINGTON ARSENAL—HER STORY STRAIGHT AS A STRING, BUT THE WHOLE BUSINESS SHOWS A REPREHENSIBLE LOOSENESS OF AFFAIRS.

Not on the part of Mary Ann Dougherty though. No looseness in the affairs of Mary Ann Dougherty, a woman of unexceptionable character. But there is no record here to prove the character of her assailants in that respect. They stand equal before the country, and I submit it is time to produce affidavits in support of the veto and those who defend it against the charge of looseness in affairs.

[Special telegram to the Dispatch.]

WASHINGTON, *July* 28.

The one curious and mysterious feature of the Mary Ann Doherty case is that no record of the woman's name can be found on the books of the Second Auditor's Office, where the vouchers of the pay-rolls of the arsenal are kept. When Senator COCKRELL said, in uttering his defiance to Senator DAVIS, that he would undertake to show from the records that no such person was employed in the arsenal in 1864, many thought it was a mere bluff. But COCKRELL is not that kind of a man. He is famous for posting himself in regard to the smallest details of a case, yet no one seemed to know whether the Senator had searched the records or not.

At the Second Auditor's Office to-day no one knew of the search having been made in regard to the Doherty case. Thereupon the Dispatch correspondent procured from Secretary Fairchild a note to the Second Auditor, directing that a thorough search be made for the name of Mary Ann Doherty among the vouchers of 1864. As the examination was about to begin it was learned that a week ago Mr. John Cook, chief clerk of the Ordnance Department, had made some investigation of the matter.

Right here I want to ask the Senator to bear in mind that the certificates he has produced cover all the records of the time from 1861 to 1865, and they say in regard to all these records that there was no Mary Ann Dougherty.

Mr. COCKRELL. Not a bit of it.

Mr. BLAIR. Between those months. I apologize. It was from nine months before to six months after the accident.

Mr. COCKRELL. That is it.

Mr. BLAIR. It is in proof here and demonstrated by the concurrent account in the testimony given in the investigation, a sworn copy of which I have put in from the Evening Star, that the records were blown up in one of these explosions and destroyed, and yet there is no exception made, and these papers do not show that any portion of the records are absent. If there were not two explosions, there being only a little inaccuracy as to date, then it was demonstrated that the records were not on file at all, for they could not be and never were there, for they went in the air before they could be filed at all, and if there were two explosions, what reason is there to suppose that they were not as likely to go into the air in the second explosion when twenty people were killed and a large number wounded, as in the first explosion that occurred, in which it is proved that the records were destroyed? Then, of what use are these certificates that the Senator produces here when they fail directly to note that any records whatever were destroyed, and carry to the country the impression that all records during the period in question were placed on file, and that therefore the name of Mary Ann Dougherty ought to appear?

I submit that these records and these letters produced by the Senator, which at best could only undertake to prove a negative, are so far impeached and invalidated by this pretense to cover everything, when it is demonstrated that there is much that they can not cover, because they were never there, that they should all be wiped out of the case. But to go on with the Pittsburgh Dispatch:

Repairing to Mr. Cook, the correspondent was informed that at the instance of Senator COCKRELL he (Mr. Cook) had, with another clerk, made a

MOST SEARCHING EXAMINATION

of the vouchers from October, 1863, to December, 1864, and that the name Mary Ann Doherty was not to be found. Neither was it among the list of names of beneficiaries from the $2,000 appropriated for the relief of those wounded by the explosion.

Now, right on that point the Senator makes an argument, as though it could be an argument of any consequence to meet this direct and positive and overwhelming testimony from a dozen witnesses, based on the circumstance that she failed to get the money that belonged to her. Does not the Senator know that in cases of this kind scarcely one-half of those who deserve and should receive reparation get any, and here this woman sick, in the insane asylum, and unable to attend to her affairs, and Mr. Moulton injured, and for many months unable to attend to anything, and these other workmen having enough to attend to to get a living for themselves they were not likely to hunt up this woman, nor were they in any sense responsible for her at all.

The undoubted fact of the absence of the name from existing records was the chief basis of the President's veto of the bill passed by both branches of Congress.

That was not so, because the veto discussed the facts as found by Congress and rejected the claim upon those findings, and then when we said the woman's claim was good notwithstanding the veto, and when I and others criticised the fact that the President defamed the woman unnecessarily, even if she had no right on the facts to the pension, then it was that the Senator from Missouri came in and charged that all the proofs were frauds, the admitted facts sworn to by everybody, found by both Houses of Congress in this Congress and by the committees which reported on the case at the last Congress and a re-examination at the Pension Office, and nothing at the Pension Office ever developing anything to the contrary of the truth of all these three principal facts, the injury to this woman, the loss of one son by death in the navy-yard, and the kidnapping of the other. I say the Senator then came in and charged that what everybody had before, including the President in his veto, taken to be true was a fraud.

Now for the other side, and I will observe that the correspondents have a sense of justice and give both sides. That is the great saving feature of our American journalism; it plays the mischief with both sides and gets at the truth in the end.

Now for the other side.

Mary Ann herself, who is fifty-three years old, tells a very straight story, and Captain Whyte—

The man who was there in charge as chief clerk, and now a retired Army officer, and, as I understand, a graduate of West Point, blind,

seventy-three years old, whose statement is here in the proof I have presented—

and Captain Whyte is convinced that he and other officers signed the certificate dated March 9, 1880, only after they had ample evidence from persons acquainted with the facts that there was nothing fraudulent in the application of Mrs. Doherty.

I do not wonder when the Senator's alert eye crept over this article from the Pittsburgh Dispatch that he was anxious to withhold it; that he exhibited no anxiety to read it, and the more he examined it the less likely it seemed that we should ever get it, and I made my advance to the Senator's desk, and I, perusing it, found it to be a most important piece of evidence for Mrs. Dougherty's side.

H. B. Moulton, a lawyer of unquestioned veracity—

That is what I said about him; the Senator said he was a fraud—

a lawyer of unquestioned veracity, made affidavit that he was foreman of the cartridge department of the arsenal June 17, 1864, when the explosion occurred; that Mary Ann Doherty worked under him, and that he knew her; that she was badly injured by the explosion. He has no doubt that the Mary Ann applying for a pension is the Mary Ann who was blown up.

There was plenty of evidence that not long after the explosion the young son of this Mrs. Doherty was given a situation—

Did the Senator from Missouri know that there was plenty of evidence right here in his possession from these witnesses that he produced and put on record?—

There was plenty of evidence that not long after the explosion the young son of this Mrs. Doherty was given a situation at the navy-yard at the solicitation of citizens—

They can not find that petition of the citizens either, I suppose—

on account of the injuries and impoverished condition of the mother, and that this boy, who was about nine years of age, was caught in the machinery of one of the shops and crushed to death.

There is plenty of evidence—these correspondents find it and Mrs. Dougherty said the same thing—a great inventor Mrs. Dougherty!—has invented all this history and got all the responsible members of the Army and Navy, nearly, in this city to certify that her story is true; and yet it is a falsehood!

Mrs. Dougherty's story is indorsed by Admiral Porter, George A. Bancroft, a nephew of the historian.

It seems in my conversation with Bancroft something of that kind did drop out, that he was a remote connection—he did not emphasize that he was one at all. I asked him what this George Bancroft business meant. He said it was a good name and belonged to him and he used it, and I could not see why he had not the right to his own name. But I found out that he led the singing in several of the churches, that he stood first rate in the Sunday schools, and I thought he might possibly tell the truth, even if he was not the historian Bancroft himself.

A nephew of the historian—

I state this on the authority of the correspondent now—

and other gentlemen of equal reputation, who learned the story years ago, before this application for a pension was thought of.

Just think of that, all these people are inventing this story to perpetrate a fraud upon the country long before the perpetration of the fraud was throught of!

Yet with all this testimony, involving H. B. Moulton's positive assertion of the employment of Mrs. Doherty at the arsenal at that time,

NO SUCH NAME

appears on the pay-rolls—

The name went up in the same smoke in which disappeared the pay-rolls themselves—

and that is unaccountable, except upon two theories: either that she was appointed the 1st of June, and was blown up before the first day, in which case her name would not appear on the rolls; or else, admitting Moulton's affidavit to be correct, she was known to Moulton as Mary Ann Doherty and drew her pay under another name.

What is to be said of that? Moulton states that she was known as Mary Ann Dougherty; he put her name upon the pay-roll; and the other solution which is suggested here is perhaps the true one. Of the other two theories which I suggest, either one would account for it. One is that the clerk in his search at the Department failed to find her name on the roll, if the name was there, and the second is, that in the second explosion rolls were as likely to be destroyed as in the first, and it is demonstrated that in the first the rolls were destroyed. And these Government certificates fail to take notice of any destruction of rolls whatever, yet the Senator from Missouri would have us believe they have got all the names of persons that were in the employment of the Government during that period, notwithstanding the proven destruction of a part of the rolls in at least one explosion, and undoubtedly in both, if there was more than one.

One fact that seems to have been generally overlooked is that the case was given, among others, to a subcommittee of the Committee on Pensions, of which Senator BLODGETT, of New Jersey, is chairman. Senator BLODGETT investigated the case and made a favorable report.

It might have been said that it was also investigated in the last Congress, and Senator SEWELL made a favorable report also.

It was upon the strength of this report that the bill was passed, and therefore BLODGETT is really responsible for all the wrangling that has been indulged in—

Perhaps that accounts for what is said to be the difficulty over in New Jersey—

the epithets that have been hurled at the President, and the almost bloody encounter in the field of honor between BLAIR, the Puritan, and BUTLER, the Firecater.

Comment is unnecessary on that.

It has certainly become a very interesting, as well as perplexing case, and all the more interesting because both sides are preparing to fight it out on the lines already marked. As for Mary Ann Doherty personally, she is not an attractive individual.

Perhaps this correspondent, if he had been blown up in that arsenal twenty-five or thirty years ago, been insane a good part of the time ever since, and had passed through the distress and suffering which mark the countenance of this woman, whose body was burned in many places almost to a cinder, would not be so very charming.

She has worked herself into a condition of excitement over her pension which unfits her for work. She does nothing but gad about—often none too sober—and bore every one she meets with her story. But that has nothing to do with the truth or justice of the matter.

Thank God here is a correspondent who has struck the point in the case at last.

And so the battle will be fought just as though she were the most charming woman in the world.

And that is the way it ought to be fought.

Mr. President, I have no more to say. If the President of the United States and the Senator from Missouri and the country can leave this matter where it is, I am content; but Mary Ann Dougherty is vindicated. There is nothing against her but the unsustained and libelous assertion of the President in his veto message, made unnecessarily, irrelevantly, and wrongfully, and the effort of the Senator from Missouri to bear him out in the false position which he has assumed.

JAMES M. WILLBUR—VETO MESSAGE.

Mr. VEST. I rise to morning business.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. Before morning business can be entertained by the Chair it is his duty to lay before the Senate a message from the President of the United States, which will be read.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read the message.

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President——

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. Does the Senator from Georgia rise to the question that has just been before the Senate?

Mr. BROWN. I rise to ask the Senator in charge of the tariff bill to yield to me a few moments until I present a petition, and I want to submit a few remarks in connection with it.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The Chair can not entertain morning business until the messages of the President, now on the table, are laid before the Senate. The reading of the message will proceed.

The Chief Clerk resumed and continued the reading of the message, as follows:

To the Senate:

I herewith return without approval Senate bill No. 1044, entitled "An act authorizing the Secretary of the Treasury to state and settle the account of James M. Willbur with the United States and to pay said Willbur such sum of money as may be found due him thereon."

The claim mentioned in this bill grows out of alleged extra work done by the claimant in the construction of the post-office and court-house building in the city of New York.

The United States, in September, 1874, entered into a contract with Messrs. Bartlett, Robbins & Co., by which they agreed to furnish and put in place certain wrought and cast iron work and glass for the illuminated tiling required for the said building according to certain specifications and schedules which formed a part of said contract. The work was to be of a specified thickness, and the contractors were to be paid for the same at certain rates per superficial foot. The approximate estimate for the entire work was specified at $35,577.56. Samples of the tiling to be put in were submitted to the Supervising Architect and accepted by him.

In August, 1874, the claimant entered into an agreement in writing with Bartlett, Robbins & Co. to do this work as subcontractor for them at certain prices for each superficial foot of said tiling put in place.

In neither contract was the weight of the tiling mentioned.

The work was, under the contract with Messrs. Bartlett, Robbins & Co., completed, and after such completion and the measurement of the work the said firm of Bartlett, Robbins & Co. were paid by the Government the sum of $35,217.57, in full satisfaction of their contract with the United States.

It appears that after the completion of the work the claimant gave notice to the Government that he had a claim against Bartlett, Robbins & Co., growing out of said work, for the sum of $3,744.44, and requested that payment be withheld from said firm until his claim against them was adjusted.

The fact that said claim had been made having been communicated by the Supervising Architect to Bartlett, Robbins & Co. on the 22d day of August, 1876, they responded to the Supervising Architect as follows:

"DEAR SIR: We inclose copy of our account against Willbur and the Illuminated Tiling Company and a copy of Willbur's assignment to the tile company, which includes a copy of his agreement with us; and when the Department settles the measurement of the work the items in the contract will show just what the amount is, and, as we have repeatedly assured him, he will have all the measurements the Government gives us.

"If any one has cause of complaint in this case it is us. Four times the work came to a stand, or nearly so, and our Mr. B. was compelled to go to New York and stay until it was moving again, charging his expenses by Willbur's request, and finally it had to be finished by others, etc. We know this does not interest you particularly, as you do not know him in the matter, but there has been so much willful misrepresentation we thought silence might be misconstrued.

"It is charitable to think Willbur must be crazy.

"Very respectfully, yours,

"BARTLETT, ROBBINS & CO."

In an opinion of the Solicitor of the Treasury concerning this claim, dated November 30, 1883, I find a statement that on the 20th day of October, 1876, a paper was filed by the attorneys of the claimant, in which his claim for extra work and material in performing his contract was alleged to be $21,857.94. It is further stated that this claim was hastily drawn by one of Willbur's attorneys, and without consultation with him.

On or about the 20th day of March, 1877, Mr. Willbur himself filed a statement

of such extra work and material, in which he claimed for the same the sum of $42,685.20.

Another statement made by Willbur, in February, 1878, presents a claim on account of the same matters, amounting to $47,159.62.

This claim, so variously stated, is based upon the allegation that tiling and frames of greater thickness than were required by the contract were put in the building. Although it is insisted by the claimant that these thicker tiles and frames were directed to be put in, or at least accepted by the person having charge of the construction of the building for the Government, I hardly think it will be seriously contended that the claimant has any legal claim against the United States.

But, with a view of discovering whether, upon equitable grounds, the claimant should be paid anything by the Government for glass and iron of greater thickness than its contract with Bartlett, Robbins & Co. required, and which had been put in its building by their subcontractor, the Secretary of the Treasury in 1884 appointed a committee of three persons to examine and report upon this claim of Willbur's, "with a view of determining what portion, if any, it is proper for the Government to pay."

On the 24th day of January, 1885, this committee made a report, by which they determined that there should be paid to the claimant on account of the matters alleged the sum of $1,214.90.

This report was based upon the measurements, examinations, and estimates of two experts, one selected by the claimant and the other by the committee. The report was transmitted to the House of Representatives by the Secretary of the Treasury and an appropriation asked to pay the amount awarded.

But Mr. Willbur was not satisfied, and on the 6th day of January, 1885, addressed a communication to the Secretary of the Treasury, in which this passage occurs:

"I shall insist on a remeasurement of the entire work, as this is vital to my claim. The excess which I furnished can only be ascertained by weight instead of by measuring the thickness of the plates and frames."

At the second session of the Forty-ninth Congress and early in 1886 this claim was before the Senate Committee on Claims, and at the instance of the committee this work was again examined by experts, who came to the conclusion that the claimant was entitled to the sum of $45,615.67 for the extra work which he had performed and materials furnished.

It is only alleged that the glass tiling and frames actually put in the building were slightly thicker than those required by the contract, and this alleged increased thickness seems to be fairly represented in a general way by the claim that some of the glass and frames which were required to be 1 inch thick were actually put in 1¼ inches thick.

Upon this statement it must be admitted that the sum above stated as the value of this extra thickness is somewhat startling. In the language of the report upon this bill by the Supervising Architect, "a claim of $47,15?.02 for such slight excess on work, the price of which was $35,217.57, is hardly entitled to consideration."

The claim, as well as the award of the experts last named, reach their astonishing proportions by the application of weights to the question in the following manner: A certain area is measured. A square foot of the tiling actually put in is weighed, and a square foot of the tiling required by the contract is also weighed. Both these weights are multiplied by the area. The lesser aggregate weight is deducted from the greater, and the difference is divided by the weight of a square foot of the lightest tiling, thus reducing it to square feet of such lightest tile. These square feet are multiplied by the price agreed to be paid by the contract for each superficial foot, and an item of extra work is determined. Thus additional weight in constructed and finished tiling is converted, as far as price and measurement are concerned, into finished tile, which more than doubles the quantity actually laid down.

This can not be right. And yet the bill herewith returned directs the Secretary of the Treasury to settle this claim for extra work upon the basis of the report of the experts who have adopted this mode of adjustment; or, if not satisfied with their report, he shall within thirty days from the passage of the act cause a reweighing of said material to be made by two sworn experts, one to be appointed by him and one by the claimant, and a third to be appointed by these two, in case they can not agree. The bill further provides that he shall then pay to said Willbur the difference of excess in weight and superficial measurement as found by said experts between the illuminated tiling and frames furnished and that contracted for at the contract prices for such work and material.

There are features of this claim which suggest suspicion as to its merit. In any view of the matter I regard the claimant as seeking equitable relief. He is not entitled to dictate the rule by which his claim is to be adjusted; and he should be quite satisfied if the officers of the Government charged with the settlement of such matters are permitted by the Congress to afford equitable relief according to such rules and methods as are best calculated to reach fair results.

GROVER CLEVELAND.

EXECUTIVE MANSION, *October* 12, 1888.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. Shall the bill pass, the objections of the President of the United States to the contrary notwithstanding?

Mr. EVARTS. I move that the bill and message be referred to the Committee on Claims.

The motion was agreed to.

MARY K. RICHARDS—VETO MESSAGE.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore* laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States; which was read:

To the Senate:

I return without approval Senate bill No. 3306, entitled "An act granting a pension to Mary K. Richards."

The beneficiary named in this bill applied for a pension on the 14th day of November, 1878, and the same was rejected in April, 1879. Her claim has lately been re-examined, and since the passage of the bill herewith returned she has been allowed a pension by the Pension Bureau, it having been there determined that the former rejection was a manifest error.

With this action of the Pension Bureau I entirely concur.

I therefore venture, notwithstanding the persistent misrepresentations of my action in similar cases, to disapprove this bill upon the ground that this deserving beneficiary will receive under the action of the Pension Bureau a much larger sum than she would if such action was superseded by the enactment of the proposed special statute in her behalf.

GROVER CLEVELAND.

EXECUTIVE MANSION, *October* 15, 1888.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. Shall the bill pass, the objections of the President of the United States to the contrary notwithstanding?

Mr. BLAIR. Mr. President, there are some observations in this veto message upon which I wish to comment. The President of the United States reiterates his former assumption of unusual anxiety for the rights of soldiers in like cases, as he states, by saying that he vetoes this bill in order that the applicant may receive a still higher reward from a grateful country.

This is a case where a rejection has occurred, and in consequence of that rejection application is made to the two Houses of Congress. The investigation by the two Houses of Congress in this case calls the attention of the Pension Office to the injustice it has wrought, and rather than submit further, as in many instances, to the admonition and sometimes severe reproof contained in the reports of the two Houses of Congress, the Pension Office reviews its previous act of injustice, admits its error, and allows the claim. Meanwhile the matter proceeds in the halls of legislation. At last, when it reaches the President he makes the result at the Pension Office, which is caused by this action of the legislature of the country, the basis of claiming an unusual virtue in himself. It is not the first time that this has been done. It is not the first time that the President himself has gone to the country upon this improper pretense.

I wish to call attention to a similar case reported in the last Congress—the case of Newcomb Parker—which I had occasion to review. I shall read the report in that case upon the veto message. We have found it impossible to obtain the two-thirds vote in former Congresses in these vetoed cases, and that is the reason why the time of the Senate is not taken up by the reporting of them back and the interminable discussions which never could result, no matter how just the case, in securing the two-thirds vote necessary in the two Houses of Congress.

The majority of the Committee on Pensions, to whom was referred the message of the President of the United States, returning Senate bill No. 1077, granting a pension to Newcomb Parker, with his objections to the passage of the same, have considered the message, and reconsidered the bill and the evidence in support thereof, and report:

This is really an interesting case. The claimant filed his declaration January 7, 1889, six months before the expiration of the limitation for arrears, so that if granted he would be pensioned from the incurrence of the disability, and become entitled to considerable money. He proved that he had suffered from a broken ankle received in line of duty, and there was no doubt about it.

Two special examiners successively reported in favor of the claim. There must have been parties in the Pension Office who resented these favorable reports of their own agents. If two favorable reports result in rejection, how many are necessary to secure the admission of a claim under the rules of the Pension Office? Where the reports continue in a man's favor why should the office interrupt the flow of good results by interposing a rejection? It would seem that the best chance of success is to have a bad case, since verdicts for the plaintiff turn him out of court.

This is not an obscure case either, for the certificate of disability shows that claimant was discharged for this very permanent hurt "bv reason of an old irreducible dislocation and fracture of right ankle-joint, received at Fort Totten, District of Columbia. Is unfit for duty in Invalid Corps."

A permanent incurable hurt, contracted in the service, is proved by their own records, and then proved again by two reports of their own agents, who must have known better than to do justice if it could be avoided when their work had to run the gantlet of such official supervision at Washington.

Well, the result of all this demonstration was the rejection of the claim November 10, 1885, on the ground that claimant "is unable to prove that he contracted or had any disability in the service that he did not have prior to enlistment," and the claimant was notified accordingly. Whereupon, January 14, 1886, Senator EDMUNDS introduced the following bill (S. 1077):

"That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension-roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of Newcomb Parker, late of Company K, Eleventh Regiment of Vermont Volunteers."

Which, on the 15th day of April, was reported by the Committee on Pensions to the Senate without amendment, and the following statement of facts submitted in support of the bill:

[Senate Report No. 561, Forty-ninth Congress, first session.]

The Committee on Pensions, to whom was referred the bill (S. 1077) granting a pension to Newcomb Parker, have examined the same, and report:

The claimant, Newcomb Parker, late private of Company K, Eleventh Vermont Volunteers, enlisted August 14, 1862, and was discharged February 8, 1864. He made application for pension January 7, 1880, alleging dislocation of right ankle by a falling stockade at Fort Slocum, District of Columbia, about January 1, 1864. The claim was rejected November 10, 1885, on the ground that the claimant is unable to prove that he contracted or had any disability in the service that he did not have prior to enlistment.

It appears from the report of the Adjutant-General that this soldier was disabled by reason of lameness from the fracture of ankle-joint December 31, 1863, and that on February 8, 1864, was discharged for disability, but when and where fracture of ankle occurred the records do not show. The certificate of disability for discharge is, however, on file, and states that he was fouud unable to perform the duties of a soldier because of old and irreducible dislocation and fracture of right ankle-joint received at Fort Totten, District of Columbia, and unfit for duiy in Invalid Corps, discharged at his own request, disability one-quarter.

The last examination by a medical board, August 6, 1885, rates the disability by reason of injury to right ankle at total.

The claimant has entered evidence of several parties who knew him before enlistment, showing that he was then a sound man and had no difficulty with his ankles, and also testimony as to the incurrence of the disability in the service.

The report of a special examiner, dated October 23, 1885, which closes as follows, is also on file:

"From the testimony in this claim I am of the opinion it is one of merit, and therefore respectfully recommend it for admission."

The report of another special examiner, in which a large amount of testimony was taken, dated August 4, 1885, is also on file in which he states:

"I think there is merit in the claim for injury of right ankle, and that on that account it may be admitted."

It would seem from this evidence that there can be no doubt that this disability was incurred in the service, and that this case should properly have been admitted as recommended—as recommended by the special examiners—in the Pension Office. Why it was not so admitted does not appear from the papers.

Your committee recommend the passage of the bill.

On the 21st of April—

I ask attention to the dates, to see how an effort is made by the veto

message to put Congress in a false position, just as I doubt not is the case now before us—

On the 21st of April the bill passed the Senate, and on the 12th of June it passed the House of Representatives, was enrolled June 14, and went to the President for his approval on the 21st of June, whereupon such proceedings were had as the following letter indicates to be usual in such cases. It will be observed that enrolled bills can not come to the possession of the Interior Department save from the custody of the President, who receives them from Congress.

"[From letter in other cases, June 14, 1886.]

"DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR.

"SIR: I send hereby enrolled bills as follows: * * * Please cause the same to be critically examined and report to this Department whether in your opinion any objections to their approval are known to exist. In cases where objections exist they should be specifically set forth.

"Very respectfully,

"H. S. MULDROW,
"Acting Secretary.

"The COMMISSIONER OF PENSIONS."

Does the President review the evidence for himself, asking the Senate for it? If he saw fit to do so, he could get the papers from the Senate, although we find it impossible for us to get public documents from the Executive when they are essential to the performance of public duty. We have asked for them and hunted for them carefully for some years and have failed to get them. If he asked he would readily get the additional evidence often in possession of the Pension Committees of Congress. These bills coming to him, enacted by both Houses of Congress, instead of reviewing them for himself or appointing some independent tribunal that has not already been overruled, he sends them back to the very source of the injustice that is complained of, and asks the Pension Office to say whether they can find any objection to the action of Congress, when that action is a re-proof of their inaccuracy or their own wrong.

February 6, all the papers on file in the Pension Office in this case were called for and sent to the Senate committee, and April 15 were returned to the Pension Office.

Being now in possession of the Senate report and of the papers from and after April 15, and of the enrolled bill from the President, and his demand for the facts, the Commissioner overhauls the performances of his subordinates in this case, and the following report of the evidence on file is the result. It will be observed that this document itself proves that it is made after the Senate action took place, and was known to the Commissioner, who personally examined this case, as a document printed herewith, containing, as it does, these words: "The papers were sent to the Senate Committee on Pensions February 6, 1886, and returned April 15, 1886."

[No. 335797. Newcomb Parker, Company K, Eleventh Vermont Volunteers.]

Claim was rejected November 10, 1885, on the ground that claimant is unable to prove that he contracted or had any disability in the service that he did not have prior to enlistment.

Soldier enlisted as private August 14, 1862, and was transferred to One hundred and twenty-ninth Company, Second Battalion Invalid Corps, December 31, 1863, at Clifburn Barracks, by reason of lameness from fracture of ankle-joint and flat foot. Discharged February 8, 1864, for disability.

Certificate of disability shows that he was discharged by reason of an "old irreducible dislocation and fracture of right ankle-joint, received at Fort Totten, District of Columbia, is unfit for duty in the Invalid Corps, and is discharged at his own request; disability, one-fourth."

Regimental records not on file.

Claimant alleges in declaration filed January 7, 1880, that about January 1, 1864, at Fort Slocum, District of Columbia, he had his right ankle dislocated by the falling of a stockade.

In deposition before special examiner he states that as near as he can remember, it was in October, 1863, at Fort Slocum, District of Columbia, a detachment of his company were engaged in strengthening the earthwork by driving a stockade. He was on top of the parapet handling one of the timbers, when he slipped and fell into the ditch, and the timber came down on him and crushed his right ankle. Was picked up by his comrades and taken to regimental hospital, which was between Fort Totten, where Company K was stationed, and Fort Slocum. Never had any trouble with his feet or ankle prior to enlistment, and has never received any injury to right foot or ankle since discharge, but admits an injury to left hip by being squeezed between two cars in 1873 or 1874. Was stripped and examined at enlistment.

Special examiner reports not reliable.

Moses Demarse, late private Company K, Eleventh Vermont Volunteers, testifies that in the fall of 1863, at Fort Totten, he had just come off of picket duty and he saw claimant lying in his bunk, and he had crutches made for him. He said, and they all said, that he was hurt coming off the bomb-proof at Fort Totten. He was all right when affiant went on pickett duty, and was lame when he returned. His ankle was not broken, for it was not in splints, but it was badly swollen, and a kind of black color and bruised. His foot was kind of flat when he enlisted, but he used it perfectly well, only it turned out a little more than the other. Can not say which foot it was.

Reputation good, by special examiner.

Nathan K. Martin testifies that he was a member of Company K, Eleventh Vermont Volunteers, and claimant seemed all right at enlistment, except that he had a twisted ankle and flat foot. Claimant was examined at enlistment at same time affiant was. Remembers that in the fall of 1863, when the defenses of Washington were being strengthened, claimant was at work, and in some way got his ankle strained. He was in line of duty. Does not remember the circumstances of the injury, only that he was at work on the fortifications.

Julius Gaudant testifies that he was a private in Company K, Eleventh Vermont Volunteers, and knew claimant from boyhood, but had not seen him for several years prior to enlistment. Did not notice that he had any trouble with his foot or a peculiar walk at enlistment. Remembers that late in the fall of 1862 (same year they went out) they were building stockade barracks, and in some way claimant got his foot, ankle, or leg hurt, and it made him lame for a long time. Did not see him when he was hurt, but did see him five minutes afterwards, and he said his foot or leg was hurt, and started away, limping. Claimant was made lame in 1862, and laid around camp for more than a year, doing nothing. Claimant's allegations were read to affiant, and he states that he does not remember the injury at all that way, and only recollects his statement above. Remembers that when claimant was hurt somebody said, "Newk's leg is broken;" and the boys said, "He is only fooling to get rid of work." But affiant did not afterwards, for he would not have kept it up so long, and he kept getting worse.

Allen S. Fleury testifies that he was a member of Company K, Eleventh Vermont Volunteers, and has known claimant ever since he was a child, and knows that as a boy and young man he was an active, athletic fellow, and never noticed any difficulty in getting around. Can not say from his own personal knowledge that claimant received any injury in the service; knows that he was transferred to the Invalid Corps for lameness, and that he was lame around camp for a considerable time before he was transferred. While he has no personal knowledge of how he became lame, yet there is an impression on his mind that he was hurt somehow at Fort Slocum in the fall of 1863. Whether that impression was made from facts within his own knowledge, or from having this matter talked up to him, he can not say.

At Fort Totten they used to play ball a good deal, and claimant was quite active; but there was a time when he did not play on account of lameness. Claimant's statement was read to affiant, and he states he does not remember any feature of the narrative.

"Good."

George H. Soules, late lieutenant, Company K, Eleventh Vermont Volunteers, states, in a reply to a letter from this office, that he remembers claimant was off duty at Fort Totten in 1863 on account of his foot and ankle being bad. As to his being sound at enlistment, knows that he was stripped and examined, and he supposed that was good evidence of soundness.

M. S. Lillie, late private Company K, Eleventh Vermont Volunteers, states, in reply to a letter from special examiner, that he remembers Parker, and was on duty with him when he was injured, and he never did any duty afterwards.

Thinks it was his hip or ankle that was injured by a small tree hitting him, but can not recall the particulars to mind.

The surgeons of the regiment have been corresponded with, but they fail to remember claimant.

Henry C. Hill, postmaster, Isle La Motte, Vt., testifies that he has known claimant since he was a boy, and prior to 1862 he seemed to have some trouble with his ankles and he had a flat foot. He walked with the right foot more turned than the left and it was flat, broken down in the instep so that there was no hollow; sold him boots from the time he was old enough to wear them until he enlisted, and he walked on the "inner side" of his feet, but he turned the right foot more than the other, wore it out on the inner side of the sole, and broke down the shank directly. It is reported that he has met with two or three accidents on the railroad since the war. He has no bias or prejudice in this matter.

Polly A. Goodsell testifies that she is claimant's sister, and that when he was a boy eight or nine years old he fell off a car and sprained his ankle; it was not broken, and he got well in a little while, and never was a cripple until he came home from the war. He never had a flat foot until he came home from the Army, and always wore his boots as straight as any of the other boys, and nothing was the matter with his feet when he enlisted; remembers of two accidents received since the war. Last winter he got jammed in coupling cars, and hurt his stomach, and about sixteen years ago he had his shoulders squeezed.

Elizabeth Parker testifies that she is claimant's mother, and that when he was about fifteen years of age, in attempting to get off a train while it was in motion the heel of his boot dragged along the ground as he hung on, and turned his right ankle and sprained it. In two weeks he was walking around again, and he never had any more trouble with that foot until he went into the Army. Both feet were alike when he enlisted, and he walked as well as ever he did; had no flat foot and did not break down the shank of his boot. He got doubled together on the cars about fifteen years ago and dislocated his right hip. Is certain that it was his right hip because we have spoken about it a good many times; that all the injuries he has received have been on that limb. Has noticed that his foot has changed since then.

He had a lump on his ankle as big as her fist when he came from the Army, but she did not see that his foot was any different from what it was when he enlisted; but since he got that hip hurt she can see a change in his foot, and it is flattened out and turned sideways. He has met with two other accidents on the railroad since, and both of them to the right limb, and of course that goes to affect the foot and ankle. He said when he returned that he was digging a trench at Fort Slocum, and fell in and broke his ankle. Knows the bones were broken because they had to straighten the ankle by bandages.

Ezra Fleury testifies that he has known claimant since he was a boy, and used to employ him a good deal. He always had a flat foot from boyhood, and a peculiar gait which gave him the appearance of slight lameness, but it did not interfere with him, and he was always ready to scuffle or wrestle with anybody who came along, and was an expert at it. Has seen him swimming, and seen his bare legs, and should say, so far as his ankles were concerned, he was a sound man in 1862.

The papers were sent to the Senate Committee on Pensions February 6, 1886, and returned April 15, 1886.

Medical examination by the Plattsburgh board, held August 6, 1885, shows as follows:

The internal malleolus of the right foot is extra prominent. Immediately below this malleolus is another bone, one of the tarsus, which is nearly as prominent as the malleolus. Below this other bone is a large callus of the integument. The ball of great toe and the internal border of the same toe are also the seat of hard calluses of the integument. The foot is everted so that he walks on the internal border of this foot. The arch of this foot is entirely obliterated. His boot shows that he walks constantly on the internal border. There is considerable motion of the ankle, and the motion of the toes is not interfered with.

Rated total for injury of right ankle.

So all that had been done in Congress had got back through the President into the possession of the Commissioner of Pensions, and thereupon he made a report, and a favorable report.

The wrapper or jacket in which the papers were kept has the following indorsement (we call especial attention to that which shows that a special act was pending):

Returned from S. C. (Senate committee) April 15, 1886.

[Indorsed on jacket.]

"No. 335797.
"Newcomb Parker; P. O., Rouse's Point, N. Y.
"Service: Co. K, 11th Vt. Vols.
"Enlisted July 14, 1862.
"Discharged Feb'y 8, 1864.
"Application filed Jan'y 7, 1880.
"Alleges dislocation of right ankle.
"Attorney: George L. Clark, Plattsburgh, N. Y.

Another of these "wretches" known as claim agents. This man is a leading member of one of the churches of the city, I happen to know.

"Nov. 19, 1885, Clark informed rejected; claimant is unable to prove any dis. in service he did not have prior thereto.
"June 22, 1886, date and cause of rejection to claim't through Hon. H. G. Burleigh.
"Ret'd from S. C. April 15, 1886.
"June 24, 1886, letter to Att'y Clark (see copy)."

In the indorsement of April 15 the letters "S. C." are used for "Senate committee" by the custom of the office, and indicate, of course, to any one examining the papers that the papers have been in the possession and on that date returned from possession of that committee.

June 24, the Commissioner makes the order indicated by the following paper now among the files:

"[335797. Newcomb Parker, Company K, Eleventh Regiment Vermont Volunteers.]

"MR. MACK, *Chief, Eastern Division:*

"The honorable Commissioner directs that this claim be allowed under his ruling No. 181.

"EVANS, *Re-rev'r.*

"JUNE 24, 1886."

This allowance of the claim, this long report in favor of it, was made after two rejections, and after, in consequence of those rejections, this man had come to Congress, got his bill through Congress, gone to the President, and the President had sent it down to the Pension Office to see if they could not find some objection to it, and finding that there was objection they could make to it, to specifically note it in their reply. They make the examination, reverse all their former action, report in favor of the claim June 24, and the Commissioner orders the claim to be allowed June 24, 1886.

Prior to June 29 all these things have taken place at the Pension Office, the bill and the action of the Pension Office considered by the Executive, and on the 29th the President of the United States sends the following veto message to the Senate:

[Senate Ex. Doc. No. 194, Forty-ninth Congress, first session.]

Message from the President of the United States, returning Senate bill 1077, without his approval.

To the Senate:

I hereby return without approval Senate bill numbered 1077, entitled "An act granting a pension to Newcomb Parker."

This claimant filed an application for a pension in the year 1880.

Before the passage of the bill herewith returned, the Commissioner of Pensions, in ignorance of the action of Congress, allowed his claim under the general law. As this decision of the Pension Bureau entitles the beneficiary named to draw a pension from the date of filing his application, which, under the provisions of the special bill in his favor, would only accrue from the time of its passage, I am unwilling that one found worthy to be placed upon the pension-rolls by the bureau to which he properly applied should be an actual loser by reason of a special interposition of Congress in his behalf.

GROVER CLEVELAND.

EXECUTIVE MANSION, *June* 29, 1886.

Now note that all these things have taken place at the Pension Office, the bill and the action of the Pension Office have been considered, and on the 29th the President sends the veto message to the Senate, which is so like the form employed in the conclusion of the present veto message, which suggested this case to me, with very slight alteration. I call attention to the similarity in the conclusion of the veto message before the Senate and the one to which I have reference.

See the deadly parallel.

To the Senate:

I return without approval Senate bill No. 3306, entitled "An act granting a pension to Mary K. Richards."

The beneficiary named in this bill applied for a pension on the 14th day of November, 1878, and the same was rejected in April, 1879. Her claim has lately been re-examined, and since the passage of the bill herewith returned she has been allowed a pension by the Pension Bureau, it having been there determined that the former rejection was a manifest error.

With this action of the Pension Bureau I entirely concur.

I therefore venture, notwithstanding the persistent misrepresentations of my action in similar cases, to disapprove this bill upon the ground that this deserving beneficiary will receive under the action of the Pension Bureau a much larger sum than she would if such action was superseded by the enactment of the proposed special statute in her behalf.

GROVER CLEVELAND,

EXECUTIVE MANSION, *October* 15, 1888.

To the Senate:

I hereby return without approval Senate bill No. 1077, entitled "An act granting a pension to Newcomb Parker."

This claimant filed an application for a pension in the year 1880.

Before the passage of the bill herewith returned the Commissioner of Pensions, in ignorance of the action of Congress, allowed his claim under the general law. As this decision of the Pension Bureau entitles the beneficiary named to draw a pension from the date of filing his application, which, under the provisions of the special bill in his favor, would only accrue from the time of its passage, I am unwilling that one found worthy to be placed upon the pension-rolls by the bureau to which he properly applied should be an actual loser by reason of a special interposition of Congress in his behalf.

GROVER CLEVELAND.

EXECUTIVE MANSION, *June* 29, 1886.

The following letter of the Commissioner, addressed to the committee, dated February 6, 1886, proves that as early as that date he was informed of the action going on in Congress; that from and after that date he was not in ignorance of the proceeding for a special act, and that up to that date, when he transmitted the papers to the Senate, nothing had been done in the way of reconsidering the case, and as a matter of fact nothing was done until in the month of June last.

"DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR, PENSION OFFICE,
"*Washington, D. C., February* 6, 1886.

"SIR: In response to your request, I have the honor to transmit herewith the papers in the claim for pension of Newcomb Parker, late private of Company K, Eleventh Vermont Volunteers, original number 335797. The claim was rejected on the ground that the claimant is unable to prove that he contracted or had any disability in service that he did not have prior to enlistment.

"Very respectfully,

"JOHN C. BLACK, *Commissioner.*

"Hon. JOHN I. MITCHELL,
"*Chairman Committee on Pensions, United States Senate.*"

The Senate kept the papers until the bill was reported and returned to them April 15. During the time the papers were in possession of the Senate nothing would have been done by the Commissioner. The bill passed the House on the 12th of June. It was in possession of the House from and after its passage by the Senate, April 21, up to June 12. It was reported to the House some days earlier, on May 11, and after the House report was made the papers, if the House had called for them, would have been returned to the Pension Office. Accordingly, on the 12th of June, we find the Pension Office astir, as by the following appears:

"BOARD OF RE-REVIEW, *June* 12, 1886.

"[No. 335797. Newcomb Parker, Company K, Eleventh Regiment Vermont Volunteers.]

"Respectfully referred to the medical referee.

"Please look over this case and state whether, in your opinion, claimant's present condition is due entirely to injury of right ankle and flat foot, shown to have existed prior to enlistment; or whether, if it is accepted that he received an injury to said ankle in the service, you can separate the two, and rate for the disability which may be due to the service, as per Commissioner's ruling No. 181.

GEO. O. EVANS, *Re-reviewer.*

"Approved:

"F. W. POOR, *Acting Chief Board Re-review.*"

"[No. 335797. Newcomb Parker, Company K, Eleventh Regiment Vermont Volunteers.]

"MEDICAL DIVISION, PENSION OFFICE,
"*Washington, D. C., June* 14, 1886.

"Respectfully returned to Mr. Poor, acting chief board of rereview.

"To say exactly what degree of disability is due to the injury received before enlistment and to that alleged to have been received in service is impossible, but if the alleged injury is accepted legally, then it is, in my opinion, the duty of the medical division to separate the injuries received before and after enlistment, and grant a rating for the injury as legally accepted.

"GEORGE P. DU BOSE, *Medical Examiner.*

"Approved:

"P. H. BARTON, *Acting Medical Referee.*"

This completes the light thrown upon the subject by the records, except as by the following unsigned document, which comes to us among the files:

"[No. 335797. Newcomb Parker, Company K, Eleventh Vermont Volunteers.]

"DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR, PENSION OFFICE,
"*Washington, D. C., June* 23, 1886.

"SIR: In reply to your communication of recent date relative to the above-entitled claim, I have the honor to state that I have caused the evidence to be carefully examined and have personally considered the same.

"You are informed that the case is now under consideration with a view to its allowance, and certificate will be issued as soon as the exigencies of the work of this office will admit.

"Very respectfully,

"——— ———, *Commissioner.*"

"GEORGE I. CLARK, 916 *F street, City.*"

Now, we submit in this connection the French proverb that "he who excuses accuses," and also the legal maxim, "unusual clauses always induce a suspicion." With all the rest, why does the President in his message suppress the fact that this claim had been formally rejected by the Pension Office, so that the claimant had no remedy but in the interposition of Congress? Why does he take pains to say that "in ignorance of the action of Congress" the Commissioner had allowed the claim under the general law? Why does he proceed to express his anxiety to save the claimant from the loss of arrears of pension by the action of Congress when such action would have no such effect, not in the least impairing his right to the allowance of the arrears, save by the force of a recent unaccountable ruling of the present Commissioner, reversing all previous practice and violating all equity, and, we believe, all legal right, made apparently as a punishment to those who dare to apply to Congress for relief, no matter what the outrage they may have suffered in the toils of the office?

Why does the President so write this message as to place Congress (whose action was based upon the rejection of the claim by the Commissioner), himself, and the Commissioner before the country in a light favorable to himself and the Commissioner and unfavorable to the legislature of the country?

Can any one believe that the Commissioner of Pensions reversed his own deliberate action rejecting this claim without a particle of further evidence or any trace of reason save as the result of the proceedings in Congress, of which it is simply absurd or worse to deny his knowledge, or at least knowledge of those who reviewed and reversed his previous action, and allowed this claim just in season to enable the President to write this peculiar veto which places Congress in the attitude of inflicting hurt to the claimant by its meddlesomeness?

The President could not have been familiar with the facts in this case; all he knows of them comes from the Commissioner of Pensions or from his office.

Who told him that the Commissioner had reversed the rejection and allowed the claim in ignorance of the action of Congress? That assertion must have come from the Commissioner, for no one else could have known of his want of knowledge. The Commissioner decided June 23 to allow the claim. June 21 the enrolled bill went to the President. Was the enrolled bill in possession of the Commissioner before he decided to allow this claim? However that may be, is it conceivable that, with the office stirred up by this pension controversy and the constant watchfulness of the office over the proceedings of Congress and the correspondence going on between committees and the office, the overhauling and transmission of files, and the special attention thus called to each case, besides the public proceedings, reports, passage of bills recorded in our Congressional daily, which goes in numbers to all Executive Departments, to say nothing of the omnipresent newspapers of the land, that the eyes of the men who do the work in the office were not fixed upon their unjust and unreasonable decision in this case, and that whether or not those who were urging the claim in Congress called the attention of the Commissioner to it, the allowance of this claim is not wholly due to the action of Congress and not "in ignorance" of that action?

There can be no good cause assigned for this ruling of the Commissioner, refusing, by reason of special acts, the right to prosecute under the general laws for arrears justly due, except in the few cases where Congress makes express or plainly implied provision that the pension granted is in lieu of all claims whatsoever. Even then, when the claim is for a vested right under existing and general laws, which is the fact in this and nearly all other cases, the action of the legislative power would fail, for a vested right can not be taken away by act of Congress, and pensions due by virtue of laws existing when the contract of enlistment should be held to be, in effect, vested rights protected by all subsequent legislation.

In closing this report it is proper to observe, as the result of a careful re-examination, that in the whole twenty-five vetoes of special pension acts, originating in the Senate, not one "bogus," or fraudulent, or ill-considered claim, so far as Congress is concerned, has been developed. Nor, in the belief of your committee, is there one, except the case of Mrs. De Krafft, in which there was a clerical error in the bill, doing no one any harm, in which the defeat of the pension by the exercise of the veto power has not worked great wrong, and in most cases, suffering to the soldiers or their dependent and needy relatives in whose favor the Congress had exercised the legislative power.

This report is prepared and submitted under the following order of Senate committee:

"At a regular meeting of the Committee on Pensions, June 29, 1886—

"*Ordered*, That the several veto messages of the President be referred, respectively, to the members of the committee who reported the bills vetoed, with instructions to examine and report the same back to the Senate, submitting any questions to the committee for advice and re-examination which they think necessary, and that any member of the minority of the committee have leave to present dissenting views."

I think this report, made upon just such a case as I presume that before the Senate to be, so far as the claim of the President is concerned, is pertinent and should go along with the message of the President, which is made part of the records of the country.

I wish in this connection to have printed the first, second, third, fourth, and part of the fifth pages of Senate report No. 1424, Forty-ninth Congress, first session, being the general report made by the Committee on Pensions, or made by myself by their direction upon the pension vetoes which were referred to the committee. It is the general matter preceding the reports upon a large number of vetoes of Senate bills in the last Congress:

Mr. BLAIR, from the Committee on Pensions, submitted the following report, to accompany bill S. 2005, returned by the President with his objections thereto.

The Committee on Pensions, to whom was referred the message of the President returning Senate bill 2005, granting a pension to Mary J. Nottage, widow of Thomas Nottage, late a sergeant of Company F, Third New Hampshire Volunteers, with the Executive disapproval, have considered the same, and have re-examined and reconsidered the evidence in support of the claim of this soldier's widow for a pension.

The committee report the veto message back to the Senate and recommend the passage of the bill, the President's objections to the contrary notwithstanding.

It is said that never since the foundation of the Government has there been an Executive veto of a private pension bill, save in a single instance, until the present session. How that may be is of no consequence, but so great has become the number of such vetoes interposed by the present Executive, all within a few weeks past, and so extraordinary the censure, sometimes rudely expressed, and in nearly every instance severely implied, of the action of the two Houses of Congress and of their committees, upon whom has devolved the wearisome and generally unappreciated labor of investigating these claims, accompanied in many cases by such ridicule of, and evident disgust with, the claims themselves, that your committee feel that they are justified in a brief review of the circumstances involved.

In doing this a strong effort will be made to restrain a not unnatural feeling of indignation, which, if permitted to assume the proportions which the provocation justifies, would wholly destroy those respectful forms of expression which must be maintained in official intercourse between the different officers and Departments of the Government. This becomes the more necessary in proportion as it is rendered the more difficult by reason of the unjust and unexampled style in which some of the messages of the President are expressed. It shall be the effort of the committee to get on in this difficult matter without violating the courtesies of official intercourse by imitating an example which, so far as we are aware, is without precedent and which, so far as we are concerned, shall remain so.

We have caused an examination of the files of the two Houses of Congress to be made, and we think with a substantially accurate result, including the first session of the Forty-ninth Congress from its commencement to the 26th day of June.

There have been 3,788 bills for private pensions, or for increase of private pensions already granted, introduced in the House, and 764 in the Senate; 530 House bills and 88 Senate bills have passed both branches and gone to the President for his approval.

The President has vetoed so far forty-five House bills and twenty-three Senate bills, or 26 per cent. of the Senate bills and 8½ per cent. of the House bills which have been submitted for his approval. These vetoes have been accompanied with declarations of distrust of the merits and good faith of the mass of other legislation which he can not veto for want of time.

It is necessary to state the facts, although your committee is not insensible to the special condemnation with this disparaging contrast between the proportion of Senatorial ill-work as compared with that of the House inflicts upon them. Each House, however, is responsible for every bill which reaches the Executive. The actual work done in the way of passing bills by the Senate is as follows: House bills passed by the Senate 530, Senate bills 292. There would seem to be unacted upon or rejected by the House of bills introduced in the House about six-sevenths of the whole number, while the Senate has acted favorably upon about three-eighths of the whole number of bills originally introduced in that body thus far during the session.

It will also be observed that but a small proportion of those introduced are reported by either House. It is, in fact, impossible to investigate them generally and fully, and it is all that mortal strength can perform to act upon those which are believed to be clearly just. It is but an idle waste of time to write up adverse reports, as a rule, and only those who have comparatively little else to do can spend time in making reports against doubtful claims which are likely yet to be made good ones by testimony which may be produced later in the same or in subsequent sessions.

We observe further, that whatever may be said to the contrary, it is very seldom that a member of the House or Senate will introduce any bill in the slightest degree tainted with fraud. Very few bills are introduced without some knowledge of their merit on the part of those who introduce them.

A computation as careful as your committee is able to make without the full examination of each bill—and even if that were done it would still remain to deduct the pension already being paid in cases of increase (a very large proportion of the total named in the bill)—satisfies the committee that up to this date, June 26, the whole amount of money called for annually by all the private pension bills passed by Congress this session, including those struck down by the President, the character of which will appear further on, is not more than $150,000, and $200,000 would cover the total possible raid by Congress had it been permitted to pursue its scandalously extravagant career unchecked to the end of the session. The vetoes have covered not far from $20,000, or perhaps $25,000, and applicants for special relief are expected to know better than to press Congress and the President further for a redress of their wrongs.

These sums of money are not to be despised by this nation, but it would be a comfort to know that it rightly belongs to us—or, at least, that if withheld wrongfully it did not cost health and life to those and the dependent relatives of those whose valor and sacrifices preserved our institutions and made the official existence possible which has saved this cash to the surplus in the Treasury. The present population of this country is at least 60,000,000 souls, and our wealth not less than $60,000,000,000. We have also, let us feel grateful to Providence, a most encouraging prospect for the future.

Much criticism has been indulged in by the President of the methods of legislation pursued by the two Houses of Congress, and however uninformed he may be upon the subject, and however unintentionally by reason of want of knowledge he may have misrepresented to the country the methods of legislation which have been pursued in like cases ever since congresses and parliaments have existed, and which have, since parliaments became free, been safe from kingly and presidential interference, all the same the people are misled by the unwarranted statements of the President as to the manner in which legislation upon pensions, claims, and the like is, and of necessity must be, conducted.

A claim or a private pension act can be discussed in committee and debated in the Senate as long as an appropriation bill; and therefore the conduct of affairs compels on the part of Congress, if not on the part of any other department of the Government, some attention in the division of time and labor to the relative importance of the interests involved. Pension claims always require the investigation of questions of fact and appeal to motives of justice, humanity, gratitude, sound public policy, patriotism, admiration for noble deeds, the love of glory, and the perpetuation of the Republic. It is not necessary that this investigation of the facts be made by a full jury of 76 Senators, nor by the whole 325 members of the House of Representatives, nor by both Houses in full assembly concurring. It is essential that at least one capable and honest mind should examine thoroughly each case in each House of Congress, and in all cases of doubt and difficulty or of unusual features that the committee and the House should do the same.

That we aver to be the usual and ordinary course of the transaction of the pension business of the Senate, and to have been so during the session, all statements to the contrary notwithstanding. The printed reports of the committee have been on the personal files of every Senator for days, and in some cases for months, on all the bills which have been passed by the Senate. Alert objectors from the ablest Senators not on the committee have watched its work and the progress of these bills through the Senate, objecting and discussing whenever they believed there was cause to do so in the careful and proper discharge of their duty. And if formal headings and phrases common to all bills have been sometimes omitted, and in consequence of long delays there have been, when an opportunity finally came, many cases rapidly passed when there was no ground for opposition, it was only a convenient dispatch of public business, hurtful in no way, usual always, and to be commended by any intelligent observer.

The pension business of the Senate has never been better done than during this session. Those members of the committee who have performed the most have been as careful as any, and derision of their patient, conscientious, and exhausting labors to help along these noblest and best portion of God's poor and the country's benefactors can originate only in a wise and noble nature which is misled, or in one that, if informed, sadly needs reconstruction or re-creation.

There has been from year to year an accumulation of this work, and both Houses of Congress have this session made great exertions to perform that which came from their predecessors as well as the increase from more recent rejections by the Pension Office, together with new cases arising outside the jurisdiction of that institution.

Still the President is wrong when he attempts to stigmatize the industry of this Congress as a reckless and scandalous disregard of public duty and waste of the public treasure, and says that there have already been three times as many pension bills passed as at any former session; but we are informed that 381 such bills were passed in the second session of the Forty-eighth Congress—a short session—nearly two-thirds instead of one-third as many as during the present session. Not very important, to be sure, but when a dazed Congress is struggling to preserve a decent reputation it may be justified in pointing out an occasional error on the part of the accuser.

The files of papers in these vetoed cases, which are now in possession of your committee, contain the letter of the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, under date of June 14, 1886, stating that he incloses enrolled bills as follows, enumerating 118 House bills and 11 Senate bills, and instructing the Commissioner of Pensions as follows:

"Please cause the same to be critically examined, and report to this Department whether, in your opinion, any objections to their approval are known to exist. In cases where objections exist they should be specifically set forth."

This indicates, of course, unmistakably that the President relies upon the Commissioner for his facts.

Any one who knows the prolonged and critical examination required would at once discredit the pretense of thorough personal investigation in the large number of cases which go to the Executive. It is, of course, impossible.

In every, or nearly every, vetoed case, Congress, by the action of both Houses, has overruled the action of the Commissioner of Pensions. Thereupon the President calls upon the Commissioner, whose physical condition is well known, to sustain the action of his office, and he naturally does so to the best of his ability. It should not be forgotten that oftentimes the reports of the two Houses contain severe and deserved reprimand of the action of the Pension Office.

Why the President should initiate this game of shuttlecock and pelt a coordinate department of the Government with vetoes based upon the review of the action of Congress by some subordinate of the Commissioner of Pensions is a topic which will bear thought, but perhaps may be left without discussion. Why the finding of the two Houses of Congress should be discredited and attributed to unworthy motives, indifference, or incapacity, while the reassertion by the pension clerk that he is right and Congress wrong is accepted as the basis of fact in these numerous vetoes, it is hard to perceive. But all through these vetoes there seems to run the fallacy that the power of Congress to grant pensions is limited to what may already be done by the Pension Office under the general law.

It is difficult to write in that rudimentary way upon the nature of pensions and the various grounds of compensation, charity, and public policy which is necessary in order to remove this impression. It is sufficient to observe that the jurisdiction of the legislative power of this Government is larger than that of the Commissioner of Pensions, and that sooner or later, although it may cost the country a prolonged and steady effort, this truth will become apparent.

But it should be remembered that in a very large number of these bills passed by Congress important original written evidence is filed with the committees or presented verbally, as in hearings before other committees upon all public questions which come before legislative bodies; and often the applicant is present with his statement and his palpable disabilities. This evidence is not available to the Executive, at least without the asking, and never has been in possession of the Pension Office. Consequently, in nearly every case the Congressional statement stands upon stronger proof than the finding of facts which the President sets up in disapproval of the bill.

The several pension bills vetoed by the President, with the evidence in each case, have been re-examined by the member of the committee who submits this report, and it is his belief that in every instance—twenty-three in number—the veto of Senate bills granting relief to claimants of pension has wrought injustice to them, and that the statement of facts submitted by the Senate committee in support of the bills was true upon the evidence, and that the statements of fact in the veto messages, so far as they conflict with finding of Congress, is untrue and wrong. Such brief notes upon each case as may facilitate further examination of the evidence, together with the Senate report and the veto of the President, are herewith submitted.

Further and more particular reports in the several cases will be submitted by

the members of the committee to whom the bills are referred, or in the Senate when they are called up for action.

In the particular case—that of Mary J. Nottage—in which this general report is respectfully submitted, there is a reprint of the evidence, that there may be a full opportunity for the people to examine and judge for themselves on the premises. This case is selected because of the comparative brevity of the testimony, and is by no means one of exceptional merit or hardship.

In this connection I ask leave to have printed the special report accompanying the case of Harriet Welch and James E. O'Shea. There are many others, but I can not cumber the RECORD to too great an extent:

No. 5.—HARRIET WELCH.

The principal facts upon which this claim is based are set forth in the previous report of this committee, which is hereto appended. The reason alleged by the Pension Office for the rejection of this claim is that the death of the soldier did not result from the service. The following newspaper account of his death appeared at the time:

"Syreannous Welch (or Deuney, as he was generally called), a veteran and pensioner of the last war, was killed on the track of the Wisconsin Central Railroad, about 4 miles north of this place, on Wednesday night or Thursday morning last, and was mangled in a fearful manner, his head having been cut into just above his eyes and his brains scattered along the track. He had been to Green Bay attending to some business relating to his pension and returned on the 11 p. m. train. He was known to have left Hilbert, but was not known to have ever reached Chilton, and it is supposed that he fell from the 11 p. m. train and was lying on the track when the 1 a. m. train going north killed him. An inquest was held by Esquire Green, of this city, and a verdict rendered in accordance with the facts. The deceased was an industrious and hard working man and was an engineer at Zech Brothers' mill, and leaves a wife and seven small children to mourn his loss."

No question is raised as to the legality of the marriage, which seems to have resulted in long cohabitation and the birth of seven children. The claimant was married to the soldier June 7, 1868. There is nothing in the evidence to justify the slur which the President casts upon the chastity of this widow and the legitimacy of her seven fatherless children. Pensions have heretofore frequently been granted in cases similar to this. Human nature cries out aloud for the allowance of pension in such a case, and if this woman, with her seven small children, is to be deprived of it, your committee at least are glad that the responsibility rests elsewhere.

We print the Senate report and the veto of the President, and recommend the passage of the bill, the veto to the contrary notwithstanding.

[Senate Report No. 295, Forty-ninth Congress, first session.]

Harriet Welch is the widow of Syreannous Welch, private Company C, Thirty-eighth Regiment Wisconsin Volunteer Infantry, who was pensioned for gunshot wound of his left leg, received in the military service and in the line of his duty. The rate of pension was increased from one-half to three-quarters because of increasing disability in the wounded leg. Again applying for increase of pension, he was directed to report for examination before the examining board of surgeons convened at Green Bay, Wis. Returning from Green Bay, Wis., he fell from the cars and was killed, September 7, 1877.

John Harmer filed affidavit May 22, 1884, that "soldier's leg was so crippled that he could not depend upon it, and that it gave way many times and caused him to fall." That it is his belief in attempting to pass from one car to another while returning from Green Bay his leg gave out and caused him to fall between the cars, when he was crushed to death.

In view of all the facts, the committee believe it to be their duty to report in favor of this bill, and recommend its passage, with the following amendment: Strike out in the seventh, eighth, and ninth lines the words "at the rate of $8 per month, and $2 per month for each of her children under the age of sixteen years," and insert "and her minor children" in lieu thereof.

To the Senate:

I return without approval Senate bill No. 1333, entitled "An act granting a pension to Harriet Welch."

The beneficiary named in this bill asks for a pension as the widow of Syreannous Welch, who was wounded in 1864 while in the service, and was pensioned therefor in 1867. In 1876 his rate of pension was increased. In 1877 he appears to have applied to have his pension again increased. It is alleged that upon such application he was directed to appear before an examining board or a surgeon at Green Bay., Wis., for examination, and in returning to his home from that place on the 7th day of September, 1877, he fell from the cars and was killed, his remains having been found on the track the next morning.

No one appears to have seen the accident; but it is claimed that he could not depend upon his wounded leg and that it "gave way many times and caused him to fall." From this statement the inference seems to have been indulged that his death was attributable to the wound he had received thirteen years before.

The widow's claim based upon this state of facts was rejected by the Pension Bureau on the ground that the accident resulting in death was not the result of his military service; and on an appeal taken to the Secretary of the Interior from that determination the same was sustained.

Though this widow admits that prior to her marriage with the deceased soldier she had married another man whom she could only say she believed to be dead, I believe her case to be a pitiable one and wish that I could join in her relief. But unfortunately official duty can not always be well done when directed solely by sympathy and charity.

GROVER CLEVELAND.

EXECUTIVE MANSION, *June* 22, 1886.

No. 14.—JAMES E. O'SHEA.

A re-examination of the evidence in this case satisfies your committee that the original report made by them is just, and that the statements therein are fully borne out by the testimony. It would seem that this soldier was a very brave and trustworthy man, a scout and prisoner of war, who rendered dangerous and most efficient service. He has many wounds and is a completely broken-down man. We have seen him. He is now in the Soldiers' Home in this District. Instead of being a deserter the records prove that although tried he was found "not guilty." The report of this committee is right, and the sneers of the veto uncalled for. Apparently there can have been no examination whatever of the evidence by the author of the veto in person. To veto this brave and patriotic soldier into history as a deserter in addition to all the rest is a carelessness to say the least of which your committee has not been guilty. Here is food for thought and an opportunity for reparation.

WAR DEPARTMENT, ADJUTANT-GENERAL'S OFFICE,
Washington, March 12, 1886.

MY DEAR BOB: The bearer, James E. O'Shea, is an old soldier of the Volunteer Army. From a careful examination of his case I am satisfied that he has been unjustly treated, and if you can do anything to assist him until his case (application for pension) in Congress is settled, it will be appreciated and fully deserved.

He was charged on the records with desertion. I found the facts to be that he was tried for desertion, but found not guilty. I therefore removed the charge, and his bill will doubtless pass both Houses of Congress in due time. General Logan, I understand, has charge of it.

Yours faithfully,

THOMAS WARD,
Assistant Adjutant-General, United States Army.

Capt. ROBERT CATLIN,
Deputy Governor Soldiers' Home, Washington, D. C.

DECEMBER 19, 1885.

To the Governor of the Soldiers' Home, Washington, D. C.:

Your petitioners would respectfully represent that the bearer of this petition, James E. O'Shea, late of Company F, Twenty-third Illinois Volunteers, is an old soldier who is trying to get a pension by reason of disabilities which he claims were contracted while doing duty as a soldier. He is in very needy circumstances and is a worthy man.

We respectfully ask that you will admit him to the privileges of the Home while he is prosecuting his claim for pension.

THOMAS WARD, *A. A. G.*
CECIL CLAY,
Bvt. Brig. Gen., U. S. A., Chief Clerk Dept. of Justice.
JOHN W MAHAN,
Formerly Major Ninth Mass. Vols., and Bvt. Lt. Col. U. S. V., Vice-Pres., representing Fifth Corps Society Army of Potomac, 1878.

I concur.

JNO. A. LOGAN.

We print the Senate report and the veto:

[Senate Report No. 607, Forty-ninth Congress, first session.]

The committee ascertain from the record report that this claimant enlisted in April, 1861, and was discharged in October, 1864. He asks to be pensioned for disability, occasioned by a gunshot wound in the leg, which was disallowed on the ground of want of evidence that he received the wound in the line of duty. The examining surgeon finds the wound, and describes the entrance and exit of the ball; also, a wound or scar in the head, and the nearly total loss of sight of one eye. The report of the Surgeon-General shows that the soldier was in hospital more than once, but the record does not give the cause for which he was treated. The Adjutant-General's report shows that the man was under discipline for some irregularities, but, notwithstanding this and the lack of the required proof that he was wounded in the line of duty, the committee are of the opinion that, situated as he was, he was very liable to, and very probably did, receive the wound from which he had suffered and is still suffering.

The fact that the records of the War Department are often imperfect works great hardship to men who apply for pensions, and where there is reasonable proof to substantiate a claim the committee are of the opinion that the absence of record testimony should not deprive him of relief.

Inasmuch as there is proof that the soldier received the wound, and that he is badly disabled from it and other causes shown by the medical examiners, and that he is old and destitute, the bill is reported favorably with a recommendation that it do pass.

[Senate Ex. Doc. No. 161, Forty-ninth Congress, first session.]

Message from the President of the United States, returning Senate bill 337 with his objections thereto.

June 3, 1886.—Read, referred to the Committee on Pensions, and ordered to be printed.

To the Senate:

I return without approval Senate bill No. 327, entitled "An act granting a pension to James E. O'Shea."

From the report of the committee to whom this bill was referred I learn that the claimant enlisted in April, 1861, and was discharged in October, 1864.

He filed a claim in the Pension Bureau alleging that he received a saber wound in the head March 7, 1862, and a gunshot wound in the left leg in the autumn of the same year.

It appears upon examination of his military record that there is no mention of either disability, and that he served two years after the time he claims to have received these injuries. So far from being disabled, it is reported as an incident of his Army life that in the year 1864 this soldier was found guilty of desertion and sentenced to forfeit all pay and allowances for the time he was absent.

The report of the committee, in apparent explanation of the lack of any official mention of the injuries alleged, declares that "the fact that the records of the War Department are often imperfect works great hardship to men who apply for pensions;" and his conviction of desertion and the lack of proof to sustain his allegations as to his injuries are disposed of as follows in the committee's report:

"The Adjutant-General's report shows that the man was under discipline for some irregularities, but, notwithstanding this and the lack of the required proof that he was wounded in the line of duty, the committee are of the opinion that, situated as he was, he was very liable to, and very probably did, receive the wound from which he suffered and is still suffering."

I am convinced that there exists serious difficulty on the part of the claimant, instead of in the record of the War Department; that the kind of irregularity for which he was under discipline is calculated to produce a lack of confidence in his merits as a pensioner; and that the fact of his situation being such as to render him liable to receive a wound is hardly sufficient to establish his right to a soldier's pension, which is only justified by injuries actually received and affirmatively proven.

GROVER CLEVELAND.

EXECUTIVE MANSION, *June* 2, 1886.

Taking the case of James E. O'Shea, I will say, notwithstanding all the trouble we had about it since the last Congress, this faultless institution, the Pension Office of this country, has taken it up again and allowed the pension to James E. O'Shea from the beginning.

I shall ask consent to put in another case like the case of James E. O'Shea, if I can find the name. After having been passed by Congress and rejected by the Executive veto in the Forty-ninth Congress, it has been passed again in both branches of the present Congress, and has been signed by the President; and, as I have been informed by those who have examined the case, there is not a single particle of additional or different evidence from that which existed years ago, and which was upon the files of the Pension Office for years.

I also ask leave to insert the case of J. D. Haworth, on page 47 of the report:

No. 15.—J. D. HAWORTH.

A careful re-examination of the evidence in this case will convince any fair mind that the report heretofore made by the committee (Senate Report No. 633)

does not state the claimant's case as strongly as it should be. The ground alleged for the rejection of this case is that the disease of the eyes from which claimant suffers existed prior to enlistment. In regard to that we are of opinion that although there may have been a hereditary tendency to weakness of the eyes, yet it appears clearly that the serious development of this trouble was almost wholly attributable to his service, and that it has continued ever since. The soldier rendered long and faithful service, and the rejection of his claim on the ground that the disability was contracted before entering it works exceeding hardship and injustice. This man is old, poor, and blind, and the country which he served so well and faithfully ought to help him in this extremity. It will help him if there is any soul left in it.

We append hereto in further explanation the petition of his citizens and comrades respecting the veto, as well as the Senate report containing a statement of the facts, and the message of the President.

HEADQUARTERS CHARLTON POST, No. 143, G. A. R.,
Richland, Iowa, June 14, 1886.

Whereas a bill pensioning our comrade, James D. Haworth, has passed both branches of Congress; and

Whereas Grover Cleveland, President of the United States, has vetoed the same, thus depriving a worthy, honored, and a deserving ex-soldier and comrade of the benefit of the action of the said Congress, which is his just dues; and

Whereas we, as citizens and comrades, have known said comrade, James D. Haworth, intimately and well, some of us from a time dating before the late war, and believing that a great injustice has been done our comrade, leaving a stigma upon his character, that of perjury: Therefore, be it

Resolved, That we earnestly condemn the action of the President in said veto, and believe that he was not properly informed in the case; that we ask, and earnestly insist that the United States Senate and House of Representatives, and each member thereof, to use their best endeavors to pass the same over the veto of the President that justice may be done to our comrade, neighbor, and friend, who served in the Army for three years.

Resolved, That comrade James D. Haworth has our permission to furnish the Senate Committee and Committee of the House on Pensions, also such members of Congress, a copy of these resolutions at his pleasure.

Unanimously adopted by Charlton Post No. 143, June 14, 1886.

S. E. JOHNSON, *Commander.*
Attest: LEWIS HORTON, *Adjutant.*

[Senate Report No. 633, Forty-ninth Congress, first session.]

That the records in this case show that the claimant was a sergeant in Company H, Thirty-third Regiment Iowa Volunteers, and that he served with the regiment until about the month of April, 1863, when he began to complain of "sore eyes," and was treated for sore eyes by Assistant Surgeon William Scott, of the Thirty-third Iowa Volunteers, and that he excused claimant from duty at Little Rock, Ark., in the spring or summer of 1863, because of "blindness in right eye and weakness of left eye;" and there is evidence to show that he did not continue in his regiment after this time, but was transferred to Company H, Twenty-first Regiment, Veteran Reserve Corps, where he remained until the expiration of his term of service, when he returned to his home.

Declaration for pension filed February 20, 1879, in which claimant alleges "sore eyes, with complete loss of right eye, and injury to the left eye." Claim rejected November 4, 1880, on the ground that there is "no satisfactory proof that the affection of the eyes is due to disability arising from service, but existed prior to service."

The affidavits of the claimant's mother, two sisters, and a brother, clearly show that the claimant could not see out of his right eye from early childhood, and was called "blind" in that eye, although their testimony shows that he could see a little out of that eye, but not much.

One sister testifies that claimant did use an "eye-water" to bathe his eyes with occasionally when they became "sore," and that it was the same eye-water as his father used, who was said to have the same trouble with his eyes.

It appears from the testimony, therefore, that the claimant had "sore eyes," and that the sight of the right eye was much impaired even in childhood, so that it can not be said that the disease originated from causes growing out of the service.

There is abundance of testimony to show that the claimant's eyesight has failed since he entered the service, and is not now as good as it was before he enlisted.

The committee believes that it is the object of the Government to pension all who are deserving and who have been impaired in health by faithful services performed, and it is shown by the record that claimant is not able to perform manual labor, and often requires help to enable him to get about, and that in consequence of his infirmity he is very poor. It is also shown that the disease is steadily progressing and it will not be long before claimant may become totally blind.

Taking into consideration the evidence on file in this case, your committee believe it to be their duty to report in favor of this bill and recommend its passage.

[Senate Ex. Doc. No. 158, Forty-ninth Congress, first session.]

Message from the President of the United States, returning Senate bill 1253, *with his objections thereto.*

May 28, 1886.—Read, referred to the Committee on Pensions, and ordered to be printed.

To the Senate:

I hereby return without approval Senate bill No. 1253, entitled "An act granting a pension to J. D. Haworth."

It is proposed by this bill to grant a pension to the claimant for the alleged loss of sight in one eye and the impairment of the vision of the other.

From the information furnished me, I am convinced that the difficulty alleged by this applicant had its origin in causes existing prior to his enlistment, and that his present condition of disability is not the result of his service in the Army.

GROVER CLEVELAND.

EXECUTIVE MANSION, *May* 28, 1886.

Mr. President, the tariff can wait until another year, if necessary, but I want to speak upon this assumption of kindness and virtue on the part of the Executive and the Pension Office. I will do the Pension Office the justice to say that I think in many respects they have transacted their business with commendable celerity and for the benefit of the soldiers of the country. There are undoubtedly abuses, and many of them, I think, are very great abuses, which have not yet been reformed. But I believe that the management of the office has been conducted in some respects for the direct purpose of political advantage. If necessary, I will give my reasons for that, but I think the country understands it; and if I have done anybody any injustice I will be the sufferer and not the Department. Many of the claims to superior merit are unfounded, with no right to special credit, and I think while the present Commissioner, a man of energy and vigor, has administered his office well and efficiently in many respects, he has done as well for his party as he has for the soldiers.

The President and the Democratic party set up an incessant clamor that by reason of having signed so many of these bills the President has demonstrated an exceedingly and unusually friendly animus toward the soldiery of the country, the men who preserved the Union by their valor, their sacrifices, and oftentimes by their lives. But it is to be considered with reference to these special acts, first, that they had been accumulating for years; that the rejections had been accumulating for years; that efforts had been making for a long period of time to get reviews and more favorable action, and at last these cases came in a large body to the Houses of Congress. It is true that for a long time they failed to be considered with favor, but they are now considered in the Senate committee by both parties as represented on that committee. I take pleasure in saying—it is nothing but an act of justice to the Senate committee as now constituted—I think its members of both parties act with friendly feeling and just favor toward pension claims and in pension legislation. I express this feeling, not that it is a compliment to anybody, for it is simply a discharge of duty, but I think it an act of justice to the Senate committee as it is now constituted of both parties.

But this has not always been so. In the last Congress, the Forty-ninth Congress, when the flood of claims came to us which had been rejected year after year or failed to be in anywise acted upon, the illness of the chairman of the committee cast upon me the labor of acting chairman. I determined that those bills should be acted upon. We proceeded to do it, and it was from impulses emanating from that committee-room that these numerous cases found their way to the Presidential mansion and the great number of vetoes took place of cases as meritorious as those that were signed, and a large number were signed and did meet with the Executive approval. But the vetoes and the approvals were without discrimination as to the merits of the claims.

I wish to read now a statement of the number of reports made by the members of the Committee on Pensions of the Forty-ninth Congress:

By Mr. SAWYER, 542.

He stands pre-eminent in the list. His work is a monument more to be desired than the one of Washington; a monument which will endure for all time in the gratitude of the defenders of our country.

Reports made by Committee on Pensions, Forty-ninth Congress.

Mr. Sawyer	542
Mr. Blair	363
Mr. Sewell	108
Mr. Van Wyck	80
Mr. Aldrich	23
Mr. Mitchell	17
	1,133

It is proper to say that the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. Mitchell] was sick nearly all the time, and the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. ALDRICH] was very largely engaged on another committee. The reports made by Republican members of the committee aggregate 1,133, while those made by the Democratic members were as follows:

Mr. Whitthorne	30
Mr. Camden	10
Mr. Jackson	7
Mr. Colquitt	3
	50
Total	1,183

I have here a statement which covers like data for several Congresses. It is not all of it so unfavorable to the Democratic efforts to pass these bills—some of it is perhaps as much so—but I read the list for the last Congress because that is the Congress which has been particularly criticised, and I know the evil, if it be one, originated in the Senate committee-room, and that I am myself responsible to a considerable extent for this work, whatever be its desert.

Statement of private pension bills reported by the Committee on Pensions, United States Senate, during the Forty-sixth, Forty-seventh, Forty-eighth, and Forty-ninth Congresses, and the first session of the Fiftieth Congress.

By Democratic members of the committee:	
Forty-sixth Congress reported	235
Forty-seventh Congress reported	192
Forty-eighth Congress reported	198
Forty-ninth Congress reported	50
Fiftieth Congress reported	285
Total	960
By Republican members of committee:	
Forty-sixth Congress reported	179
Forty-seventh Congress reported	155
Forty-eighth Congress reported	637
Forty-ninth Congress reported	1,133
Fiftieth Congress reported	702
Total	2,806

In regard to pension legislation that has been proposed and that has been enacted during the last Congress and the present Congress, comprising a period of time covered by the Democratic administration, I have in my hand a list of all the important bills, I think of all the bills of a general character, which have been introduced.

A bill (S. 2263) to amend the pension laws, and for other purposes. Passed the Senate but failed in the House.

A bill to amend the pension laws, and for other purposes.

Be it enacted, etc., That the act entitled "An act relating to claim agents and attorneys in pension cases," approved June 20, 1878, is hereby repealed.

SEC. 2. That sections 4768, 4769, 4786 of the Revised Statutes are hereby made applicable also to all cases filed with the Commissioner of Pensions since June 20, 1878, and which have not been heretofore allowed.

SEC. 3. That section 4785 of the Revised Statutes is hereby re-enacted and amended so as to read as follows:

"SEC. 4785. No agent or attorney or other person shall demand or receive any other compensation for his services in prosecuting a claim for pension or bounty land than such as the Commissioner of Pensions shall direct to be paid to him, not exceeding $25; nor shall any agent, attorney, or other person demand or receive such compensation, in whole or in part, until such pension or bounty land claim shall be allowed."

SEC. 4. That section 4786 of the Revised Statutes is hereby amended so as to read as follows:

"SEC. 4786. It shall be the duty of the agent or attorney of record in the prosecution of the case to cause to be filed with the Commissioner of Pensions, for his approval, duplicate articles of agreement, without additional cost to the claimant, setting forth the fee agreed upon by the parties, which agreement shall be executed in the presence of and certified by some officer competent to administer oaths. In all cases where application is made for pension or bounty land, and no agreement is filed with and approved by the Commissioner as herein provided, the fee shall be $10, and no more. And such articles of agreement as have been heretofore or may hereafter be filed with the Commissioner of Pensions are not authorized nor will they be recognized except in claims for original pension, claims for increase of pension on account of a new disability not before alleged, in claims for restoration where a pensioner's name has been, or may hereafter be, dropped from the pension-rolls, on testimony taken by a special examiner of this office, showing that the disability or cause of death on account of which the pension was allowed did not originate in the line of duty, and in cases of dependent relatives whose names have been, or may hereafter be, dropped from the rolls on like testimony upon the ground of non-dependence, and in such other cases of difficulty and trouble as the Commissioner of Pensions may see fit to recognize them: *Provided*, That no greater fee than $10 shall be demanded, received, or allowed in any claim for pension the cause of which originated prior to March 4, 1861; nor in any claim for pension or bounty land granted by special act of Congress; nor in any claim for increase of pension on account of an increase of the disability for which the pension had been allowed: *And provided further*, That no fee shall be demanded, received, or allowed in any claim for arrears of pension or arrears of increase of pension allowed by any act of Congress passed subsequent to the date of the allowance of the original claims in which such arrears of pension or of increase of pension may be allowed.

"The articles of agreement herein provided for shall be in substance as follows, to wit:

"ARTICLES OF AGREEMENT.

"Whereas I, —— ——, late a —— in company ——, of the —— regiment of —— volunteers, war of 1861 (or if the service be different, here state the same), having made application for pension under the laws of the United States:

"Now, this agreement witnesseth, that for and in consideration of service done and to be done in the premises, I hereby agree to allow my attorney, —— ——, of ——, the fee of —— dollars, which shall include all amounts to be paid for any service in furtherance of said claim, and said fee shall not be demanded by or payable to my said attorney, in whole or in part, except in case of the granting of my pension by the Commissioner of Pensions, and then the same shall be paid to him or them in accordance with the provisions of the act of Congress approved —— ——.

"Having heretofore paid my said attorney in part for his services herein the sum of —— dollars, that amount is to be deducted from the sum above stipulated to be paid.

"(Claimant's signature.)

"(Two witnesses' signatures.)

"STATE OF ——, *County of* ——, *ss:*

"Be it known that on this the —— day of ——, A. D. 188—, personally appeared the above-named —— ——, who, after having had read over to —— in the hearing and presence of the two attesting witnesses the contents of the foregoing articles of agreement, voluntarily signed and acknowledged the same to be —— free act and deed.

"(Official signature.)

"And now, to wit, this —— day of ——, A. D. 1880, I (or we) accept the provisions contained in the foregoing articles of agreement, and will, to the best of my (or our) ability, endeavor faithfully to represent the interest of the claimant in the premises.

"And I (or we) hereby acknowledge that I (or we) have heretofore received from the claimant the sum of —— dollars, and no greater sum, and agree that that amount shall be deducted from the sum herein stipulated to be paid.

"Witness my (our) hand the day and year first above written.

"(Signature of attorney.)

"STATE OF ——, *County of* ——, *ss:*

"Personally came —— ——, whom I know to be the person he represents himself to be, and who, having signed above acceptance of agreement, acknowledged the same to be —— free act and deed.

"(Official signature.)

"And if, in the adjudication of any claim for pension in which such articles of agreement have been or may hereafter be filed, it shall appear that the claimant had, prior to the execution thereof, paid to the attorney any sum for his services in such claim, and the amount so paid is not stipulated therein, then every such claim shall be adjudicated in the same manner as though no articles of agreement had been filed."

A bill (S. 2208) to provide pensions for certain invalid soldiers and sailors who have been discharged from the Army or Navy of the United States after three months' service therein during the war of the rebellion, and for the widows and dependent parents of deceased pensioners, and to increase the rate of pension in certain cases, and for other purposes.

This is a proposition in substance the same which I had the honor originally to present in previous Congresses.

Added as an amendment to House bill No. 5667. Failed in the House.

A bill (S. 2208) to provide pensions for certain invalid soldiers and sailors who have been discharged from the Army or Navy of the United States after three months' service therein during the war of the rebellion, and for the widows and dependent parents of deceased pensioners, and to increase the rate of pension in certain cases, and for other purposes.

Be it enacted, etc., That every person specified in the several classes enumerated in section 4693 of the Revised Statutes of the United States, and the amendments thereto, who served in the military or naval service, as mentioned in said section, for the period of three months during the war of the rebellion, and has an honorable discharge therefrom, and who is or shall become disabled from any cause not the result of his own gross carelessness, disreputable conduct, or vicious habits, and shall also be dependent, wholly or in part, upon his own labor or upon pecuniary assistance from others for the means of comfortable support, shall, upon making due proof of the facts, under such regulations as may be prescribed by the proper authority, be placed upon the list of pensioners of the United States, and be entitled to receive a pension during the continuance of such disability at a rate proportionate to the degree thereof; and such pension shall commence at the date of filing an application therefor. The highest rate of pension granted by virtue hereof, which shall be for total incapacity to perform any manual labor, shall be $30, which is hereby made divisible upon that basis for any less degree of disability: *Provided*, That no person entitled to or receiving an invalid pension under existing laws, or such as may be hereafter enacted, granting pensions for disabilities contracted in the military or naval service of the United States and line of duty, greater than that provided for herein, shall receive the benefits of this act. But any such applicant for invalid pension having an application therefor pending, or who shall hereafter file his application for such pension, may, by a declaration over his own signature, at any time elect to prosecute his said claim under this act or under the general laws; and his pension, when allowed, if prosecuted under this act, shall commence from the date of such election, except as above provided.

SEC. 2. That all widows of soldiers or sailors who, as such widows, are now receiving, under existing laws or a special act of Congress, the sum of $8 per month, by reason of the death of such soldiers and sailors from a disability contracted in the military or naval service of the United States, and in line of duty, since the 4th day of March, 1861, shall, from and after this date, be entitled to and receive the rate of $12 per month in lieu of said rate of $8; and all such widows who shall hereafter be found to be entitled to the rate of $8 per month under existing laws shall be entitled to and receive the rate of $12 in lieu of said rate of $8.

SEC. 3. That if any invalid pensioner pensioned under pre-existing laws has died or shall hereafter die, or if any pensioner under section 1 of this act shall die, leaving a widow or minor child under sixteen years of age, or both, at the date of the death of such pensioner, such widow and minor children shall be held to be entitled, in the order of succession named, to an original pension in their own right, under existing laws, without being required to prove that the death cause of such pensioner was due to his military or naval service of the United States, and shall receive the rates now allowed by law, except that such as may be found to be entitled to $8 per month shall receive in lieu thereof $12 per month.

SEC. 4. That pension granted such widows on account of such minors shall be continued without limit as to age, provided it shall appear that such minors are of unsound mind or physically helpless, so as to render them incapable of earning a subsistence: *Provided*, That such widow retains the care, custody, and control of such minors; and in the event of the death or remarriage of such widow, or abandonment by her of such minors, then the pension shall be continued to them in their own right, without limit as to age, payable to a duly constituted guardian.

SEC. 5. That in considering the claims of dependent parents the fact and cause of death and the fact that the soldier left no widow or minor children having been shown as required by law, it shall be necessary only to show by competent and sufficient evidence that such dependent parent is without other present means of support than his or her own manual labor, or the contributions of others not legally bound for his or her support; and such as may be found to be entitled to $8 a month under existing laws shall receive in lieu thereof $12 a month from the date of this act.

SEC. 6. That in all applications under the general pension laws, including this act, where it appears by record evidence that the applicant was regularly enlisted and mustered into the service, that fact shall be sufficient *prima facie* evidence that he was then in good health and free from the disease or cause of disability for which he claims a pension; but such evidence shall be subject to rebuttal by record or other satisfactory evidence of the prior existence of such disease or cause of disability.

A bill (H. R. 5667) granting pensions to soldiers and sailors of the Mexican war, and for other purposes. Passed the Senate with amendments. Failed in the House.

An act granting pensions to the soldiers and sailors of the Mexican war and for other purposes.

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension-roll the names of the surviving officers and enlisted men, including marines, militia, and volunteers of the military and naval services of the United States, who, being duly enlisted, actually served fourteen days with the Army or Navy of the United States in Mexico or on the coasts or frontier thereof or *en route* thereto in the war with that nation, or were actually engaged in a battle in said war and were honorably discharged, and to such other officers and soldiers and sailors as may have been personally named in any resolution of Congress for any specific service in said wars, although their term of service may have been less than sixty days, and the surviving widows of such officers and enlisted men as were married to such officers or soldiers or sailors prior to the discharge of such officers and enlisted men: *Provided*, That such widows have not remarried: *Provided*, That every such officer, enlisted man, or widow who is or may become sixty-two years of age or who is or may become subject to any disability or dependency equivalent to some cause prescribed or recognized by the pension laws of the United States as a sufficient reason for the allowance of a pension, shall be entitled to the benefits of this act; but it shall not be held to include any person not within the rule of age or disability or dependency herein defined, or who incurred such disability while in any manner voluntarily engaged in or aiding or abetting the late rebellion against the authority of the United States.

SEC. 2. That pensions under section 1 of this act shall be at the rate of $8 per month, and payable only from and after the passage of this act, for and during the natural lives of the persons entitled thereto, or during the continuance of the disability for which the same shall be granted: *Provided*, That section 1 of this act shall not apply to any person who is receiving a pension at the rate of $8 per month or more, nor to any person receiving a pension of less than $8 per month, except for the difference between the pension now received (if less than $8 per month) and $8 per month.

SEC. 3. That before the name of any person shall be placed on the pension-roll under this act proof shall be made, under such rules and regulations as the Secretary of the Interior may prescribe, of the right of the applicant to a pen-

sion; and any person who shall falsely and corruptly take any oath required under this act shall be deemed guilty of perjury; and the Secretary of the Interior shall cause to be stricken from the pension-roll the name of any person whenever it shall be made to appear by proof satisfactory to him that such name was put upon such roll through false and fraudulent representations, and that such person is not entitled to a pension under this act. The loss of the certificate of discharge shall not deprive any person of the benefits of this act, but other record evidence of enlistment and service and of an honorable discharge may be deemed sufficient: *Provided*, That when any person has been granted a land-warrant, under any act of Congress, for and on account of service in the said war with Mexico, such grant shall be *prima facie* evidence of his service and honorable discharge; but such evidence shall not be conclusive, and may be rebutted by evidence that such land-warrant was improperly granted.

SEC. 4. That the pension laws now in force which are not inconsistent or in conflict with this act are hereby made a part of this act, so far as they be applicable thereto.

SEC. 5. That it shall be unlawful for any attorney, claim agent, or any other person to demand or receive a fee greater than $10 for services rendered in behalf of a claimant under this act, which shall not be demanded or received until such claim is allowed; and any person violating the provisions of this section shall be subject to the provisions of section 5485 of the Revised Statutes of the United States.

SEC. 6. That section 4716 of the Revised Statutes is hereby repealed so far as the same relates to this act or to pensioners under this act.

SEC. 7. That the provisions of this act shall not apply to any person while under the political disabilities imposed by the fourteenth amendment to the Constitution of the United States.

SEC. 8. That every person specified in the several classes enumerated in section 4693 of the Revised Statutes of the United States, and the amendments thereto, who served in the military or naval service, as mentioned in said section, for the period of three months during the war of the rebellion, and has an honorable discharge therefrom, and who is or shall become disabled from any cause not the result of his own gross carelessness, disreputable conduct, or vicious habits, and shall also be dependent on his own labor for support, shall, upon making due proof of the facts, under such regulations as may be prescribed by the proper authority, be placed upon the list of pensioners of the United States, and be entitled to receive a pension during the continuance of such disability at a rate proportionate to the degree thereof; and such pension shall commence at the date of filing an application therefor. The highest rate of pension granted under this section, which shall be for total incapacity to perform any manual labor, shall be $24, which is hereby made divisible upon that basis for any less degree of disability: *Provided*, That no person entitled to or receiving an invalid pension under existing laws, or such as may be hereafter enacted, granting pensions for disabilities contracted in the military or naval service of the United States and in line of duty, greater than that provided for herein, shall receive the benefits of this act; but any such applicant for invalid pension having an application therefor pending, or who shall hereafter file his application for such pension, may, by a declaration over his own signature, at any time, elect to prosecute his said claim under this act or under the general laws, and his pension, when allowed, if prosecuted under this act, shall commence from the date of such election.

SEC. 9. That all widows or minor children of soldiers and sailors who as such are now receiving, under existing laws, general or special, the sum of $8 per month, by reason of the death of such soldiers and sailors in service or from a disability contracted in the military or naval service of the United States, and in line of duty, since the 4th day of March, 1861, shall, from and after this date, be entitled to receive the rate of $12 per month in lieu of said rate of $8; and all such widows or minor children who shall hereafter be found to be entitled to the rate of $8 per month under existing laws shall be entitled to and receive the rate of $12 in lieu of said rate of $8.

SEC. 10. That if any invalid pensioner pensioned for a disability contracted in the military or naval service of the United States, and in the line of duty, has died or shall hereafter die, leaving a widow or minor child under sixteen years of age, or both, at the date of the death of such pensioner, such widow and minor children shall be entitled, in the order of succession named, to an original pension in their own right, under existing laws, without being required to prove that the death of such pensioner was due to his military or naval service of the United States, and shall receive the rates now allowed by law, except that such as may be found to be entitled to $8 per month under existing laws shall receive in lieu thereof $12 per month.

SEC. 11. That pensions granted widows on account of minor children shall be continued without limit as to age, whenever it shall appear that such minors are of unsound mind or physically helpless, so as to render them incapable of earning a subsistence: *Provided*, That such widow retains the care, custody, and control of such minors; and in the event of the death or remarriage of such widow, or abandonment by her of such minors, then the pension and additional pension shall be continued to them in their own right, without limit as to age, during the continuance of such disability, payable to a duly constituted guardian.

SEC. 12. That in considering the claims of dependent parents the fact and cause of death and the fact that the soldier left no widow or minor children having been shown as required by law, it shall be necessary only to show by competent and sufficient evidence that such dependent parent is without other present means of comfortable support than his or her own manual labor, or the contributions of others not legally bound for his or her support; and such as may be found to be entitled to $8 a month under existing laws shall receive in lieu thereof $12 a month from the date of this act.

SEC. 13. That in all applications under the general pension laws, including this act, where it appears by record evidence that the applicant was regularly enlisted and mustered into the service, that fact shall be *prima facie* evidence of soundness at the time of his enlistment; but such presumption shall be subject to rebuttal by record or other competent evidence.

House bill 5667 was sent to us by the House, and the Senate amended it by adding Senate bill 2203. This bill being thus attached to the Mexican pension bill, the whole went back in the Forty-eighth Congress to the House, and rather than pass this bill a Democratic House defeated both, and thus the Mexican pensioners went to the wall likewise, and only found their remedy in the Forty-ninth Congress, when action was had upon the two propositions, the Mexican pensioners on the one hand and the soldiers of the war of the Union on the other, in two separate bills, and the Mexican pension bill got through and the Union soldiers' bill was killed in the House.

A bill (S. 1526) amending sections 4756 and 4757 of the Revised Statutes, relating to pensions to certain disabled persons who have served in the Navy or Marine Corps.

Passed the Senate and House and became a law.

An act amending sections 4756 and 4757 of the Revised Statutes, relating to pensions to certain disabled persons who have served in the Navy or Marine Corps.

Be it enacted, etc., That section 4756 and section 4757 of the Revised Statutes of the United States be, and the same are hereby, amended by inserting the words "or as an appointed petty officer, or both," after the words "as an enlisted person" in the former section, and after the words "as an enlisted man" in the latter section.

A bill (introduced by Mr. BLAIR) (S. 1886) for the relief of soldiers of the late war, honorably discharged after three months' service, who are disabled and dependent upon their own labor for support, and of dependent parents of soldiers who died in the service or from disabilities contracted therein.

Passed the Senate, but failed in the House.

A bill for the relief of soldiers of the late war, honorably discharged after three months' service, who are disabled and dependent upon their own labor for support, and of dependent parents of soldiers who died in the service or from disabilities contracted therein.

Be it enacted, etc., That every person specified in the several classes enumerated in section 4693 of the Revised Statutes of the United States, and the amendments thereto, who served in the military or naval service, as mentioned in said section, for the period of three months during the war of the rebellion, and has an honorable discharge therefrom, and who is or shall become disabled from any cause not the result of his own fault, and shall also be dependent upon his own exertions for support, or upon the contributions of others not legally bound thereto, shall, upon making due proof of the facts, under such regulations as may be prescribed by the proper authority, be placed upon the list of pensioners of the United States, and be entitled to receive a pension during the continuance of such disability and dependence at a rate proportionate to the degree of such disability; and such pension shall commence at the date of filing an application therefor. The highest rate of pension granted under this section, which shall be for total incapacity to perform any manual labor, shall be $24 per month, which is hereby made divisible upon that basis for any less degree of disability: *Provided*, That no person entitled to or receiving an invalid pension under existing laws, or such as may be hereafter enacted, granting pensions for disabilities contracted in the military or naval service of the United States, and in line of duty, greater than that provided for herein, shall receive the benefits of this act; but any applicant for such invalid pension having an application therefor pending, or who shall hereafter file his application for such pension, may, by a declaration over his own signature, at any time, elect to prosecute his said claim under this act or under the general laws, and his pension, when allowed, if prosecuted under this act, shall commence from the date of such election: *Provided further*, That no pension paid under any law hereafter shall be rated at less than $4 per month.

SEC. 2. That in considering the claims of dependent parents, the fact and cause of death and the fact that the soldier left no widow or minor children having been shown as required by law, it shall be necessary only to show by competent and sufficient evidence that such dependent parent is without other present means of comfortable support than his or her own manual labor, or the contributions of others not legally bound for his or her support; and such as may be found to be entitled to $8 a month under existing laws, as modified by this section, shall receive in lieu thereof $1 a month from and after the approval of this act.

SEC. 3. That in all applications under the general pension laws, including this act, where it appears by record evidence that the applicant was regularly enlisted and mustered into the service, that fact shall be conclusive evidence of the soundness at the time of his enlistment, except in case of fraud.

SEC. 4. That no person shall be entitled to more than one pension at the same time under any or all laws of the United States, whether such pension shall have been already obtained or shall be hereafter obtained, unless the act under which such pension is claimed shall specially so declare.

That bill passed the Senate, was reported to the House, but did not pass the House; it died in the House. It was the most important bill that has ever been pending with any possibility or probability for the time being of its passage since the arrears-of-pension bill. It is a bill which covered the entire list of all the soldiers of the Union who were in need of assistance from their Government, those who under the general laws were not pensionable. The bill in substance had passed in the previous Congress. It had been associated with the Mexican pension bill. I am stating matters that I am conversant with and was a part of. I had urgently sought that the two measures might go together, and that the two might become part of the statute law of the land, that being great acts of justice to the soldiers in two great wars they might proceed with equal step; but it was fated not so to be.

The soldiers of the country will recognize this bill if I do not stop, being short of time for a more specific setting forth of its merits; but it would have covered some two hundred and fifty thousand undoubtedly of the meritorious and disabled soldiers of this country. If anybody had cared to do a service to the soldiers of this country who were in want and destitution and disabled from gaining a livelihood by manual labor, it would have been easy to have passed that bill and to have used some of the surplus in giving their just dues to these men, their widows, their orphans, and their parents, but it failed.

A bill (S. 2056) to amend the pension laws by increasing the pensions of soldiers and sailors who have lost an arm or leg in the service.

Passed the Senate and House and became a law.

An act to amend the pension laws by increasing the pensions of soldiers and sailors who have lost an arm or leg in the service.

Be it enacted, etc., That from and after the passage of this act all persons on the pension-rolls, and all persons hereafter granted a pension, who, while in the military or naval service of the United States and in line of duty, shall have lost one hand or one foot, or been totally disabled in the same, shall receive a pension of $30 a month; that all persons now on the pension-rolls, and all persons hereafter granted a pension, who in like manner shall have lost either an arm at or above the elbow or a leg at or above the knee, or been totally disabled in the same, shall receive a pension of $35 per month; and that all persons now on the pension-rolls, and all persons hereafter granted a pension who in like manner shall have lost either an arm at the shoulder-joint or a leg at the hip-joint, or so near the joint as to prevent the use of an artificial limb, shall receive a pension at the rate of $45 per month: *Provided*, That nothing contained in this act shall be construed to repeal section 4699 of the Revised Statutes of the United States, or to change the rate of $18 per month therein mentioned to be proportionately divided for any degree of disability established for which section 4695 makes no provision.

A bill (S. 2482) to restore pensions in certain cases.

Passed the Senate, reported in the House, but did not pass the House.

An act to restore pensions in certain cases.

Be it enacted, etc., That the act entitled "An act to restore pensions in certain cases," approved June 9, 1886, shall be construed so as to include within its provisions all officers and enlisted men in the Army, and their widows and minor children.

A bill (S. 181) granting pensions to ex-soldiers and sailors who are incapacitated for the performance of manual labor, and providing for pensions to dependent relatives of deceased soldiers and sailors.

Passed the Senate March 8, 1888.

An act granting pensions to ex-soldiers and sailors who are incapacitated for the performance of manual labor, and providing for pensions to dependent relatives of deceased soldiers and sailors.

Be it enacted, etc., That in considering the pension claims of dependent parents, the fact and cause of death, and the fact that the soldier left no widow or minor child or children, having been shown as required by law, it shall be necessary only to show by competent and sufficient evidence that such parent or parents are without other means of support than their own manual labor or the contributions of others not legally bound for their support: *Provided*, That all pensions allowed under this section shall commence from the date of the passage of this act, or from the date of subsequent dependence, and shall continue no longer than the existence of such dependence.

SEC. 2. That all persons who served three months or more in the military or naval service of the United States during the late war of the rebellion, and who have been honorably discharged therefrom, and who are now or who may hereafter be suffering from mental or physical disability, not the result of their own vicious habits, which totally incapacitates them from the performance of manual labor, and who are without other adequate means of self support, shall, upon making due proof of the fact according to such rules and regulations as the Secretary of the Interior may provide, be placed upon the list of invalid pensioners of the United States, and be entitled to receive $12 per month; and such pension shall commence from the date of the filing of the application in the Pension Office, after the passage of this act, upon proof that the disability then existed, and shall continue during the existence of the same: *Provided*, That persons who are now receiving pensions under existing laws, or whose claims are pending in the Pension Office, may, by application to the Commissioner of Pensions, in such form as he may prescribe, receive the benefits of this act; and nothing herein contained shall be so construed as to prevent any pensioner thereunder from prosecuting his claim and receiving his pension under any other general or special act: *Provided, however*, That no person shall receive more than one pension for the same period: *And provided further*, That rank in the service shall not be considered in applications filed thereunder.

SEC. 3. That if any invalid pensioner has died, or shall hereafter die, leaving a widow, minor child, or children under eighteen years of age, or in case there be no widow, or minor child or children, a dependent mother or father, such widow, minor child or children, or mother or father, shall be placed upon the pension-roll at the rates established by law for widows, minor children, and parents, without regard to the cause of death of such pensioner: *Provided*, That said widow was married to the deceased pensioner prior to the passage of this act. All pensions granted to widows under this or any other general law shall take effect from the date of the death of the husbands of such widows, respectively, but not dating back of the passage of this act. That the increase of pensions for minor children shall be at the rate of $5 per month instead of $2 per month, as now provided by law, and in case a minor child is insane, idiotic, or otherwise helpless, the pension shall continue during the life of said child, or during the period of such disability.

SEC. 4. That any agent, attorney, or other person instrumental in prosecuting any claim under section 2 or 3 of this act who shall, directly or indirectly, contract for, demand, receive or retain, for his services or instrumentality in presenting and prosecuting such claim, a sum greater than $10 (payable only upon the order of the Commissioner of Pensions, by the pension agent making payment of the pension allowed), or who shall wrongfully withhold from a pensioner or claimant the whole or any part of the pension or claim allowed and due such pensioner or claimant, shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor, and upon conviction thereof shall, for every such offense, be fined not exceeding $500, or imprisonment at hard labor not exceeding two years, or both, in the discretion of the court.

SEC. 5. That section 4716 of the Revised Statutes is hereby modified so that the same shall not apply to this act: *Provided*, That this act shall not apply to those persons under political disabilities. And no person shall be pensioned under this act for any disability incurred while engaged in any military or naval service against the United States.

SEC. 6. That all laws and parts of laws which conflict with the provisions of this act be, and the same are hereby, repealed.

Senate bill 181 is similar in some respects to Senate bill 186 of the last Congress, but provides for only about fifteen thousand, who, as it is supposed, are in the poor-houses of the country or directly sustained by charity such as is given only to the very helpless and very poor. That bill has been passed by the Senate. It is a very modest bill. It left out the two hundred and twenty-odd thousand cases which Senate bill 186 included. It has gone to the House, there to sleep the sleep of death. So that even the soldiers of the country in extremest need, God's poor and our saviors in war, are not to receive any assistance from a Democratic House nor from the Executive who controls that body with an arm of iron power.

A bill (S. 373) for the relief of women enrolled as Army nurses, etc.

On Senate Calendar.

A bill for the relief of women enrolled as Army nurses, etc.

Be it enacted, etc., That all women regularly enrolled in the United States service as Army nurses or sanitary agents during the late war of the rebellion, and who rendered six months' service in the hospitals, diet kitchens, or on the battle-fields, and who have been honorably discharged therefrom; or who, prior to the completion of the period named, were disabled in the line of duty and honorably discharged, shall, upon making due proof of the fact, according to such rules and regulations as the Secretary of the Interior may provide, be placed on the list of pensioners of the United States and entitled to $25 per month; and such pensions shall commence from the date of filing the application in the Pension Office after the passage of this act: *Provided*, That persons who are now receiving pensions under special enactments may, by making application to the Commissioner of Pensions, in such form as he may prescribe, receive the benefits of this act: *Provided*, That no person shall receive more than one pension for the same period.

SEC. 2. That any agent, attorney, or other person instrumental in prosecuting any claim under this act who shall, directly or indirectly, contract for, demand, receive, or retain for his services or instrumentality in presenting and prosecuting such claim, a sum greater than $10 (payable only upon the order of the Commissioner of Pensions, by the pension agent making payment of the pension allowed), or who shall wrongfully withhold from a pensioner or claimant the whole or any part of the pension or claim allowed and due such pensioner or claimant, shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor, and upon conviction thereof shall, for every such offense, be fined not exceeding $500, or imprisonment at hard labor not exceeding two years, or both, in the discretion of the court.

SEC. 3. That all laws and parts of laws which conflict with the provisions of this act be, and the same are hereby, repealed.

Amendment intended to be proposed by Mr. BLAIR to the bill (S. 373) for the relief of women enrolled as Army nurses, etc., namely: Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

"That all women who volunteered or were registered in the United States service under medical authority as Army nurses, or hospital agents during the late 'war of the rebellion,' and who rendered six months' service in the hospitals, or on the battle-fields, or who, prior to the completion of the period named, were disabled in said service and honorably discharged by reason of such disability, or on showing present necessity, upon making proof of service rendered, from surgeons, or others having personal knowledge of the same, which may be verified, as far as possible, by any records on file in the War Department, according to such rules and regulations as the Secretary of the Interior may provide, shall be placed upon the pension-roll, and entitled to $25 per month, during life; such pensions to commence from the passage of this act: *Provided*, That persons who are now receiving pensions under special enactments, or under general laws, who are entitled to the benefits of this act, may, by making application to the Commissioner of Pensions, as herein provided, receive the above sum in addition to their present pension as an increase.

"SEC. 2. That any agent, attorney, or other person instrumental in prosecuting any claim under this act who shall, directly or indirectly, contract for, demand, receive, or retain for his services or instrumentality in presenting and prosecuting such claim a sum greater than $10 (payable only upon the order of the Commissioner of Pensions, by the pension agent making payment to claimant of the pension allowed) shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor, and upon conviction thereof shall, for every such offense, be fined not exceeding $500, or imprisonment at hard labor not exceeding two years, or both, in the discretion of the court.

"SEC. 3. That all laws and parts of laws which conflict with the provisions of this act be, and the same are hereby, repealed."

My genial friend from Missouri [Mr. COCKRELL] I have plied twenty or thirty times to know if he was ready to take up this bill, and I suppose he is waiting yet for papers from the Department of War.

Mr. COCKRELL. He needs more information.

Mr. BLAIR. He nods assent, and as to when these Army nurses will get their claim nothing save some power possessed of the power of prophecy can give any indication; but I will assure the Senator that if there were a quorum here and we could do business at all, I would not fail to move its consideration.

Mr. MORGAN. Is there no quorum here?

Mr. BLAIR. I should think there would be, listening to one of my speeches. They are in the Democratic committee-rooms, it may be.

A bill (S. 379) to allow soldiers and sailors in the United States service who have lost both hands an increased pension.

Passed the Senate March 21, 1888.

An act (S. 379) to allow soldiers and sailors in the United States service who have lost both hands an increased pension.

Be it enacted, etc., That from and after the passage of this act all persons who, in the military or naval service of the United States and in the line of duty, have lost both hands shall be entitled to a pension of $100 per month.

Amend the title of the bill so as to read: "A bill to increase pensions in certain cases."

A bill (S. 509) authorizing an increase in pensions in cases of deafness.

Passed the Senate and House and became a law.

An act authorizing an increase in pensions in cases of deafness.

Be it enacted, etc., That from and after the passage of this act all persons on the pension-rolls of the United States, or who may hereafter be thereon, drawing pensions on account of loss of hearing, shall be entitled to receive, in lieu of the amount now paid in case of such disability, the sum of $30, in cases of total deafness, and such proportion thereof in cases of partial deafness as the Secretary of the Interior may deem equitable; the amount paid to be determined by the degree of disability existing in each case.

A bill (S. 993) to restore pensions in certain cases.

Passed the Senate March 21, 1888.

An act to restore pensions in certain cases.

Be it enacted, etc., That the act entitled "An act to restore pensions in certain cases," approved June 9, 1880, shall be construed so as to include within its provisions all officers and enlisted men in the Army, and their widows and minor children.

A bill (S. 1000) to increase the pensions of certain soldiers and sailors who are utterly helpless from injuries received or diseases contracted while in the service of the United States.

Passed the Senate February 2, 1888.

An act to increase the pensions of certain soldiers and sailors who are utterly helpless from injuries received or diseases contracted while in the service of the United States.

Be it enacted, etc., That from and after the passage of this act all persons who are or who may become totally helpless from injuries received or diseases contracted while in the military or naval service of the United States shall be entitled to receive a pension of $72 per month.

SEC. 2. That the increase allowed by this act to those persons who may hereafter become totally helpless shall be made to commence in strict conformity with section 4698½, Revised Statutes.

A bill (S. 1529) to amend paragraph 3 of section 4693 of the Revised Statutes, and for other purposes.

Passed the Senate March 31, 1888.

A bill (S. 1529) to amend paragraph 3 of section 4693 of the Revised Statutes, and for other purposes.

Be it enacted, etc., That so much of paragraph 3 of section 4693 of the Revised Statutes as provides that no claim of a State militiaman on account of disability from wounds or injuries received in battle with rebels or Indians, while temporarily rendering service, shall be valid unless prosecuted to a successful issue prior to the 4th day of July, 1874, is hereby repealed.

SEC. 2. That the claims of all such persons now pending, or which may be hereafter filed, shall be adjudicated in the same manner as claims of persons who have been regularly enlisted in the United States military service. This act shall include claimants wounded or disabled in any Indian war prior or subsequent to the passage of this act.

A bill (S. 1567) to give a pension of $100 per month to persons who, in the military or naval service of the United States, and in the discharge of duty, have lost both hands, or the use of both hands.

A bill (S. 1567) to give a pension of $100 per month to persons who, in the military or naval service of the United States, and in the discharge of duty, have lost both hands, or the use of both hands.

Be it enacted, etc., That from and after the passage of this act all persons who, in the military or naval service of the United States and in line of duty, shall have lost both hands, or lost the use of both hands, so as to require the regular personal aid and attendance of another person, shall be entitled to a pension of $100 per month; and this shall not be so construed as to reduce any pension.

That bill has not been acted upon as yet. The subject-matter has been considered. The Senate committee has several important bills as yet not acted upon on its files, for the reason that our work seems to go for nothing. If we do pass these bills in the Senate, they die almost invariably and inevitably in the House. The records show how that is. It is not at all strange that the committee is discouraged in doing this important and interminable work merely to provide material for the agencies of destruction in other departments of the Government.

A bill (S. 1596) in relation to oaths in pension and other cases.

Passed the Senate March 31, 1888.

A bill (S. 1596) in relation to oaths in pension and other cases.

Be it enacted, etc., That any and all affidavits and declarations to be hereafter made or used in any pension or bounty cases, or in claims against the Government for back pay or arrears or increase of pension, or for quarterly vouchers, or oath of allegiance, may be taken by any officer authorized to administer oaths for general purposes in the State, city, or county where said officer resides. If such officer has a seal and uses it upon such paper, no certificate of a county clerk, or prothonotary, or clerk of a court shall be necessary; but when no seal is used by the officer taking such affidavit, then a clerk of a court of record, or a county or city clerk, or prothonotary having a seal shall affix it thereto, and shall certify to the signature of said officer, to the effect that such certifying officer believes his signature is genuine.

A bill (S. 1626) to amend the act of March 3, 1877, entitled "An act amending the pension law so as to remove the disability of those who, having participated in the rebellion, have, since its termination, enlisted in the Army of the United States and become disabled."

Passed the Senate March 31, 1888.

An act to amend the act of March 3, 1877, entitled "An act amending the pension law so as to remove the disability of those who, having participated in the rebellion, have, since its termination, enlisted in the Army of the United States and become disabled."

Be it enacted, etc., That the act of March 3, 1877, entitled "An act to amend the pension law so as to remove the disability of those who, having participated in the rebellion, have, since its termination, enlisted in the Army of the United States and become disabled," be, and hereby is, amended to read as follows:

"That the law prohibiting the payment of any money on account of pensions to any person, or to the widow, children, or heirs of any deceased person, who in any manner engaged in or aided or abetted the late rebellion against the authority of the United States, shall not be construed to apply to such persons as afterward voluntarily enlisted in the Army or Navy of the United States, and who, while was in such service, incurred disability from a wound or injury received or disease contracted in the line of duty."

That is an evidence of the ultra determination of the representatives of the people of the North to inflict some indignity, some species of mal-action, some terrible blow to the feelings and the prosperity of our friends of the South. We will get it up and pass it at any time unless, indeed, it should meet with that sort of opposition which I met with when I tried to do a little something for the confederate soldiers in getting them employment instead of its being given to confederates who were not soldiers, to disabled men instead of men who were not disabled, men who were to render an equivalent for all they got, because whatever they received would be simply the wages which would be paid to somebody and would go in any event to somebody who was in the service of the so-called Confederate States.

A bill (S. 1770) granting pensions to soldiers and sailors confined in Confederate prisons.

On the Senate Calendar.

A bill granting pensions to soldiers and sailors confined in Confederate prisons.

Whereas many officers, soldiers, and sailors of the Federal Army and Navy were confied in so-called Confederate prisons for an unusual length of time, suffering great hardships, and contracting disease hard to prove under the existing pension laws: Therefore,

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension-roll the names of such officers, soldiers, sailors, and marines who, while in the service of the United States and while in the line of their duty, were taken prisoners of war, and as such confined in so-called Confederate prisons, between the 1st of May, 1861, and the 1st of May, 1865, as follows: All who were prisoners of war two months and less than six months, one-half pension; those who were prisoners of war six months and less than twelve months, a three-fourths pension; and all such as were prisoners of war twelve months and more than twelve months, a total pension; and, furthermore, such surviving prisoners of war shall receive $2 a day for each and every day's confinement in said Confederate prisons: *Provided*, That such pension shall in each case begin from the date of the passage of this act, and shall be paid at the same time and in the same manner as other pensions are now paid: *Provided further*, That this act shall not entitle any person to draw more than one pension, but that such survivors of the so-called Confederate military prisons as are entitled to and are receiving a pension at the time of the passage of this act shall be entitled to the increase of their pension which this act may grant them.

A bill (S. 2381) to so amend section 9646 of the Revised Statutes as to allow the pensions of officers of the Army and Navy, their widows and dependent parents, to be rated as of the rank held by such officers at the date of discharge.

On the Senate Calendar.

A bill to so amend section 9646 of the Revised Statutes as to allow the pensions of officers of the Army and Navy, their widows and dependent parents, to be rated as of the rank held by such officers at the date of discharge.

Be it enacted, etc., That in all cases in which application for a pension is now pending, or shall hereafter be made, by any officer of the Army or Navy, or the widow or dependent parent of the same, where the proof shows that the person on account of whose disability application is made incurred the disability for which, or in consequence of which, the pension is claimed in the line of duty, but nevertheless remained in the service, and was afterward promoted and mustered into service in good faith, the claimant, whether officer, or widow, or dependent parent, shall be entitled to receive the same pension that would have been allowed in case such disability had been received while such officer held the rank which he occupied when discharged from the service.

SEC. 2. That in any case where a pension has been heretofore granted to any such person, or widow, or dependent parent, in which by this act a higher rating is provided for, the Secretary of the Interior shall, upon due application and proof, increase such pension according to and on the basis prescribed by this act.

Amend the title so as to read: "A bill to allow the pensions of officers of the Army and Navy, their widows and dependent parents, to be rated as of the rank held by such officers at the date of discharge."

That bill has passed the Senate, and a more just bill in its way, though comparatively unimportant, can not be conceived. Here is a man who when he is a corporal or a private loses his physical powers by wounds or by other disability, yet he is sufficiently serviceable by reason of his intellectual qualities, it may be—at all events he is so necessary to the service that he remains in the service, and in spite of all this discomfort and disability, the ill conditions under which he continues in the service of his country, he wins promotion. That man may become a general by his service in camp and in field, and yet if after his discharge he applies for a pension he will only receive one in proportion to the pay which he received at the time the injury was inflicted. The bill is designed to give him pension as of the rate belonging to the rank which he held at the time of his discharge.

A bill (S. 2446) granting an increase of pensions in certain cases therein mentioned.

Passed the Senate May 16, 1888.

An act granting an increase of pensions in certain cases therein mentioned.

Be it enacted, etc., That section 4698 of the Revised Statutes of the United States be, and the same is hereby, amended so as to allow to all persons who are now paid, or may hereafter be found entitled to, a pension for the loss of one eye or the sight thereof, under existing laws for such disability, a pension of $16 per month in lieu of any lesser sum now by law provided therefor, the increase herein provided to take effect only from the passage of this act.

SEC. 2. That nothing herein contained shall deprive a pensioner of the right to a higher rating by reason of his rating for total disability, as is now provided for by existing laws.

SEC. 3. That the Commissioner of Pensions is hereby required and authorized to proportionately divide the rate for a partial loss of sight of either or both eyes, upon the basis of the rate for the loss of one eye herein provided for.

I submit these measures for the examination of the future if not of the present, in order that the public records may contain the evidence upon which a just conclusion can be arrived at as to the proposition of the President and the Democratic party that they are specially the friends of the soldiers of the war for the Union; that they have done as much, and always what they could, to secure justice to these servants of the public. I submit that the record is against them, as the result of the war was against them.

The single bill, Senate bill 1886, had in it more of good than all the other pension legislation that has taken place or that has been proposed during the last four Congresses by any party whatsoever, and not only have we failed to secure a consideration of it, not only has that bill in the various forms in which it has been pending for years been destroyed in the House, but an exceedingly imperfect and comparatively useless and unimportant and a troublesome sort of bill in administration, which would nevertheless have done some good, was vetoed by the President in the Forty-ninth Congress. In this Congress the Senate has passed a bill, introduced by Senator MANDERSON at request of the Grand Army, including or supposed to include only 15,000 of the 250,000 or more cases that Senate bill 1886 would have relieved—a bill which we passed simply because we could not pass anything better with hope of its favorable consideration by the executive power.

That went to the House a long time ago. Senators will remember the debate we had upon it, that it was a mere pretense of relief, but we took it simply because we had no hope of getting more. The Grand Army came here entreating for the passage of just this little measure of relief for men that were absolutely in suffering and abject poverty in this country, men but for whom there would have been no country to-day, no Treasury, no surplus, no existing taxing power whatever, no unity, no nation at all. They appealed to us that these men might receive a mite to ease the suffering of their remaining lives. That bill has gone to the House. No action has been had upon it, not even by the Democratic committee.

It has not even been returned, as I understand, to the House. Certainly it has not been considered, and if considered nobody believes it would ever be approved by the Executive, who comes to us in the message which draws from me these remarks and postures before the country as one determined that no defender of his country shall suffer by reason of the hostile action of the Senate of the United States. I have shown that but for the special act which has been vetoed there never would have been any reconsideration, much less reversal of their own

unjust action in the Pension Office; there would never have been any allowance of the claim. Tell the truth.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The bill, with the message of the President, will be referred to the Committee on Pensions, and printed.

WILLIAM S. BRADSHAW—VETO MESSAGE.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore* laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States; which was read:

To the Senate:

I herewith return without approval Senate bill No. 3208, entitled "An act granting a pension to William S. Bradshaw."

The beneficiary mentioned in this bill was mustered into the military service as first lieutenant on the 28th day of October, 1861.

About eight months afterwards, and in June, 1862, he resigned from the service, his resignation being based upon a surgeon's certificate which he procured, and which is as follows:

"William S. Bradshaw having applied for a certificate to accompany his resignation, I do hereby certify that I have carefully examined this officer and find that his disease is of a chronic pleuritic character, contracted (previous to his entering the service) four years since from an injury received in shoeing a fractious horse, in consequence of which he was laid up for a number of weeks with a severe attack of pleuritis; that he has never been able to endure severe labor since; that since entering the service active drilling or marching has invariably developed severe pleuritic pains about his chest and underneath his sternum, rendering him totally unfit for duty."

It is entirely evident that the statements contained in this certificate are of such a nature that they must have almost entirely been communicated to the surgeon by the officer himself. It will be observed that there is an absolute lack of any intimation that his disabilities were attributable in their origin to army service, and he surely can not ask us to believe that a man with the intelligence fitting him to be a commissioned officer in the Army, and having this certificate in his possession, did not know what it contained.

It furnished the reason for his honorable discharge in the dark days of his country's need and operated as an exemption from further military service.

And yet in September, 1883, more than twenty-one years after his discharge, he applied to the Pension Bureau for a pension, alleging lameness of breast and back, contracted in the service.

After an examination of all the facts, I can not believe that this is a case in which a pension should be granted.

GROVER CLEVELAND.

EXECUTIVE MANSION, *October* 15, 1888.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. Shall the bill pass, the objections of the President of the United States to the contrary notwithstanding?

Mr. SAWYER. I move that the bill and message be referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. BROWN. I object to the reference at this time. The Senate is not in a condition at this time where it has power to pass an order making the reference. Upon that question I desire to be heard for a few moments.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The Chair can not hear the Senator on that question.

Mr. BROWN. Not on a motion to refer?

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. If the Senator objects upon the ground he states, the Chair will have to ascertain whether the Senate is in a condition to refer the bill and message or not.

Mr. BROWN. I will just conform to the ruling of the Chair, and simply object without giving my reason.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. That being the case, the message and bill will lie on the table.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. CLARK, its Clerk, announced that the House had agreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 11262) to authorize the construction of bridges across the Kentucky River and its tributaries by the Richmond, Nicholasville, Irvine and Beattysville Railroad Company.

The message further announced that the House had passed a bill (H. R. 3715) for the relief of the State National Bank of New Orleans, formerly Louisiana State Bank; in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message also announced that the House insisted upon its amendments to the bill (S. 1786) to regulate appointments in the Marine-Hospital Service of the United States, agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and had appointed Mr. PHELAN, Mr. LAGAN, and Mr. O'NEILL of Pennsylvania managers at the conference on the part of the House.

SARAH C. TAYLOR.

Mr. TURPIE. I ask the Presiding Officer to lay before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 1482) granting a pension to Sarah C. Taylor. The effect of the amendment is to reduce the allowance made by the Senate bill from $25 to $12 per month.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. FRYE in the chair) laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 1482) granting a pension to Sarah C. Taylor; which was, in line 6, before the word "dollars," to strike out "twenty-five" and insert "twelve."

Mr. TURPIE. I move that the Senate concur in the amendment of the House of Representatives.

The motion was agreed to.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. Is it the pleasure of the Senate now to receive morning business?

Mr. BROWN. I present the petition of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of the State of Georgia, praying for the repeal of the internal-revenue laws. I move its reference to the Committee on Finance, and desire to make some remarks on the motion.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. If there be no objection, the petition will be received, and the Senator from Georgia will be recognized as entitled to the floor as soon as other morning business is through.

Mr. TURPIE presented the petition of Thomas H. Shelton and other citizens of Green Oak, Ind., praying that a widow's pension be granted to Mrs. Elizabeth New; which was referred to the Committee on Pensions.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES.

Mr. TURPIE, from the Committee on Pensions, to whom were referred the following bills, reported them severally without amendment, and submitted reports thereon:

A bill (H. R. 2707) granting a pension to Baker Saine;
A bill (H. R. 8549) granting a pension to Louisa Rogers;
A bill (H. R. 8521) for the relief of William A. Mathes; and
A bill (H. R. 10199) for the relief of William E. Springstein.

Mr. SAWYER, from the Committee on Pensions, to whom were referred the following bills, reported them severally without amendment, and submitted reports thereon:

A bill (H. R. 3608) to grant an increase of pension to William E. Prince;
A bill (H. R. 4887) granting a pension to Charles E. Scott;
A bill (H. R. 4648) granting a pension to Jemima Sterling; and
A bill (H. R. 2236) granting a pension to Eli Yamgheim.

Mr. SAWYER, from the Committee on Pensions, to whom was referred the bill (S. 3628) granting an increase of pension to Emma Riddle, reported it with an amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

COMMITTEE ON EPIDEMIC DISEASES.

Mr. DAVIS. I have been requested by the chairman of the Committee on Contingent Expenses to present on his behalf a favorable report upon the resolution submitted by the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. HAMPTON] October 10, 1888, and to ask for its consideration.

The resolution was considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Epidemic Diseases have leave to sit during the recess of Congress, and any necessary expenses shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the Senate.

WASHINGTON AQUEDUCT TUNNEL.

Mr. HALE. With the approval of the members of the Committee on Appropriations who are present I report a joint resolution and ask for its immediate passage. It will speak for itself.

The joint resolution (S. R. 116) authorizing the Secretary of War to protect the Washington Aqueduct tunnel, was read the first time at length, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That the Secretary of War be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to use so much of any unexpended balance of appropriations for the work of the Washington Aqueduct tunnel, District of Columbia, as may be necessary, for the purpose of protecting and preserving the work already done upon said tunnel.

Mr. HALE. Under the rulings of the Comptroller no work can be continued on this tunnel after the 1st of November, and there is now no fund that can be used by the Secretary of War for preserving and protecting this great work. The resolution provides simply that from the unexpended balances which have not yet been used, the Secretary may for that purpose, and for that alone, use such sums as may be necessary to protect and preserve the work.

By unanimous consent the joint resolution was read the second time and considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The joint resolution was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

BILLS INTRODUCED.

Mr. VEST introduced a bill (S. 3633) for the relief of the legal representatives of Samuel A. Craddock, late of Audrain County, Missouri; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. BLACKBURN introduced a bill (S. 3634) granting a pension to Mrs. Nancy Smith; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. SAWYER introduced a bill (S. 3635) granting a pension to Persis L. Hall; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. CHACE (by request) introduced a bill (S. 3636) for the relief of William McClain; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

HOUSE BILL REFERRED.

The bill (H. R. 3715) for the relief of the State National Bank of New Orleans, formerly Louisiana State Bank, was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

EXHIBITS AT PARIS EXPOSITION.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. President——

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. Does the Senator from Georgia yield to the Senator from Alabama?

Mr. BROWN. I will yield to the Senator from Alabama, but I shall not yield further. My remarks will not be lengthy.

Mr. MORGAN. I desire to call up the joint resolution (S. R. 115) authorizing the Departments of the Government to use articles in their possession for exhibition at the Paris exhibition of 1889.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. Is there objection to the present consideration of the joint resolution?

Mr. HOAR. Let it be read for information.

Mr. MORGAN. I offer a substitute for it.

Mr. HOAR. Let the substitute be read.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The amendment will be read.

The SECRETARY. It is proposed to strike out all after the resolving clause and insert:

That the Secretary of State, the Secretary of the Treasury, the Secretary of War, the Secretary of the Navy, the Postmaster-General, the Secretary of the Interior, the Attorney-General, the Commissioner of Agriculture, the Secretary of the Smithsonian Institution, the Director of the National Museum, the Commissioner of the Fish Commission, and the Commissioner of Labor be, and they are severally hereby, authorized, in their discretion, to use for exhibition at the Paris Universal Exposition of 1889 such articles as may be available for said exposition, and that any unexpended balances of the appropriations for the Cincinnati Exhibition of 1888 may be applied for that purpose.

By unanimous consent, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the joint resolution.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The question is on agreeing to the amendment proposed by the Senator from Alabama [Mr. MORGAN].

The amendment was agreed to.

The joint resolution was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendment was concurred in.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

WASHINGTON AND WESTERN MARYLAND RAILROAD.

Mr. SPOONER. The Senator from Georgia kindly yields to me for a moment. I move that the bill (H. R. 9415) to incorporate the Washington and Western Maryland Railroad Company be recommitted to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

The motion was agreed to.

WILLIAM S. BRADSHAW—VETO MESSAGE.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. Does the Senator from Georgia object to the reference of Senate bill 3208 and the veto message of the President to the Committee on Pensions?

Mr. BROWN. No, sir.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. It will be so ordered, if there be no objection.

BUSINESS OF THE SESSION.

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, the Constitution of the United States in Article I, section 5, says:

Each House shall be the judge of the elections, returns and qualifications of its own members, and a majority of each shall constitute a quorum to do business; but a smaller number may adjourn from day to day, etc.

Neither House of Congress has the right to do business in the absence of a quorum, and Congress has certainly no right to do business in the absence of a quorum in either House. I suppose I may without transcending proper bounds say truthfully that there has not probably been a quorum in the House of Representatives, as shown by the different divisions called for and published, at any time within the last ten days or two weeks. And while I do not demand a call of the Senate at present, I suppose I may say with equal truth that there is not probably a quorum of the Senate now present, either in this Chamber or in the city of Washington, and that there is no reasonable probability that there will again be a quorum of either House present answering to their names before the first Monday in December.

It follows therefore that neither can do any business that is objected to by a Senator in one case or a Representative in the other. I submit, then, that we can do no legal act as a Congress in the present state of affairs, and that there is but one thing left that ought to be done, and that is, that Congress shall adjourn at the earliest day possible; and it might be much more convenient in getting away from here, if the adjournment should take place before there has been a formal test of the question whether there is a quorum present.

Now, why this extraordinary proceeding? We have already protracted the session to a greater length than was ever reached by any other Congress from the commencement of the Government to the present day. We ought to have a good excuse before our constituents for this protracted session, and we ought to be able to show something substantial that we have accomplished during ten and a half months of constant session.

It may be said that our salaries are the same whether Congress is in session or not; but the expense of Congress is very different when in session to the expense when Congress is not in session. Every day that we stay here we are wasting in salaries and hire of clerks, messengers, doorkeepers, printers, and other expenses, to say nothing of the bills that we are passing illegally without a quorum, large sums of money that ought not to be expended in the present state of things.

Now, why all this irregularity and this extraordinary conduct on the part of the Congress of the United States?

It all grows out of the fact that there is a Presidential campaign pending; that the two parties are jealous of each other, and each is constantly fearing that the other will get some advantage, and it grows out of the further fact that the two parties are divided on the tariff question, and while they both profess to be in favor of a reduction of revenues, so as to rid the country of the surplus in the Treasury and send it back into the proper channels of trade, still each party is afraid that the other will get the advantage in the manner of conducting the campaign by the legislation which may be enacted.

In the House of Representatives, which alone has the power to originate a revenue bill, the Democratic party is in the majority and controls the House. That party, from the time of the organization of the committees, which I believe was in January, down to the latter part of July, was occupied in considering, preparing, reporting, and passing a tariff bill looking to a reduction of the revenues and of the surplus in the Treasury. The House passed a bill and sent it to the Senate more than two months ago. The Republicans having a majority of the Senate, took up this question, by its Finance Committee, and a subcommittee took probably some two months in preparing a bill to be offered as a substitute for the House bill. This bill gives the Republican plan of reducing the revenues and disposing of the surplus in the Treasury. I do not think the Democrats in the House consumed more time than was necessary, in view of the great task that was before them, and I do not think the Republicans have consumed more time in the Senate than the necessities of the case required, or more than was necessary to do the labor of preparing a bill for a thorough revision of the tariff.

The Democratic House having fully discussed the measure, the Republican Senate was certainly entitled to reasonable time for discussion; but when we take into the account the fact that for the last sixth months or more the question has been almost constantly discussed in one branch or the other of Congress, and in the public press, and by politicians in every portion of the Union, it can hardly be expected that much that is new can be produced in the discussion in the Senate at the present time. Distinguished Senators have already made able speeches on the question, throwing much light upon it; and able and distinguished Senators may still follow and discuss the same question in different forms and under different headings, but after all the argument must be substantially the same that we have already heard.

Now, in this state of the case, with no quorum of either House present, I do not think any one will say that it is possible to pass a tariff bill at this session of Congress. Suppose the Senate should remain in session and discuss the bill for another month, or until the first Monday in December; and taking it by sections it would probably take that length of time, as it took more than that length of time in the House to discuss it in detail by sections. Then, if the Senate should pass its bill and send it back to the House as a substitute for the House bill, the question must go to a conference committee, and there would be no reasonable probability, pending the Presidential campaign, that the two Houses would agree upon a bill that would become a law. In this state of the case what earthly use is there for continuing the session?

There certainly is no good excuse for its continuance for another day, unless it is claimed that the Republican party in the Senate has not had an equal chance with the Democratic party in the House for the discussion of the question. But there is certainly no reason why the debate should be as protracted in the Senate as it was in the House, when we have the able debate in the House by the leading orators of both parties before us for our information. Now I see no reason why an adjournment should not be agreed upon at once, unless the Republicans will state that they do not feel that they can safely go to the country on their substitute without further discussion, or that they believe they can pass a tariff bill at this session.

Let it be borne in mind, however, that the question has been very ably discussed by the chairman of the committee, Mr. SHERMAN; and Mr. ALLISON, who has the bill in charge, made a lengthy and at the same time a very able presentation of the views of his party on the question. He has been followed by the Senator from New York, Mr. HISCOCK, the Senator from Illinois, Mr. CULLOM, the Senator from Rhode Island, Mr. CHACE, and the two Senators from Connecticut, who have ably expounded their side of the question.

On the other hand, the Democratic side has been very ably presented by the Senator from North Carolina, Mr. VANCE, the Senator from Tennessee, Mr. BATE, the Senator from Florida, Mr. CALL, the Senator from Texas, Mr. REAGAN, and others are still to be heard.

It seems to me, when two weeks have been taken in the able presentation of the case by the distinguished orators on both sides whose names I have just mentioned, that there is little left for others to say.

I do not by these remarks intend to be understood as claiming for either party an advantage over the other in the discussion, and I do not say that the Republicans with propriety might not continue the discussion and attempt to pass their bill if there was a quorum present.

Let it be borne in mind, however, that a majority of the Senators belonging to each of the political parties, including several of the most distinguished leaders on each side, are now absent.

In this state of the case I take it that no vote can be had upon the bill, and no good can come from protracting the discussion. If we can not at this session pass a tariff bill, we ought without further delay to adjourn *sine die*, and let the bill go over until the December session. I do not believe, after the long discussion that has already been had on the question, both in and out of Congress, that either party is making a single vote by protracting this debate in this Chamber.

The intelligent people of the United States have no doubt made up their verdict on this question, and they only wait for the election to make up the record. If anything can be done to influence them either way, it will be better done by meeting the people face to face and discussing the question in their hearing than it can be done by sending out speeches from this Chamber, which, by the time they are now prepared, printed, and sent out, will not be generally read, and would not probably influence to any great extent the popular verdict.

The most that can be done by either party in the short remaining period of the campaign will be to see to it that they get their people to the polls.

I do not propose to demand a call of the Senate, or to make any point to test the question of quorum or no quorum for the present, as I understand there are two or three Senators who have already prepared tariff speeches that they desire to deliver; but I do not believe that other legislation ought to be proceeded with until there is a quorum present to take part in the deliberations of the Senate, and to cast their votes on all questions that come before the body, and to discharge their duty as Senators.

A majority of the Senate have no right to leave their seats in this Chamber and go home to engage in the campaign or in other business, and leave a minority here to protract the session, which has already been longer than the people of this country approve.

Now, Mr. President, I desire to ask the Senator from Iowa [Mr. ALLISON], who has the bill in charge, if he sees any possible chance to pass a tariff bill at the present session of Congress and in the present state of things, when there is not a quorum of either House present and no probability that we can get a quorum before the December session?

Does the Senator from Iowa expect under any state of the case to be able to pass the bill through both Houses in any shape at the present session of Congress? If there is to be a tariff bill passed by the Fiftieth Congress, is it not now inevitable that it must be done by the next and not by the present session of Congress?

Mr. COCKRELL. Mr. President, I——

Mr. BROWN. I desire to have the Senator from Iowa answer my question.

Mr. COCKRELL. I yield to the Senator from Iowa.

Mr. ALLISON. Mr. President, the Senator from Georgia [Mr. BROWN], I think, in the main has very well stated the situation, and therefore it is hardly worth while for me to answer in any great detail the specific questions submitted by him.

I do not now see, I will say frankly to the Senator from Georgia and to the Senate, that it is possible to pass through the Senate during the remainder of this session the revenue bill under the circumstances which surround us. Three weeks from to-morrow we have a Presidential election. I think it will be conceded by all that Senators should have an opportunity of going home in a reasonable time for the purpose of participating in that election. So, unless we are to sit here continuously until the 1st of December without a recess or adjournment, I do not think it possible to pass this bill through the Senate.

The next question is, whether I believe if we should stay until the 1st of December or until such time as we should get this measure fully and intelligently presented, that then the bill could pass the other House? As I understand, the rules of the House will require that the bill when returned shall go to the Committee of the Whole. Therefore should the bill go through it would result in some weeks of discussion, and should there be at once a conference ordered, it seems to me that under the circumstances it would be impossible to complete the bill before next December.

There is another thing which I ought to mention, and that is that we should have in the consideration of this bill a full Senate, and without saying anything respecting why we have not a full Senate I think Senators will all agree with me that that is impracticable and impossible for the next few weeks. I do not believe that Senators will remain here in session for the next three weeks to consider this bill pending the Presidential election, nor do I believe that we are called upon to do so.

The Senator from Georgia states that this is the longest session known in our history; but it is a fact that to this day and to this hour, laying aside this tariff question entirely and absolutely, this Senate and this Congress are not ready to adjourn. That is a most extraordinary circumstance.

Mr. GEORGE. Will the Senator repeat that statement?

Mr. ALLISON. I say, laying aside the question of the tariff entirely, this Congress is not this day and this hour ready to adjourn if it discharges fully the duties which are required of it. We have the most extraordinary situation as respects the appropriation bills. One of the important appropriation bills of this session, one affecting a vast number of people, and in many instances very many poor people, the general deficiency bill, has not yet received the signature of the President of the United States. It was only transmitted to him, I think, last Friday or last Saturday. Therefore, whatever may be said as respects the discussion of the tariff bill or its consideration in the other House or in this Chamber, there has never yet been a moment when either House could afford to adjourn on account of the appropriation bills which are necessary to carry on this Government. The most important appropriation bill in the whole list was signed, I believe, only one week ago. Clearly, then, whatever delay has occurred at this session of Congress has not occurred in this Chamber because of the consideration of the tariff bill or the want of that consideration.

Mr. President, the appropriation bills have been considered in this Chamber as they came to us with all the diligence that was possible under the circumstances and in the situation that surrounded us. We have given in the Committee on Appropriations such consideration as we could to those bills and reported them promptly to the Senate of the United States. Therefore, whatever may be the situation now, it does not arise in this Chamber from the consideration of the tariff bill. It arises wholly, so far as we are concerned, from the fact that the appropriation bills did not come to us as they usually come to us, in the early period of the session, and as under the former rules of the House of Representatives and the universal custom of that House they heretofore come to us. So this delay in the appropriation bills is the primal cause of the situation as respects the Senate to-day.

The Senator from Georgia says that the House of Representatives considered the tariff bill and sent it to us during the last week of July. That is true, and it is also true that the Senate Committee on Finance took up the bill with all the care and diligence possible, and reported it to this Chamber at the earliest day practicable. It is also true that since that report has been made we have been engaged here in a general discussion of it, and I know perfectly, as the Senator from Georgia knows, that other gentlemen desire still to be heard upon the measure on both sides of the Chamber.

So I concur with him in the view that it is not possible for us to take up the tariff bill, beginning even to-morrow, and consider it under the ten-minute rule, to pass it, as this bill should be passed, before we return to our respective States for the great Presidential election which is pending.

Now, whether we should take a recess and come back here within a few weeks after that election and go on with this bill, I leave very much to the judgment of Senators on both sides of the Chamber. It has fallen to my lot to have charge of this bill. It is my purpose, I will say to Senators, to pursue it with whatever facility it can be pursued in this Chamber until it is finally disposed of. I am willing to allow a reasonable time for general debate upon it, but after a reasonable time I shall ask both sides of the Chamber to consent that we shall take up this bill paragraph by paragraph, and debate it under the ordinary five or ten minute rule respecting each paragraph.

Whatever we may do now, whether we adjourn to-morrow or next day or next week, we ought to have an understanding in this Chamber that when we return here this shall be the first and the primal business for our consideration, whether it be in November or December, and that we shall give vigilant care and attention to it in order that it may go to the House of Representatives before the Christmas holidays, and if I have my way I shall undertake to pursue this bill to the exclusion of all other business in order that that may be accomplished.

Therefore, Mr. President, having said thus much upon this bill and upon the other questions that have detained us here, I am willing to submit to the judgment of the Senate as respects its further consideration.

THE REVENUE LAWS.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. House bill 9051 is the unfinished business.

Mr. COCKRELL and Mr. VEST addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. Does the senior Senator from Missouri yield to his colleague?

Mr. COCKRELL. Yes, sir.

Mr. VEST. Does the Senator from Iowa desire that we should go on with the discussion this afternoon? I should like to make a motion to go into executive session.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The Chair will recognize the Senator for that purpose. Does the Senator submit the motion?

Mr. ALLISON. I know the Senator from Missouri [Mr. COCKRELL] does not wish to proceed to-night, but perhaps some other Senator who does not wish to occupy much time is ready to go on this evening. If so, I should prefer we should go on for some time to come.

Mr. VEST. Mr. President, I will go on.

Mr. COCKRELL. I hope my colleague will yield unless the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. SPOONER] desires to speak.

Mr. ALLISON. I understand the Senator from Wisconsin is ready to go on this evening. We can have an executive session at a later hour.

Mr. VEST. I had just as lief speak now.

Mr. COCKRELL. Very well. I will not make the motion I was about to submit.

Mr. VEST. I have no prepared speech on the tariff. The issue has been made up and has gone to the country. What I desire to submit in a very few moments will be upon some questions which have arisen in the current debate on the report and bill that have come from the majority of the Finance Committee.

The Senator from Iowa [Mr. ALLISON], who represents the majority of the committee, has just stated that the delay in disposing of tariff legislation has come from the House of Representatives. My reply to that is simply this, that in the Forty-ninth Congress the Democratic party in the House tried to consider the tariff question with a view to readjusting the tariff and diminishing the rates of duty now imposed. The Republican party, with a unanimity never seen before upon any great question, assisted by a few Democrats, succeeded in postponing entirely the consideration of this question. That record is an answer to the Senator from Iowa, complete and irrefutable.

The country understands this whole arrangement; the country understands that the Republican party does not wish to pass any tariff bill. The manufacturers in the East are to be told that they will receive additional protection, if necessary, and the grangers in the Northwest are to be deluded with a promise of a reduction of duty upon the necessaries of life. That is the status of this question to-day, and no amount of assertion or eloquence or argument will change the conviction of the people of the United States in that regard.

But, Mr. President, what I desire particularly to notice is a charge made in the national platform of the Republican party to the effect that this Administration has placed with pet banks $60,000,000 of the public money when that amount should have been applied to the purchase of bonds and the reduction of the bonded debt of the country. The majority of the Committee on Finance have gone away from the logical and I might almost say the legitimate discussion of the tariff question to make this charge, that the Democratic Administration has taken $60,000,000 of the public money and for purposes of favoritism has put it in certain national banks throughout the country.

There has not been a speech made in this Chamber which pointed toward a political subject within the last five months where this charge has not been reiterated. "The uncrowned king of America" with his characteristic aggressive eloquence has recently stated that Mr. Cleveland had put this money into the pockets of certain rich Democrats in Wall street—a charge of corruption, a charge that should damn this Administration in all history and for all time to come, if true.

Now, Mr. President, I propose to show what there has been of favoritism toward pet banks in this country. I propose to investigate the question whether or not enormous amounts of money have been put into the pockets of Democrats by this Administration as charged upon this floor and in the public prints and by stump-speakers throughout the country.

Mr. Blaine, with his characteristic indifference to actual figures and facts, and with that glittering sort of spasmodic eloquence which characterizes his effusions, recently stated that this Administration was putting in the pockets of its favorites $3,000,000 every year, being 5 per cent. upon $60,000,000 deposited with the national depositories; and he was pleased to observe in a speech lately made in which he is said by his friends to have annihilated the Postmaster-General, Mr. Dickinson, quoting from Charles James Fox, that ignorance in a Cabinet minister was utterly inexcusable. Now, if ignorance in a Cabinet minister be inexcusable, what must be or what could be the excuse for certain statements made by the ex-premier of a Republican administration and an ex-candidate for the Presidency?

Mr. Fairchild, in his speech on Saturday last in New York, so effectually disposed of Mr. Blaine's argument that I will quote his remarks in full:

WHAT BANKS EARN ON DEPOSITS.

Mr. Fairchild here quoted Mr. Blaine's assertion that with money at 5 per cent. a deposit of $60,000,000 would be a gratuity to the national banks holding the money of $3,000,000 a year.

This is not true. There are a number of banks with deposits of a million and over. I have in mind a half dozen where I know the officers to be prominent and zealous Republicans, and I can think of but one where the officers are Democrats of prominence. So much for the politics; now for the profits. Mr. Blaine says that a deposit of $1,000,000 is worth to the depository $50,000 a year. Let us see. A deposit of $1,000,000 would require $910,000 of 4 per cent. bonds as the security, which at 125 would have cost $1,137,500. This money, loaned at 5 per cent., would have given the bank $56,875 if the bank had not become a depository, but being a depository, it must keep 25 per cent. of the deposit as a reserve, so it can loan but $750,000, which produces $37,500 interest. Now add the interest on the United States bonds, which Mr. Blaine, with horror, says that the banks are allowed to collect—4 per cent. on $910,000 is $36,400—and you have $73,900 received by the depository. But from this should be deducted 1½ per cent., the yearly proportion of the 25 per cent. premium, which the owner of the bonds must lose when the bonds are paid at maturity, twenty years from date of purchase, and there is left $62,525, the difference between which and $56,875, is $5,650, not $50,000 as stated by Mr. Blaine.

So that, Mr. President, by the plainest rules of arithmetical calculation, instead of a profit of $3,000,000 a year which exists in the imagination of "the uncrowned king of America," the profit on the whole amount of the deposit, even putting it at $60,000,000, which it never was, would amount to $339,000 a year instead of $3,000,000, a mere bagatelle of two million and some six hundred thousand dollars, but it is as near exactitude as "the uncrowned king of America" ever reaches when attacking the Democratic party.

If Senators will take the trouble to look at Executive Document No. 248, they will find a list of the national depositories which have received from the Treasury fifty-eight million and some hundred thousand dollars of deposits of the public money. It is said that this money was put out through the country to favorites and pet banks. I have here a list made out with absolute exactness of the amount of money that is now in the depositories of the United States, amounting in the aggregate to $58,527,076.78 to this date. I have here a statement of the amount of money placed in the depositories of each State, and the State of Massachusetts, hopelessly Republican beyond any sort of peradventure, has more money in its national depositories in proportion to population than any State in the entire Union. Take the State of Ohio, also a hopelessly Republican State judging from all its political antecedents, and Ohio has $7,014,055.21, and Massachusetts, as I omitted to state, has $6,668,831.68.

The largest State in the Union and the great financial State of the entire country, in which is located Wall street and where is the financial heart of the United States, has $13,354,618, with her enormous population, while six millions and some hundred thousand dollars are in Massachusetts with one-fourth of the population, and $7,000,000 and more in the hopelessly Republican State of Ohio, whilst in the Southern States there is a mere pittance, because, Mr. President, under the operation of the tariff system the money of the country is in the North and in the East and not in the South and West. The national debt and the bonds of the Government are held in the nine manufacturing States in a proportion outside of all legitimate proportion as to population and territory. This system has put the money of the country there, and the national banks are found in a larger proportion in those States than elsewhere.

But, Mr. President, I propose to look into this question of favoritism to pet banks. This is not the first time that the national banks in this country have been used as fiscal agents of the Government. They are by law made the fiscal agents of the people of the United States, although they have at times forgotten that agency and assumed to be the master and to control the moneyed interests of the people who own them.

In 1879, when the Treasury of the United States under a Republican administration desired to sell the 4 per cent. bonds and to fund the outstanding bonds of the Government issued before that time at a larger rate of interest than 4 per cent., an institution in the city of New York, the First National Bank, was in intimate relations with the Treasury Department of this Government, and I have taken the pains to collect from official sources the remarkable exhibit which is now upon record in the Treasury Department in regard to that institution.

Recollect, Mr. President, that now there are $58,000,000, speaking in round numbers, of public money in the national depositories scattered all over this country—North, South, East, and West. From the account current which I hold in my hand it appears that the First National Bank of New York owed the Government of the United States on April 16, 1879, $185,270,787.95; on May 1, 1879, $180,344,941.75; on June 1, $151,076,952.94; on August 1, $57,963,086.50; and on the first of the next month, September, it owed the Government $20,065,-014.39.

This was not for money deposited, but it was for bonds sent to that bank, it being indebted, according to this account current for the months I have stated, the enormous amounts which its officials controlled and managed as a matter of course for the benefit of their stockholders.

My friend from Alabama [Mr. MORGAN] asks me what security was given. None. The money that is now out in the hands of depositories is secured by a deposit of United States bonds, and not one dollar of it is put into a depository until the bonds are placed by that depository in the national Treasury.

Mr. ALLISON. Shall I understand the Senator to say that there was no security in the case of the First National Bank of New York?

Mr. VEST. Not that I know of. Will the Senator state what security there was?

Mr. ALLISON. United States bonds for every dollar of it. It was secured by United States bonds.

Mr. VEST. As I understand the transaction, the First National Bank of New York was made a fiscal agent of the Government to dispose of the 4 per cent. bonds. They were permitted to pay in bonds of the Government, which we sought then to refund, instead of money, and the only security that the Government of the United States had was in the fact that these bonds were paid over or cash was paid over on this current account from time to time. I propose to put the account in the RECORD, and the Senator from Iowa will see that they paid, for instance, in the city of Washington a large amount, $256,135, and so on from day to day in bonds, bonds of the Government that were to be refunded, and then in another column is their cash account.

There are two accounts, one of the First National Bank of New York

as a corporation, and the other of the syndicate which they represented, but in either event they sent orders by telegraph for bonds, one of those telegrams being for the enormous sum of $190,000,000 of bonds. When these telegrams were received the bonds were sent and the bank was charged with the amount. I will insert the accounts in the RECORD:

Statement showing the payments made by the First National Bank of New York from April 16, 1879, to October 17, 1879.

Date of payment.	Account No. 1—General.		Account No. 2—"Syndicate."		Total payments as per transcripts.	Balances.
	Cash paid in New York.	Called bonds paid in Washington.	Cash paid in New York.	Called bonds paid in Washington.		
Balance						$185,270,787.95
1879.						
April 16		$509,622.92			$509,622.92	
April 17	$200,000.00	255,043.59			455,043.59	
April 19		356,553.23			356,553.23	
April 22		1,629,998.14			1,629,998.14	
April 26		521,501.56			521,501.56	
April 28		727,614.86			727,614.86	
April 30		725,511.90			725,511.90	
						4,925,846.20
May 8	1,000,000.00	2,616,239.72			3,616,239.72	180,344,941.75
May 9	500,000.00				500,000.00	
May 12	1,000,000.00				1,000,000.00	
May 13	1,000,000.00				1,000,000.00	
May 14	1,000,000.00				1,000,000.00	
May 15	1,000,000.00				1,000,000.00	
May 17	1,000,000.00	597,246.46			1,597,246.46	
May 23		841,576.73			841,576.73	
May 24		779,565.21		$10,094.93	789,660.14	
May 27		15,471,197.12			15,471,197.12	
May 29		2,349,756.14			2,349,756.14	
May 31	*102,312.50				102,312.50	
						29,267,988.81
						151,076,952.94
June 3		1,257,621.84			1,257,621.84	
June 4		57,568.50			57,568.50	
June 5		775,782.42			775,782.42	
June 6				10,810,035.75	10,810,035.75	
June 7		434,397.16			434,397.16	
June 13				3,576,388.02	3,576,388.02	
June 14				6,054,246.09	6,054,246.09	
June 17	*51,875.00			640,939.87	692,814.87	
June 18				1,363,741.56	1,363,741.56	
June 19				4,205,369.68	4,205,369.68	
June 21				3,749,374.36	3,749,374.36	
June 26	500,000.00				500,000.00	
June 27	1,000,000.00			12,307,795.68	13,307,795.68	
June 28	1,000,000.00				1,000,000.00	
						47,787,135.93
						103,291,817.01
July 3	1,500,000.00				1,500,000.00	
July 5	500,000.00			4,527,741.44	5,027,741.44	
July 7	1,000,000.00				1,000,000.00	
July 10	1,000,000.00				1,000,000.00	
July 11	500,000.00			465,118.63	965,118.63	
July 12	2,000,000.00			392,153.72	2,392,153.72	
July 14	1,000,000.00				1,000,000.00	
July 19	500,000.00				500,000.00	
July 21	1,000,000.00				1,000,000.00	
July 22	2,000,000.00				2,000,000.00	
July 23	2,000,000.00			5,166,928.87	7,166,928.87	
July 24			$1,500,000.00		1,500,000.00	
July 25			2,500,000.00		2,500,000.00	
July 26				5,257,795.09	5,257,795.09	
July 28			2,000,000.00		2,000,000.00	
July 29			1,000,000.00		1,000,000.00	
July 30			5,000,000.00	1,018,992.76	6,018,992.76	
July 31			3,500,000.00		3,500,000.00	
						45,328,730.51
						57,963,086.50
August 1			4,000,000.00	416,260.20	4,416,260.20	
August 2			4,000,000.00		4,000,000.00	
August 5				2,190,796.10	2,190,796.10	
August 6	1,192,639.13		2,000,000.00	1,018,969.40	4,211,608.53	
August 7			3,500,000.00		3,500,000.00	
August 8			1,500,000.00		1,500,000.00	
August 9				427,966.44	427,966.44	
August 11	1,000,000.00		1,500,000.00		2,500,000.00	
August 14	500,000.00			2,037,962.75	2,537,962.75	
August 15	500,000.00				500,000.00	
August 16	500,000.00			798,839.07	1,298,839.07	
August 18	1,000,000.00	1,368,188.32			2,368,188.32	
August 21	465,500.00				465,500.00	
August 22	{484,200.00 *5,100.00}				489,300.00	
August 23	315,000.00	2,433,571.79			2,748,571.79	
August 25	{*5,125.00 320,000.00}				325,125.00	
August 26	320,000.00				320,000.00	
August 27	318,000.00	401,769.54			719,769.54	
August 28	434,000.00	1,017,195.79			1,451,195.79	
August 29	346,000.00	800,988.58			1,146,988.58	
August 30	780,000.00				780,000.00	
						37,393,072.11
						20,065,014.39
September 1	312,000.00	82,542.33			394,542.33	
September 2	325,000.00				325,000.00	

*San Francisco.

Statement showing the payments made by the First National Bank of New York from April 16, 1879, to October 17, 1879—Continued.

Date of payment.	Account No. 1—General.		Account No. 2—"Syndicate."		Total payments as per transcripts.	Balances.
	Cash paid in New York.	Called bonds paid in Washington.	Cash paid in New York.	Called bonds paid in Washington.		
1879.						
September 3	*$1,022.50 331,000.00				$332,022.50	
September 4	328,000.00	$161,650.00			489,650.00	
September 5	424,000.00	305,712.33			729,712.33	
September 6	330,000.00				330,000.00	
September 8		50,952.05			50,952.05	
September 9	340,000.00				340,000.00	
September 10	339,000.00				339,000.00	
September 11	375,000.00				375,000.00	
September 12	*3,391.87 375,000.00	178,175.00			556,566.87	
September 13	376,000.00				376,000.00	
September 15	*2,025.00 375,000.00				377,025.00	
September 16	*10,125.00 374,000.00	1,180,018.49			1,564,143.49	
September 17	373,000.00				373,000.00	
September 18	375,000.00				375,000.00	
September 19	372,000.00	1,280,119.40			1,652,119.40	
September 20	369,000.00				369,000.00	
September 22	370,000.00				370,000.00	
September 23	668,000.00				368,000.00	
September 24	*250,000.00 118,000.00				368,000.00	
September 25	368,000.00				368,000.00	
September 26	368,000.00				368,000.00	
September 27	369,000.00				369,000.00	
September 29	357,774.05	651,306.37			1,009,080.42	
September 30	3,351,300.00	543,350.00			3,894,650.00	
						$16,463,464.39
						3,601,550.00
October 6		388,757.39			388,757.39	
October 9		424,161.14			424,161.14	
October 13		279,504.81			279,504.81	
October 17		15,027.59			15,027.59	
						1,107,450.93
						2,494,099.07

*San Francisco.

Mr. HOAR. May I ask the Senator a question?

Mr. VEST. Certainly.

Mr. HOAR. Does the Senator understand that the First National Bank of New York received that money as an ordinary deposit or had any right whatever to use it or make any money out of it itself? Was it not a mere agency between the persons who surrendered the old bonds and the persons who took the new bonds through a Government establishment in New York for public convenience?

Mr. VEST. We shall see about that.

Mr. HOAR. That is the question I put.

Mr. VEST. The question is a question of actual fact about which I know nothing. I only judge from the record. Here is an account current which shows a vast indebtedness from that bank to the Treasury of the United States. I do not pretend to say that that money was deposited as this present money is deposited in national depositories, but the effect has been just the same; the only difference is in the profits which have been gathered in the one case and in the other from the money of the Government.

Here is a great fiscal necessity resting upon the Government of the United States. It must use these national banks. What has this Administration done? It has publicly, openly, without sectional feeling, without prejudice, without oppression, scattered this money all over the country in different national depositories, and as I have shown from the record without any political purpose whatever.

But what was done by the Republicans when in power? Instead of putting the money all over the country so as to give every section a just proportion of the benefits, these gentlemen who now talk about pet banks, put enormous amounts of money under the control of the First National Bank of New York, and I will show beyond any sort of question that such profits were made out of that transaction as are unknown in the financial history of the whole world.

Mr. ALDRICH. Will the Senator allow me to ask him a question right there?

Mr. VEST. Certainly.

Mr. ALDRICH. Does he think that this distribution of the public money under any circumstances among the national banks is justifiable?

Mr. VEST. If I had my choice I would not put one dollar of the public money in these banks—not one dollar, speaking for myself; but Mr. Fairchild stated in his answer to a resolution of Congress the reasons for having pursued this course.

We were confronted, as the majority of the Finance Committee stated in their report, with a surplus of at least $60,000,000 which was increasing day by day. What were we to do with it? "Buy bonds," says the Senator, and yet the reports of the transactions in bonds, which I have here, show that the Government when it made a purchase of bonds advanced abnormally and extravagantly the premium upon those bonds in the open market.

No more delicate operation could have been undertaken by any administration than the purchase of bonds at enormous premiums. When these purchases commenced bonds were bought at 25 per cent. premium, and ran up at once to 26, 27, and 28, which was an enormous advance in public securities. The Secretary of the Treasury was forced to refuse large numbers of bonds, because nobody knows better than my friend from Iowa that if he had gone into the market and offered to take an enormous amount of bonds, approximating to the whole of the surplus, they would have immediately gone to a premium which would have put them beyond the reach of any Secretary of the Treasury unless a lunatic. Mr. Fairchild explains this fully.

Forty-eight million dollars of bonds have been purchased, and they must have been purchased with a view to the financial condition of the country. The Secretary could only purchase so as not to pay an enormous premium and at the same time relieve the money market from the stringency which was then existing. If he had gone in without regard to the condition of the country, if he had thrown the whole of this surplus into the bond market at once, there would have been an advance in the premium unprecedented in the financial history of this country.

Mr. CHACE. Will the Senator allow me a question?

Mr. VEST. What is it?

Mr. CHACE. Did not the Secretary of the Treasury decline bonds that were offered to him?

Mr. VEST. As a matter of course he declined.

Mr. CHACE. And could he not have bought those bonds so as to save the Government a large amount of interest?

Mr. VEST. The Senator will give me time to explain why in my judgment it would have been inexpedient and imprudent for him to have done that thing. Suppose the Secretary of the Treasury had taken all the bonds that were offered, he knew very well that Wall-street speculators were attempting to force the Treasury to buy the bonds so as to increase the premium.

Mr. CHACE. But if he had taken the bonds he would have saved the interest on them.

Mr. VEST. He would have saved some of the interest beyond any sort of question, but what would he have lost to the people of the United States in the increased premium, because every time he purchased the premium increased?

Mr. CHACE. Did he get any interest on the money he put in the banks?

Mr. VEST. I do not know that he got any interest upon it, and there is no pretense that he did.

Mr. CHACE. Then is it not the fact that he refused to buy bonds with the Government's money when by buying them he could have saved interest, and put the money in the banks and got no interest?

Mr. VEST. I would prefer that the Senator should make his own speech in his own time. He is simply making an argument in the guise of a question.

Mr. HOAR. Will the Senator allow me to ask him one question and then I will promise not to ask another? Did not the Secretary when he lent these $60,000,000, or $58,000,000, to the banks, as the Senator has just stated, compel those banks to purchase bonds for security and thereby raise the price of bonds just as much as if he had bought them himself?

Mr. VEST. That matter is fully discussed in Mr. Fairchild's report.

Mr. HOAR. I should like to hear the Senator's view.

Mr. VEST. He says that in his judgment that was not the result. But it is impossible to arrive at anything except an approximate answer to that question.

Mr. HOAR. The banks bought the bonds and got currency for those bonds?

Mr. VEST. That was a question for the banks to determine. If they wanted the public money deposited with them, they were compelled to deposit the bonds; and if they did not have them, to purchase them and deposit them as security for the bonds.

Mr. HOAR. That put up the bonds.

Mr. VEST. What was the effect of the purchase of these bonds it is impossible for me or any other living man to answer. The bond market was manipulated in the city of New York and by interests which in a monetary sense were adverse to the Treasury. The Treasury of the United States was simply in the condition of any other purchaser of bonds in the market; it was compelled to consider the existing circumstances. It was compelled to watch its monetary adversaries, and it was compelled to keep down enormous premiums and at the same time to prevent a panic in monetary circles.

Mr. TELLER. Will the Senator allow me to ask him a question?

Mr. VEST. Certainly.

Mr. TELLER. I should like to have the Senator tell the Senate and the country how many of these bonds were rejected at 26½, at 26½, and at 26¾ premium to be subsequently bought at 28, 29, and 30?

Mr. VEST. I have a full statement here. It is accessible to the Senator, and I will put it in the RECORD.

Mr. TELLER. I want the Senator to tell us——

Mr. VEST. I am not able, because——

Mr. TELLER. The Secretary's statement does not show it.

Mr. VEST. It does show it; it does show the purchases which were made and the premium that he paid on every bond purchased. I admit, and that is my statement here over and over again, that with every purchase that was made by the Treasury Department the premium on the bonds advanced, and that was the trouble in this whole transaction. It was not the plain, open purchase without any other result except that one man took the bonds and another took the money, but the Secretary was compelled to watch the condition of the money market and bond purchases in the city of New York.

Mr. TELLER. Will the Senator allow me to ask——

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. Does the Senator from Missouri yield?

Mr. VEST. I prefer that Senators would answer me afterwards, but I am a yielding man.

Mr. TELLER. Does the Senator yield?

Mr. VEST. Oh, certainly.

Mr. TELLER. I want to ask the Senator if he is not aware of the fact that when the Secretary of the Treasury said he would take bonds at 124 he was receiving a large number of bonds at 124 when he discontinued the purchase, and that no bonds went up until he had given to those bonds a fictitious value by allowing the depository banks to become the holders of Government money?

Mr. VEST. I do not know that fact.

Mr. TELLER. Then I will take occasion to enlighten the Senator.

Mr. VEST. Very good. Let the Senator do that. This is an open debate with a fair field and no favors asked. You can show it.

I say in this whole transaction, and I have gone through it as carefully and as patiently as I could, the Secretary of the Treasury has honestly endeavored to administer the functions of his great office without favors, and certainly without any personal consideration as to himself.

TREASURY DEPARTMENT, OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Washington, D. C., October 11, 1888.

Statement of bonds purchased under circular of April 17, 1888, *to June* 30, 1888.

	Bonds.	Premium.
Four per cent	$18,282,100	$4,839,578.71
Four and one-half per cent	8,337,550	579,247.87
Total	26,619,650	5,418,826.58

Bonds purchased October 9 *and* 10, 1888.

	Bonds.	Premium.
Four per cent	$4,473,200	$1,297,228.00
Four and one-half per cent	7,161,650	608,740.25
Total	11,634,850	1,905,968.25

It is very well known, and Mr. Fairchild stated it frankly, that the President of the United States had doubts in regard to his power to purchase bonds, and it is an open secret that the Attorney-General gave him the opinion that he did not have that power beyond any question, but it was a doubtful power at best, and Mr. Cleveland in accordance with his character and antecedents as President of the United States, refused to exercise a doubtful power and openly declared that he would not purchase bonds until Congress had authoritatively given him the power to do so, or made an expression of its opinion in regard to that law. All of us are familiar with the legislation that was had on that account, how a resolution that came from the House of Representatives was attempted to be amended by the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BECK], and finally passed in the shape of a declaration of opinion by the Senate and House of Representatives that the power existed. I believed that that power existed, but there were lawyers better than myself who did not believe it.

Mr. ALLISON. Will the Senator allow me to interrupt him there to make a historical statement respecting that bill?

Mr. VEST. Certainly.

Mr. ALLISON. That bill came to us from the House of Representatives and the Senator from Kentucky put on it an amendment.

Mr. VEST. I recollect it.

Mr. ALLISON. And that amendment passed here, but it went back to the other House and slept the sleep of death there.

Mr. VEST. As a matter of course the record shows it and I am obliged to my friend, but there was no necessity for the information.

The point I make in the whole matter in regard to the action of Congress is this, that the overwhelming sentiment of both Houses and of the lawyers of both Houses was to the effect that the power existed, and when Mr. Cleveland was satisfied that this was the opinion of the lawyers in Congress and the overwhelming opinion of the legal profession throughout the country, he immediately ordered the purchase of bonds, and the purchase commenced within two days afterwards as the record shows, and $48,000,000 of bonds have been purchased since that time.

I have heard it stated that the Treasury Department purchased bonds before Congress had passed this resolution or considered it. It is not true, Mr. President. No bond was purchased, except for the sinking fund, prior to the time that Congress passed upon this resolution, and the first circular was issued on April 17, two days after the resolution had been considered in the Senate and the House.

But the Senator from Massachusetts asked me if in 1879 the First National Bank of New York was not acting simply as a fiscal agent of the Government, and if it had any right to make money out of the transactions between it and the Government of the United States, under which it bought bonds and transferred them to the Secretary of the Treasury in exchange for 4 percents, or paid cash.

Mr. HOAR. The Senator, I think, misunderstood my question. My question was whether it had a right to make money out of this fund.

Mr. VEST. I do not know whether it had the right or not; I know it did; and that is the point I am coming to. I am coming to the point that is made in every speech and in every Republican newspaper in the country, that there are pet banks in New York. I want to show a pet that was petted and caressed as never was any dainty darling before. I want to show a pet that was the pet of pets, and nothing like it has ever been seen in the financial history of the world.

I have made a compendium of the history of this bank. I do not blame the bank; I do not blame its officers; their business is to make money. I am talking now about a system adopted by a Republican administration, whose supporters taunt us with having pet banks in the city of New York to put money into the pockets of rich Democrats.

The First National Bank of New York—I speak from the record—was organized in July, 1863. The capital stock, at first $200,000, was increased to $300,000 in December, 1863, and in April, 1864, to $500,000, at which figure it has remained ever since. Up to the end of 1877 the bank had paid moderate dividends and had gradually accumulated a surplus of over $700,000, so that it began the year 1878 with a little over $1,200,000 working capital. The total profits of 1878, according to the table, were $466,000, to which must be added dividends of 52 per cent. on $500,000, which somehow do not appear in the Chronicle's tables, making $260,000 more, or over $700,000 profits in one year, about 60 per cent. on $1,200,000. The stockholders got $320,000 in dividends, and the stock of the bank is quoted in the Chronicle January, 1879, at $400 per share of $100.

At the beginning of 1879 the surplus was $1,760,000, making the working capital $2,260,000, and the profits of that year amounted to $1,225,000, which is nearly two-and-a-half times the capital proper and 60 per cent. of the compounded capital and surplus.

Starting with an investment of $1,236,700 on the 1st of January, 1878, this fortunate institution in five years realized $4,486,000 in profits. Of this amount $2,740,000 was added to its surplus, and $1,746,000 was paid in cash dividends.

Since 1882 the profits have not been so conspicuous, but in 1886 they run up very near to $1,000,000.

It is a fact that commencing with $200,000 capital, which was increased in April, 1864, to $500,000, this bank has realized in net profits over $10,000,000, which is 80 per cent. per annum for twenty-five years on $500,000.

Mr. TELLER. Will the Senator allow me to ask him a question?

Mr. VEST. Certainly.

Mr. TELLER. Does the Senator mean to say that the bank made those profits on Government deposits?

Mr. VEST. I mean to say that the basis of their enormous profits was laid in 1879 through this relation with the Government.

Mr. TELLER. That is not the question. I want the Senator to answer it.

Mr. VEST. I will not yield any further. I prefer to make my own argument in my own way, and the Senator can criticise it afterwards.

Mr. TELLER. If the Senator declines to yield, it is all right.

Mr. VEST. I want to be entirely fair, and certainly not ill-natured, but I should like to proceed with my statement consecutively.

I do not mean to say that all this was made out of Government money, but I say this bank, which had only made ordinary dividends up to 1879, in that year laid the basis of all the profits which its stockholders have since received. I will show it from the record. In 1878 that bank made 12 per cent.; in 1879 it made 120—think of it—120 per cent., and it only made it after these bond transactions with the Treasury of the United States. Here is a list of its dividends taken from the record: In 1873, 15 per cent.; in 1874, 14 per cent.; in 1875, 11 per cent.; in 1876, 12 per cent.; in 1877, 12 per cent.; in 1878, 12 per cent.; in 1879, 120 per cent.

Table showing capital, surplus, dividends, etc., of the First National Bank, New York City, at the dates named, the items being taken from the New York Financial Chronicle.

Where found.		Year.	Capital.		Surplus.		Dividends.		Annual profits.	
Volume.	Page.		Par of stock.	Amount.	Amount.	At date.	Per cent.	Amount.†	Amount.†	Per cent.†
18	142	1873	$100	$500,000	Not stated		15	$75,000		
20	182	1874	100	500,000	.....do		14	70,000		
22	179	1875	100	500,000	.....do		12	60,000		
24	133	1876	100	500,000	.....do		12	60,000		
26	140	1877	100	500,000	$736,700	Jan. 5, 1878	12	60,000		
28	219	1878	100	500,000	1,142,700	Jan. 1, 1879	12	60,000	$466,006	37.7
30	14	1879	100	500,000	1,767,700	Dec. 12, 1879	120	600,000	1,225,000	74.6
32	67	1880	100	500,000	2,441,800	Dec. 31, 1880	30	150,000	824,100	36.3
*34	XIII	1881	100	500,000	3,010,500	Dec. 31, 1881	40	200,000	768,700	26.1
*36	XIII	1882	100	500,000	3,477,700	Dec. 30, 1882	40	200,000	667,200	19.0
*38	89	1883	100	500,000	3,437,700	Dec. 31, 1883	40	200,000	160,000	4.0
*40	94	1884	100	500,000	3,788,100	Dec. 20, 1884	40	200,000	550,400	14.0
*42	101	1885	100	500,000	4,322,800	Dec. 1, 1885	40	200,000	734,700	17.1
*44	108	1886	100	500,000	5,095,500	Mar. 4, 1884	40	200,000	972,700	20.2
*46	126	1887	100	500,000	5,384,800	Dec. 7, 1884	40	200,000	489,300	8.7

* Investor's supplement.
† The figures in these three columns are obtained by computation from those given by the Chronicle.

Mr. TELLER. Will the Senator now tell us how much deposits they had in 1879?

Mr. VEST. I do not know how much deposits they had.

Mr. TELLER. I mean Government deposits.

Mr. VEST. They handled $120,000,000 of 4 per cent. bonds, I know, as shown by this account, in 1879. They subscribed at one time by telegraph for $190,000,000 of 4 per cent. bonds, and the telegram is on file now in the Treasury Department; but they got $120,000,000, and the bank which the year before and all the years before had only declared 12 per cent. dividend declared 120 per cent.

Mr. BLAIR. Was that the result of commissions for placing the bonds?

Mr. VEST. I do not understand anything about it. Here is the account, and that is all I know.

Mr. BLAIR. I am glad you do not know anything about it.

Mr. VEST. Let the Senator attend to pensions. I am now on this question and I want to get through it as intelligently as I can with my poor capacity.

Mr. TELLER. I do not like to interrupt the Senator.

Mr. VEST. I will yield.

Mr. TELLER. Does not the Senator know that the profit was not made out of the Government, but that this bank acted as the banker for a large syndicate of people who were purchasing bonds, and that the profit was made out of those people and not out of the Government?

Mr. VEST. I understand Mr. Blaine to say that the $3,000,000 a year on the $60,000,000 of Government money is made out of the people of the United States, and he used the expression in his speech at Grand Rapids, picking out some old granger in the crowd as an exemplar of the horny-fisted yeomanry of the country, and said, "My friend, your money and mine is being loaned out by these banks at 5 per cent. interest."

Mr. TELLER. The Senator will allow me to say that that is no answer to my question. The Senator is dealing with this question as a Senator, and he is dealing in the presence of the American people, and I want to know whether he, as a Senator on this floor, dares to charge that they made this large amount of money out of the Government of the United States, or any money out of the United States, because that is the only point with which we are concerned, not what they made out of other bankers.

Mr. VEST. It is hardly necessary for the Senator to inform me that I am in the presence of the American people, and that I am dealing with this as a Senator.

Mr. TELLER. It did seem so to me.

Mr. VEST. I do not undertake to say that this money was paid out of the Treasury of the United States directly. I am talking about the question of pet banks.

Mr. TELLER. Was it so made indirectly?

Mr. VEST. I say it was made by reason of the favoritism shown to that bank in its fiscal operations with the Treasury of the United States, and the record shows it.

Mr. TELLER. Does the Senator mean to say that that bank had any privilege not granted to every other bank in the United States?

Mr. VEST. Certainly, as a matter of course, Mr. President, or my speech would not be worth anything. I mean to say that this enormous dividend was not declared by any other bank.

Mr. TELLER. That is not the question. Did the Government extend to this bank privileges it did not extend to any other? I want to know whether the Senator will say that.

Mr. VEST. As a matter of course, because they made this bank the fiscal agent and gave them the privilege of buying other bonds and they accepted for the 4 percents, and the account current here shows that the Treasury allowed an enormous amount to be overdue for months from this bank. That was not a good year for national banks either. I want to read from the remarks of the then Secretary of the Treasury, who is now Senator from Ohio [Mr. SHERMAN], for 1879, the year that this bank declared 120 per cent. dividend. Here is what he says:

> The effect of the business depression prevalent from 1873 until the resumption of specie payments upon the national banks is shown in the losses which they have sustained and the dividends which many have been compelled to pass; also by the noticeable diminution, from year to year, in the aggregate surplus.

But this was an oasis in the financial desert. Instead of their having diminished profits the profits were enormous beyond anything known in financial history for the amount of capital invested.

But, Mr. President, we are told by our friends on the opposite side of the Chamber that the responsibility for this condition of the Treasury of the United States rests upon the Democratic party. I have alluded to the fact that the Democrats in the House of Representatives twice attempted to consider this matter of the tariff, and were defeated by the solid Republican vote, with a few recalcitrant Democrats. Why did not our friends on the other side offer a tariff bill in the House if they wanted to reduce the surplus, as they said they intended to do in their national platform of 1884? Why did they make no attempt to reduce it? Instead of considering the question at all they voted it down, and then taunted the Democratic party with the fact that they had sent no bill to the Republican Senate from a Democratic House of Representatives.

Mr. ALDRICH. I will answer the question, if the Senator wants an answer.

Mr. VEST. I prefer to let the Senator answer it afterwards. I have no doubt he is entirely competent to do it. I will listen to my friend from Rhode Island with a great deal of pleasure. No one has a higher opinion of his ability than I have, especially his ability on tariff questions, and if he wants a certificate from me, I will tell the people of Rhode Island that he is the most valuable Senator they have ever had on this floor. If they were to defeat him for the Senate, after reading this bill which he has reported here, they would deserve to be blotted out from the list of States. The fine Italian hand of my friend from Rhode Island is evident in every line of this bill. I say it with the kindest feeling to him. He represents his people and I am representing mine. The difference between us is that he is getting an undue proportion of the money of the country at the expense of my constituents, in my opinion.

Mr. President, I have taken the trouble, through the most valuable expert, I think, in the Treasury Department, to reduce to a reasonable compass the Senate substitute for the Mills bill, and I want to show what the reduction of taxation has been. I will ask to put these tables into the RECORD so that they can be open to inspection and criticism, but I want to give the result of the reduction of taxation which has been promised us by the Republican party on the necessaries of life as found in the following statement: This is "the values of and duties collected on the below-named manufactured articles entered for consumption in the United States during the year ending June 30, 1887, with the estimated amounts of duty accruing on like imports under the provisions of House bill 9051 and the Senate substitute; also showing the excess in amounts of duty under the Senate substitute over like amounts under the present laws and House bill 9051," which is the Mills bill.

This, I take it, is valuable. All theoretic discussions have closed, and we come now to actual results. We want to see which party has attempted to reduce the import duties on the necessaries of life.

Take up the first schedule—but I will pass the schedules; they are here and they can be inspected by my friends on the other side. I was anxious to see certain specific articles manufactured in New England—for that is the milk in the cocoa-nut—and the ever-present hand of New England is seen in this bill.

Take woolens, cloths. The excess of duties under the Senate substitute over the present tariff is 6.75 per cent.; it is 87.88 per cent. over the Mills bill. It is 8.23 per cent. on dress goods over the present tariff, and it is 95.05 per cent. over the House bill. It is 14.50 per cent. excess over the present tariff on knit goods, and it is 79.44 per cent. over the Mills bill. It is 67.51 per cent. excess over the present tariff on shawls, and it is 70.67 over the House bill. It is 64.71 over the present tariff on yarns, and 186 per cent. over the Mills bill on yarns.

Now, take cotton, another New England manufacture. On thread, not on spools, it increases the rate of duty over the present tariff 10.09 per cent., and over the Mills bill 31.39. On cloths it increases the duty over the present tariff 9.88 per cent., and 24.95 over the Mills bill.

Mr. ALDRICH. Will the Senator allow me to ask him one question?

Mr. VEST. Well, I prefer to get through with the table, and then the Senator can explain.

Mr. ALDRICH. I want to ask whether this is a list of the necessaries of life?

Mr. VEST. Certainly, most of them are.

Mr. ALDRICH. I call attention to the next two or three items.

Mr. VEST. If they are not, they can very easily be pointed out. I rather think woolens are necessaries of life. My impression is that if any man would try a blizzard up in my country he would come to that conclusion very rapidly. I think that cottons, shawls, yarns, knit goods, and dress goods generally are necessaries of life.

Now, we come to flax, hemp, and jute, brown and bleached linens; the increase in the Senate substitute over the present tariff is 14.29 per cent., and over the Mills bill 62.94 per cent. On laces and embroideries it is 66.67 per cent. over the present tariff and 66.67 over the Mills bill. On yarns the increase over the present tariff is 14.29 and over the Mills bill 166.66 per cent.

On steel in forms not specified the increase over the present tariff is 33.42 per cent., and over the Mills bill the same. On railway bars, which is the only reduction on anything that can be called necessaries of life—perhaps I state it too strongly, but I mean to say that the only decrease of duty, outside of sugar, of any prominence in the Senate bill is upon railway bars, and there the decrease under the present tariff is 24.69 and over the Mills bill an increase of 42.35 per cent.

I now present this analysis:

Values of and duties collected on the below-named manufactured articles entered for consumption in the United States during the year ending June 30, 1887, with the estimated amounts of duty accruing on like imports under the provisions of House bill 9051 and the Senate substitute; also, showing the excess in amounts of duty under the Senate substitute over like amounts under the present laws and House bill 9051.

Articles.	Values.	Duties collected under—						Excess of duties under Senate substitute over—			
		Present laws.		House bill.		Senate substitute.		Present laws.		House bill.	
		Amounts.	Av. ad valorem rates.	Amounts.	Av. ad valorem rates.	Amounts.	Av. ad valorem rates.	Amounts.	Per cent.	Amounts.	Per cent.
			Per cent.		*Per cent.*		*Per cent.*				
Woolens:											
Cloths	$10,022,370.67	$7,055,824.94	70.40	$4,008,948.26	40.00	$7,531,853.64	75.15	$476,028.70	6.75	$3,522,905.38	87.88
Dress goods	17,199,141.02	12,398,974.92	72.09	6,879,656.41	40.00	13,419,025.95	78.02	1,020,051.03	8.23	6,539,369.54	95.05
Knit goods	1,980,453.74	1,243,689.31	62.80	792,181.49	40.00	1,423,935.33	71.90	180,246.02	14.50	631,753.84	79.44
Shawls	1,029,998.19	654,008.00	63.50	411,999.27	40.00	703,154.00	68.27	49,146.00	7.51	291,154.73	70.67
Yarns	1,747,562.09	1,207,734.64	69.11	692,024.84	40.00	1,989,236.45	113.83	781,501.81	64.71	1,290,211.61	186.00
Cottons:											
Thread, not on spools	919,702.30	423,759.58	46.08	355,035.58	38.60	466,497.26	50.72	42,737.68	10.09	111,461.68	31.39
Cloths	3,555,347.28	1,617,200.80	45.49	1,422,138.91	40.00	1,777,010.63	49.98	159,809.83	9.88	354,871.72	24.95
Flax, hemp, and jute:											
Brown and bleached linens, etc	13,589,418.55	4,756,296.50	35.00	3,397,354.64	25.00	5,433,767.42	40.00	679,470.92	14.29	2,138,412.78	62.94
Laces and embroideries	1,142,473.35	342,742.00	30.00	342,742.00	30.00	571,236.67	50.00	228,494.67	66.67	228,494.67	66.67
Yarns	789,013.50	276,154.73	35.00	118,354.02	15.00	315,605.40	40.00	39,450.67	14.29	197,251.38	166.66
Iron and steel:											
Steel, in forms not specified	6,091,898.65	2,614,385.43	42.92	2,614,385.65	42.92	3,488,089.52	57.26	873,695.09	33.42	873,695.09	33.42
Railway bars	1,000,329.00	843,347.49	84.30	446,853.04	44.67	636,152.29	63.59	*207,195.20	*24.69	189,299.25	42.35
Tin plates	16,883,813.95	5,705,433.89	33.80	Free		5,706,433.89	33.80			5,706,433.19	100.00
Needles, not for machines	307,434.44	76,871.10	25.00	Free		76,871.10	25.00			76,871.10	100.00

*Minus.

NOTE.—The amounts of duty stated as "collected" under House bill and Senate substitute are estimated upon the imports of 1887.

Now, Mr. President, in a few words, what is the result of this operation? The only substantial decrease in the whole of this bill is upon sugar, and sugar is made the stalking-horse for an increase upon all the necessaries of life manufactured in New England. Sugar, a Southern product, is made to bear the burden of this reduction for the purpose of concealing the increase upon cottons and woolens which are manufactured in the factories of New England, and it is a remarkable fact that our friends whose shibboleth politically is protection to infant industries should attack sugar at the very time when it is struggling into life upon the prairies of the great Northwest. In your State, Mr. President, and mine the sugar industry to-day promises to furnish enough sugar to supply every man, woman, and child in the whole United States. The Commissioner of Agriculture reports that in the culture of sorghum the seed and cane fed to stock will pay for the manufacture of the sugar. So it is a clear profit to the people upon these prairies who go into the culture of sugar on the stalk.

I have my personal opinions in regard to the sugar tax, and if isolated from this bill and from any other consideration, I should express them here to-day very freely, but I call the attention of my friend from Iowa, whose people can raise sorghum as well as mine, that at this particular juncture when the principle of protection to the infant industries should be applied by the Republican party, if ever, they take it away from the sugar industry, for the only substantial reduction in the entire bill on duties is made upon sugar.

Comparative statement showing the operations under the present tariff laws, under House bill No. 9051, and under the Senate substitute, respectively based upon the quantities and values of dutiable merchandise entered for consumption in the United States during the year ending June 30, 1887.

Schedules.	Values of merchandise dutiable under—			Duties collected on merchandise dutiable under—				
	Present laws.	House bill 9051.	Senate substitute.	Present laws.	House bill 9051.		Senate substitute.	
					At present rates.	At rates House bill 9051.	At present rates.	At rates Senate substitute.
A. Chemicals	$18,884,257.96	$14,328,700.00	*$16,027,271.69	$6,199,811.99	$4,921,661.79	$4,170,945.61	$4,810,400.92	*$4,602,661.78
B. Earthen and glass ware	13,656,150.43	13,025,369.46	13,056,150.43	7,776,202.42	7,770,044.43	6,914,682.12	7,776,202.42	7,548,760.03
C. Metals	55,111,922.37	36,788,309.46	55,111,922.37	22,469,401.89	16,393,745.24	15,126,379.16	22,469,401.89	23,218,801.21
D. Wooden ware	7,697,357.06	1,018,154.94	7,697,357.06	1,385,356.19	346,148.84	298,561.65	1,385,356.19	1,454,309.11
E. Sugar	74,242,279.20	74,242,279.20	68,905,915.07	58,016,686.34	58,016,686.34	47,079,512.20	56,519,995.74	28,[illegible],431.09
F. Tobacco	10,955,125.03	10,955,125.03	10,955,125.03	9,127,738.26	9,127,738.26	9,127,738.26	9,127,738.26	7,107,710.12
G. Provisions	33,165,566.07	35,831,552.21	†41,198,052.10	9,529,091.81	8,734,188.43	8,364,587.33	9,128,241.26	†9,736,699.98
H. Liquors	10,190,946.40	10,190,946.40	10,190,946.40	7,402,242.82	7,402,242.82	7,402,242.82	7,402,242.82	7,766,684.81
I. Cottons	30,208,851.83	30,208,851.83	30,208,679.83	12,081,297.43	12,081,297.43	11,803,687.14	12,081,263.03	12,306,648.04
J. Hemp, flax, and jute	33,807,282.55	19,316,781.15	24,802,607.55	9,497,981.74	6,639,073.59	4,793,111.06	7,870,329.08	8,798,021.87
K. Wool and woolens	60,586,613.61	42,379,625.64	60,586,613.61	35,629,534.13	29,239,479.40	16,984,966.61	35,629,534.13	40,060,648.41
L. Silk goods	31,264,278.58	31,264,276.58	31,264,278.58	15,540,300.70	15,540,300.70	15,540,300.70	15,540,300.70	15,842,061.96
M. Books, papers, etc	5,214,635.21	5,214,635.21	5,214,635.21	1,154,369.41	1,154,369.41	1,150,812.51	1,154,369.41	1,227,455.61
N. Sundries	59,580,006.88	54,737,660.43	‡51,703,440.90	16,091,597.36	14,671,037.47	13,567,845.57	14,435,013.44	‡14,581,016.00
Total	449,945,271.18	379,502,258.54	426,922,993.83	211,811,632.49	192,038,034.15	162,325,392.74	205,330,499.29	182,516,829.02

Schedules.	Average ad valorem rates of duty collected on merchandise dutiable under—					Merchandise dutiable under present laws and placed on the free-list under—					
						Values.		Duties collected under present laws.			
								Total duties.		Average ad valorem rates of duty.	
	Present laws.	House bill 9051.		Senate substitute.		House bill 9051.	Senate substitute.	House bill 9051.	Senate substitute.	House bill 9051.	Senate substitute.
		At present rates.	At rates of House bill 9051.	At present rates.	At rates of Senate substitute.						
	Per ct.	*Per ct.*	*Per ct.*	*Per ct.*	*Per ct.*					*Per ct.*	*Per ct.*
A. Chemicals	32.83	34.35	29.11	30.01	28.72	$4,535,557.96	$2,873,972.27	$1,278,150.20	$1,389,411.07	28.18	48.34
B. Earthen and glass ware	59.56	59.12	53.09	59.56	57.82	50,789.97		6,157.99		20.00	
C. Metals	40.77	44.56	41.12	40.77	42.13	18,323,612.91		6,075,650.65		33.16	
D. Wooden ware	18.00	31.00	29.32	18.00	18.88	6,679,202.12		1,039,207.35		15.56	
E. Sugar	78.15	78.15	63.41	82.03	41.02		5,335,364.13		1,496,690.60		28.04
F. Tobacco	83.32	83.32	83.32	83.32	70.36						
G. Provisions	24.33	24.38	23.34	22.16	23.58	3,334,013.86	1,232,605.00	794,903.38	400,850.55	23.84	32.52
H. Liquors	72.64	72.64	72.64	72.64	72.61						
I. Cottons	39.99	39.99	39.07	39.99	40.74		172.00		34.40		20.00
J. Hemp, flax, and jute	28.09	34.37	24.81	31.73	35.47	14,490,501.40	9,034,675.00	2,858,908.15	1,627,652.66	19.73	18.08
K. Wool and woolens	58.80	66.99	40.08	58.80	66.12	18,206,987.97		6,390,054.73		35.10	
L. Silk goods	49.71	49.71	49.71	49.71	50.67						
M. Books, papers, etc	22.14	22.13	22.07	22.14	23.54						
N. Sundries	26.86	26.80	24.78	27.92	28.20	4,842,346.45	7,884,026.98	1,330,559.89	1,566,583.92	27.48	19.87
Total	47.07	50.60	42.77	48.10	42.75	70,443,012.64	26,331,815.38	19,773,598.31	6,481,223.20	28.07	24.61

*$36,986; duty, $8,773.60 from free-list. † $3,235,091.03; duty, $574,843.44 from free-list. ‡ $7,451; duty, $2,931.40 from free-list.

NOTES.—This table shows a deficiency of $380,050.37 in the value of, and of $220,791.41 in the duty collected on dutiable merchandise in 1887, as reported in the annual report of the Chief of the Bureau of Statistics. This difference is principally due to the omission from this table of dutiable merchandise ($177,999.59) withdrawn free of duty from warehouse and of merchandise not dutiable under any of the schedules. If these amounts had been included, the average ad valorem rate of duty under the present laws would be 47.10 instead of 47.07 per cent.

The interpretation of House bill 9051 is that of the Committee on Ways and Means, House of Representatives, as published by the clerk of that committee, and of the Senate substitute that of the Senate subcommittee on tariff.

The values and duties under both House bill and Senate substitute are computed on the importation of 1887, without speculating upon any possible increase or decrease consequent upon a decrease or increase in the rates of duty imposed by the proposed bills. The computations have been made as accurate as practicable, but in many cases under the Senate substitute a calculation was made impossible by the change from an ad valorem to a specific rate of duty. In such cases no account has been taken of the proposed change.

TREASURY DEPARTMENT, *Bureau of Statistics, October* 9, 1888.

WM. F. SWITZLER, *Chief of Bureau.*

Hon. F. M. COCKRELL, *United States Senator.*

Mr. President, I do not care to go further into the argument of the details of this bill. I want to make one single observation and I am done. I wish to discuss this bill fairly. I am glad the time has come when the people of the United States are brought face to face with great industrial and financial questions, and when they must be determined by intellectual effort and fair argument. I want to discuss these questions fairly, if I know myself.

The Senator from Iowa, for whom I have the greatest regard, made a statement in his opening speech which I doubted and which I am satisfied is not correct. He said that the cost of the manufacture of steel from pig-iron into rails was over $9. I challenge that statement here now. I say it is not true as a matter of fact. I say that in the compromise or agreement which was made between the Knights of Labor and the Edgar Thomson Steel Works a year and a half ago—a deliberate sealed agreement which I can produce here in the Senate, if necessary—it was agreed between the workmen and the owners of those works that the price of labor in steel rails from the condition of pig-iron was $4.09 to the ton. Yet the Senator deliberately asserted, and I have no doubt honestly, that it was over $9 to the ton.

I shall not waste any time before the Senate of the United States or any other intelligent audience by arguing the absurdity of putting all the costs of the iron from the time it comes out of the ground until you get pig-iron into this calculation. It is answered by the simple statement that it is a finished product in the shape of pig-iron when it reaches the hand of the steel-rail manufacturer. Suppose it was intended to protect the tailor who made this coat for me, would you consider all the labor in the raising of sheep, shearing the wool, spinning and weaving, until it became the finished cloth in the hands of the tailor, in the question of protection to him? It reaches him a finished product, it comes to his hands finished, and the only protection he is entitled to legitimately is the protection on his labor in connection with the finished product.

Senators quote here a statement of Mr. Hewitt that the cost of labor in steel rails was 90 per cent. Read it again and you will find that Mr. Hewitt says it depends upon what stage in the process you start with your calculation in order to meet the ratio of labor as put into the product. It is a finished product when it reaches, in the shape of pig-iron, the steel-rail manufacturer, and the only protection he can ask is upon the basis of $4.09 in labor to the ton.

Mr. ALDRICH. Why do you support a bill that proposes to levy a duty of $11 a ton, if that is true?

Mr. VEST. Because I believe that $11 a ton is amply sufficient to

give a margin of profits of $5 at least on the ton to the steel-rail manufacturers. The duty is $17 under the present tariff law. It is reduced by the bill of the Senate to $15.68. My assertion is, and I challenge contradiction upon it, and it is a question of fact, that the cost of the labor that changes pig-iron into steel rails is $4.09. I say the protection is ample at $11, and when you give the manufacturers $15.68 protection you give them more than they are entitled to. That is all I desire to say.

Mr. ALLISON. Mr. President, I desire to detain the Senate just a few moments in noticing one or two points made by the Senator from Missouri [Mr. VEST].

As to the last point made, I do not want him to quarrel with me respecting the matter of steel rails. I quoted the Senator from Ohio [Mr. PAYNE], his colleague on that side of the Chamber, who gave me the cost of steel rails, and stated that that statement of cost was taken from the books of a company in his own city, and he vouched to me for the integrity and intelligence of the men who furnished that information. Therefore I supposed I had some right to rely upon that information, and I inserted it in my remarks.

I shall not undertake now to go into detail as to the particular point at which protection begins, but I had supposed that if an American steel-rail maker was compelled to buy his pig-iron that paid a duty first upon the ore and next upon the pig, and so on through all the processes, he would be compelled to buy the pig-iron at such a cost as would enable him to compete with people on the other side who paid no duty upon their raw material. But I do not intend to discuss that question now.

I wish to call the attention of the Senator from Missouri to his criticisms respecting the surplus in the Treasury for a moment. I do not want him to get away from the primal consideration of my criticism, although I notice that he called attention to what was said by Mr. Blaine at some remote point. I do not want him to get away from the proper criticism of the conduct of the Secretary of the Treasury as respects the surplus by calling attention to the fact that some pet bank in 1879 made a large percentage. The Senator from Ohio [Mr. SHERMAN] has over and over again explained in this body the situation of 1879. That had no relation to the question of the surplus money in the Treasury. The deposits quoted from the books of the Treasury, or from whatever books the Senator quoted, were deposits made in the operation of refunding $600,000,000 of the public debt from a 6 per cent. bond into a 4 per cent. bond, and the First National Bank of New York, to which he alludes, was one of a number of banks in New York City which subscribed for that loan.

What was the condition of the law then? It was that the man who held a 6 per cent. bond could not be required to surrender it until the expiration of a period of ninety days. Then in the operation of the syndicate it was necessary that there should be some intermediary as respects the situation between the bonds subscribed for and the bonds redeemed in order that the entire monetary business of our country would not be disturbed. The Senator from Ohio has made that explanation over and over again. I shall not undertake to defend him. He needs no defense in this regard.

But the statement made as respects the present situation is that the Secretary of the Treasury has money out of the Treasury which belongs to the people, as the Senator says Mr. Blaine said to the old farmer who was sitting in the audience. Where does this $57,000,000 come from, I ask the Senator from Missouri, and I will await his reply, that is now deposited in certain national banks of our country?

Mr. VEST. It comes from excessive tariff taxation.

Mr. ALLISON. Very well; it comes from excessive taxation; but this $57,000,000 comes out of the Treasury of the United States, where it belongs, having been paid in there by the tax-payers of the country.

Now, the criticism upon Secretary Fairchild and this Administration is that here were bonds that they could have purchased with this money, but instead of doing that they loan it to certain banks without interest.

Mr. MORGAN. Will the Senator from Iowa allow me to call his attention to an act with which I know he is entirely familiar?

Mr. ALLISON. Yes, sir.

Mr. MORGAN. It is the act of 1882 for the extension of time for the reorganization of the national banks, which was thoroughly debated here in the Senate. In section 9 of that act it is provided:

> That not more than $3,000,000 of lawful money shall be deposited during any calendar month for this purpose.

That is, for the purpose of taking up a bank's bonds, the object being to protect the Treasury by keeping the money in circulation. The Secretary of the Treasury has no right to receive from the national banks bonds that would reduce the circulation generally in the United States more than $3,000,000 a month.

Mr. ALLISON. Is it possible that the Senator from Alabama is connecting that ninth section of the act of 1882 with anything I am talking about?

Mr. MORGAN. I think so.

Mr. ALLISON. It has no more relation to it than an eclipse. It has no possible connection with the question I am considering. My point is that the Secretary of the Treasury had $57,000,000 of United States money in the Treasury of the United States that had been collected and put there by means of taxation.

Mr. MORGAN. The Senator was also complaining, if he will allow me, that the Secretary of the Treasury was not buying the bonds with this money. He can not buy from the national banks more than $3,000,000 a month.

Mr. ALLISON. It has no relation, I will say to the Senator, to the purchase of bonds. It has relation to the surrender of circulation.

Mr. MORGAN. But every bond that is bought by the United States Government to-day is canceled the moment it is bought.

Mr. ALLISON. What I am saying has no relation now to the relations of the national banks. Here is the point, and it is a point Senators on that side of the Chamber can not get away from. Here were $57,000,000 in the Treasury that should have been used in the purchase of United States bonds, thereby saving to the United States more than 2 per cent. interest per annum, and the Secretary of the Treasury or the President of the United States, instead of using this money for that purpose, which was a legitimate and lawful purpose, authorized by law, put the money into the hands of certain national banks without interest. That is the point I make against the Senator from Alabama and those who uphold this Administration, and I am not to be answered that the Secretary of the Treasury could not buy these bonds from the national banks. He could buy them wherever they were to be purchased in the open markets of the country, with more than $700,000,000 of them for sale of one kind of bonds, and $250,000,000 of another, with a very small portion in the national banks for any purpose whatever.

It is a mere subterfuge, I will say, with all due respect to the Senator from Alabama, to quote upon me the ninth section of the act of 1882. Here was lawful authority to buy bonds. The Secretary of the Treasury could have bought them and saved from 2¼ to 2.35 per cent. interest per annum to the Government of the United States. Instead of doing that he put this money into banks from the Treasury.

It will not do for the Senator from Missouri to tell me that the effect of buying these bonds was to enhance the price of bonds. The Secretary of the Treasury became the biggest bull in the market (if I may use that expression here as respects these bonds) when he authorized the national banks to receive $1.10 for every dollar of par value of bonds put into the Treasury. In other words, he said to a national bank, "You deposit here $100 of 4 percents and I will loan you without interest $110 for them."

The Secretary of the Treasury makes a fallacious calculation when he talks about a bank going into the markets and buying bonds. The presumption, and the natural presumption, is that these banks have the bonds and they are drawing 4 per cent. interest upon them at the time that these deposits are made. In nine cases out of ten they do not buy the bonds. They are holding them in the vaults of their banks, and the Secretary of the Treasury says to the banker, "If you will transfer these United States bonds that you hold in your vaults from your vaults to the Treasury vaults, I will not only pay you the 4 per cent. interest that I am paying you now, but I will loan you $1.10 for each dollar in order that you may loan that money to the people of the United States at the current rate of interest."

Mr. VEST. Does the Senator mean to say that the national banks are holding the 4 per cent. bonds when there is not a place in the United States they could not loan their money out at 5 and 6 per cent.? Why would they hold dead bonds, you might term them, at 4 per cent.?

Mr. ALLISON. The Senator from Missouri knows, as I know, that the great banks of our country keep on hand a certain amount of Government bonds as indemnity or security against their current deposits. They keep them in that form, first, for immediate conversion, and secondly, for the purpose of securing interest upon them. There is not a national bank in any of our great cities that does not in its assets show a considerable amount of bonds carried.

Mr. SPOONER. Could they not borrow them from their customers and then divide the interest they made, the difference?

Mr. ALLISON. As they have done in many cases, as I am told, on account of this enormous stimulus given to them by the Secretary of the Treasury. Therefore this fallacious statement of the Secretary of the Treasury made in Wall street will not do, because it assumes that before the banks receive the deposits they go into the markets and buy the bonds. They have these bonds, and they have them for banking purposes, and having them, the Secretary of the Treasury says to them, "Deposit your bonds in the Treasury and I will not only pay you the interest which you are receiving now, but the people will pay you whatever the current rate of interest is."

The fundamental objection to that, however, rises far beyond this question of interest. The interest is a mere surface question. I want to suggest a case to the Senator from Missouri. Suppose we were now, instead of being about the 1st of October, 1888, about the 1st of October, 1891, and these $57,000,000 on deposit were in the hands of national banks. Although our 4½ per cent. bonds would then be due, the Secretary of the Treasury could not call them in. Why? A sudden call of $57,000,000 from the banks would create a panic throughout this country. The objection that I have to these loans for redeposit in the Treasury for the purpose of paying current expenses or for the purpose of redeeming

the national debt is that a sudden call would at once create a panic throughout the United States.

So the Secretary of the Treasury in order to avoid that made a most extraordinary obligation to these banks when these deposits were made. I will read one of them, and I want to call the attention of the Senator from Missouri to this statement. It is a letter from Secretary Fairchild and was introduced into a debate in the other House by one of my colleagues, General WEAVER, from my State. I assume it to be absolutely genuine, as it was introduced in debate on the 1st of March. It is a letter addressed to the Treasurer by the Secretary.

SIR: The Western National Bank of New York City—

We know what bank that is—

SIR: The Western National Bank of New York City has been designated a United States depository, and the security fixed for the present at $1,000,000 of United States 4 per cent. bonds. In order to avoid the usual delay in obtaining a balance by accumulating revenue deposits, I will thank you, when the bonds are received, to cause to be transferred to said bank from national-bank depositories other than those in New York City such amounts as may be deposited therein to the credit of your general account in excess of their authorized balances, until the sum of $1,100,000 is reached, which amount the Western National Bank will be authorized to hold as a fixed balance.

Respectfully, yours,

C. S. FAIRCHILD, *Secretary.*

What does that mean? It means that the Western National Bank is to have $1,100,000 of Government money, and that it is to be there as a fixed balance which it can loan to its customers. Therefore the Treasury is in the attitude now of having this money not only in the hands of these national banks, but in the hands of people which may be liable to a sudden call. So, I say, for public reasons aside from the 2 per cent. to be made per annum upon this vast amount of money, it would have been better for the Secretary of the Treasury to have purchased these bonds and allowed the money thus to go into circulation among the people.

That is my criticism upon the conduct of the Secretary of the Treasury as respects these deposits. Of course, a certain amount of deposits in the ordinary transactions of Treasury affairs must be kept in national banks. It runs from $10,000,000 to $15,000,000 and $20,000,000 under ordinary circumstances, but here is now $57,000,000 beyond that amount. There are in the monthly statements that come to us to the credit of disbursing officers $38,000,000 in addition to these $57,000,000, these $38,000,000 being very largely in the hands of the national banks subject to the drafts of the disbursing officers.

Mr. TELLER. Practically altogether.

Mr. ALLISON. Practically altogether, as the Senator from Colorado tells me. So there is practically $57,000,000 plus $38,000,000 in these national banks. I tell the Senator from Missouri he can not get away from this criticism by alluding to Treasury operations in 1879, which were necessary or proper, at least in a large degree, for the purpose of refunding the interest-bearing debt then bearing 6 per cent. to an interest-bearing debt of 4 per cent.; and it will not do either for the Secretary of the Treasury to shield himself behind the fact that there was no law which allowed bond purchases to be made. That law was as clear and distinct and explicit as any law upon the statute-book.

Mr. ALDRICH. No law has been since passed.

Mr. ALLISON. No law has been passed since, as the Senator from Rhode Island suggests, but a mere opinion, expressed intelligently by the two Houses of Congress; and thereby also hangs a tale, which I should think would not be a very agreeable one to the Senator from Missouri, or to the Senator from Kentucky, or Senators on that side of the Chamber. A bill came here from the House of Representatives, and a majority of the Senate put upon it a provision that for every million dollars of national-bank notes withdrawn there should be a million dollars of silver certificates issued. It went back to the House with that amendment, for the purpose of preventing a sudden withdrawal of the circulating medium of our country. That amendment was so hostile and offensive to this Administration that with that amendment the bill now sleeps the sleep of death. It has never been met by any responsive appeal in the House of Representatives.

It has been the policy of this Administration, so far as the effect of that policy is concerned, to pile up money in the Treasury by one pretext and another, so as to furnish an excuse for having $130,000,000 in the Treasury, in order to break down the protective system of our country, which was called the other day an "infamous system" by the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. President, I do not intend, so far as I am concerned, that the Administration shall get away from a just and proper criticism of their conduct in putting this money into the hands of banks, whether pet or otherwise, rather than to have saved the interest to the people by purchasing bonds which must be presently paid, because the bonds must be paid in 1891.

I made the prediction in my remarks a few days ago, and I repeat it now, that this very money, or the greater portion of it, will be in the hands of these identical banks, if the present policy is pursued after the 4th of March, 1889, when the 4½ per cent. bonds mature in October, 1891.

Mr. TELLER. Mr. President——

Mr. HOAR. Does the Senator from Colorado desire to proceed now?

Mr. TELLER. I desire to reply to some things which have been said. I do not care about continuing at this late hour of the day.

Mr. HOAR. If the Senator will yield to me, I will move that the Senate adjourn.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore.* Before submitting the motion to adjourn, in responding to an interrogatory of the Senator from Missouri [Mr. COCKRELL], the Chair feels bound to state that the senior Senator from Missouri [Mr. COCKRELL] had been recognized to proceed upon the pending bill, being the unfinished business. The Chair understood him to yield informally, as is frequently done, to his colleague, retaining his right to the floor. The debate has proceeded by unanimous consent since, but by the practice which prevails in the Senate, the Chair thinks the Senator from Missouri will be entitled to proceed whenever he demands the floor.

Mr. ALLISON. I give notice that immediately after the ordinary routine business in the morning I shall move to take up the bill.

Mr. TELLER. I wish to say that I dissent from the ruling of the Chair that any Senator has a right to yield the floor and have a debate go on all the legislative day and then resume it, especially when the Senator was not speaking. I do not want to be technical about it and insist on making some remarks to the Senate at this time or even to-morrow, but as a matter of principle I want to enter my protest against the ruling of the Chair.

Mr. VEST. I hope the Senator from Colorado will be permitted to speak to-morrow, and I hope my colleague will give him an opportunity.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore.* The Chair was merely stating what had been the uniform practice and custom and usage in the body.

Mr. TELLER. It does not seem quite right that a Senator should launch this class of debate upon the Senate, and then shut off the other side.

Mr. COCKRELL. Have I shut off the other side?

Mr. TELLER. Not at all; I am not quarreling with the Senator from Missouri; I was criticising the ruling of the Chair.

Mr. COCKRELL. I yielded to my colleague [Mr. VEST], who was compelled to be absent. Before he got through the Senator from Iowa requested to be recognized. I believed it was but fair and just and right to let him reply to my colleague.

Mr. TELLER. Certainly.

Mr. COCKRELL. I yielded the floor to him. Now, if the Senator from Colorado wants to make an additional reply I will yield to him for the purpose, or I will yield to him to-morrow; but I do not propose to be cut out of my right to control the time.

Mr. TELLER. I was just about to say, if I had been allowed to proceed, that if the Senator from Missouri insisted upon going on, of course I would defer my remarks; but I was not allowed to say that. I am not very particular whether I go on to-night or to-morrow morning, or whether I defer my remarks until after the Senator from Missouri gets through. I shall simply claim the floor at some time.

Mr. HOAR. May I make a suggestion to the Senator from Missouri?

Mr. COCKRELL. My colleague will be here in the morning, and I will yield to the Senator from Colorado in the morning; but I want it to be understood that I have the floor, and I shall not permit every other Senator who wants to speak on the bill to go on and speak.

Mr. TELLER. I am not particular about it.

Mr. COCKRELL. I shall take the floor as soon as the Senator from Iowa calls up the bill, and if he does not call up the bill the first thing after the morning business I shall do so myself.

Mr. BLAIR. At what hour? At 2 o'clock?

Mr. COCKRELL. Oh, no.

Mr. ALDRICH. In the morning hour.

Mr. BLAIR. Is there any agreement by unanimous consent to that effect? I inquire because it is necessary for me, as I shall have to be absent from the Senate, to occupy five or ten minutes at some time. I can do it to-night.

Mr. HOAR. I withdraw the motion to adjourn.

Mr. BLAIR. It is not upon this subject, but it is upon one where I am under a certain necessity to say a word.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore.* The motion to adjourn being withdrawn, the Senator from Missouri yields to the Senator from New Hampshire.

RELATIONS WITH CANADA.

Mr. BLAIR. I ask unanimous consent that the joint resolution introduced by me on the 6th of August may be read.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore.* If there be no objection, the joint resolution will be read.

The Chief Clerk read as follows:

A joint resolution (S. R. 101) requesting the President to open negotiations with the Government of Her Britannic Majesty with a view to the political union of the Dominion of Canada, or any of the provinces or subdivisions thereof, and the United States, and for other purposes.

Resolved, etc., That the President be requested to open negotiations with the Government of Her Britannic Majesty, in which the Dominion of Canada and the several political subdivisions thereof shall be represented, with a view to the settlement of all differences between Her Majesty's Government and the United States, and especially to the arrangement of terms mutually just, honorable, and satisfactory for political union between the Dominion of Canada, or between any of the several provinces or subdivisions of the Dominion of Can-

ada, and the United States, subject to the approval of the people of the Dominion of Canada, or of the people of any province or subdivision thereof who may be included in such arrangement, and to ratification by the United States in such manner as Congress may prescribe; such political union to be republican in form and in accord with the Federal system and the Constitution of the United States; and the negotiations may embrace such further treaties, compacts, and alliances as shall be deemed necessary for the future peace, happiness, security, and general welfare of Her Majesty's Dominions and of the United States.

Mr. BLAIR. I have certain information derived from a careful and prolonged course of investigation by a very intelligent gentleman traveling in Canada for some three or four months, purposely in the pursuit of intelligence as to the public opinion of the Dominion of Canada upon the question of political union between the two countries, and as I have felt an interest in that subject and there is pending in the Committee on Foreign Relations the joint resolution bearing upon that topic introduced by myself, I wish to have this information printed, which has been prepared and condensed at my request and addressed to me as chairman of the Senate Committee on Education and Labor. It is, I think, about ten pages of matter, written with a type-writer. It is collected and prepared by Mr. Charles T. Thompson, a correspondent of the New York Tribune, a very intelligent gentleman, who made this investigation in pursuance of his own inclinations and also at the request of others who desired to ascertain as nearly as possible the exact condition of public sentiment upon this great international question.

If the Senate will give permission to have this paper printed, I will not trouble the Senate to read it *in extenso*.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The Chair hears no objection, and leave to print the paper in the RECORD is granted.

The paper is as follows:

SIR: The matters affecting the relations between Canada and the United States which your committee now has before it, and your interest in advocating the political union of the two countries lead me to lay before you the following practical facts bearing on the matter of a political union:

As a newspaper correspondent I was recently commissioned to go through Canada and ascertain the wishes of the Canadian people as to a political union with this country. The tour was an exhaustive one, across the entire country, through every province, in the important commercial cities as well as small agricultural districts, giving an opportunity to talk with representative men, members of Parliament, business men, farmers, and laborers on the matter of a political union.

So little is known or understood on this side as to the sentiment on this subject in Canada that a brief statement of the facts may be of value in your consideration of the matter. It appears to be particularly relevant to the present discussion, for the wishes of the Canadian people, for or against a political union, would be an important factor in any move which this country would take in that direction.

First. Canada is ready for a political union. This is sometimes asserted as an abstract proposition, but I will undertake to prove it. In a trip covering three months, from end to end of Canada, it was found that every community, large and small, had the nucleus of a political union party in it. They came from both parties, Tories and Grits, the sentiment not being founded on any party reasons, but solely in the belief that a political union with the United States would lead to Canada's prosperity.

The reasons assigned were various, as the succeeding statements of representative men will show. Some took the broad ground that the two countries had a common language and common interest and should be governed in common; some that Canada had grown too great to be a mere colony of Great Britain; some that the control exercised by Great Britain was a monstrous and unnecessary expense; and some that a political union was the only solution of grave social and religious problems which have arisen in the province of Quebec and are spreading to Ontario.

These feelings are best shown by extracts from the views of leading men through the Dominion, representing a diversity of localities and interests.

In the towns immediately along the border the sentiment is particularly strong. At Amherstburg, for instance, many of the leading business men and bankers are the most radical in the movement. Hon. Mr. Balfour, member of Provincial Parliament from that riding, says he has found many of his colleagues in Parliament openly advocating annexation, and that the number of these advocates has grown surprisingly of late. At Windsor, opposite Detroit, the leading banker, Mr. Curry, is one of the heads of the sentiment, and he even goes so far as to be ready to advance a considerable sum of money, $10,000 or more, to help bring Canada into the Union. The master workman of the Knights of Labor of Windsor also expresses sentiments equally as strong, and says that political union is desired by the laboring masses of Canada. At Essex Center, the central point of the agricultural community of Essex County, the feeling was thus stated by Hon. James Brien, member of Parliament:

"A great many are beginning to favor annexation. It is only within the last few years, too, that the annexation talk has become so general. Formerly the man who whispered in favor of annexation was denounced as a rebel, but it has become too common now to treat in that way."

This expression is readily borne out by talking with the people of the locality. Hon. Brien's partner is an open advocate of political union, while the storekeepers and business men are almost a unit for it. At Chatham, further up the border, the views of Mr. Charles Northwood fairly reflect many similar views:

"Political union," said he, "would be a great benefit to both sides. It is said that England would not favor it, and that such a course would be disloyal. I think, however, that mother country would like the arrangement for several reasons. It would establish a more cordial relation between the mother country and the United States, and England's trade and real interests are larger to-day with the States than with Canada. Then, it would relieve the mother country from harassing irritation over fishery disputes. That is patched up for a time, but it will come out again, and the way to stop it for ever is to have a political and commercial union. Annexation, too, would help to bring about a closer relation between all English-speaking people, by which a federation of their nations would eventually rule the world, advancing civilization and Christianity."

Along the shores of Lake Ontario, where Canadian towns with admirable harbors are without sail or shipping, there is a longing for political union as the means of restoring their commerce. For instance, Dr. Clark, the leading physician of Cobourg, Ontario, thus expresses it:

"They asked me what party I belonged to," said Dr. Clark, "but I've told our politicians I belong to neither of their parties. My party is the one representing annexation. When they put up a man representing that feeling he will have my support. We should send our representatives to Washington, not to Ottawa. I used to be called rebel for such views, but that time is gone by now. There are too many of the same way of thinking. When I talk of annexation now the only answer is that the time has not come yet. There is no longer any talk of rebel or of the impossibility of annexation. A secret ballot taken here would show a surprising result, and I believe annexation might carry. There are many of our leading merchants who would support it, although they would not say so openly. It is a strong feeling throughout Canada, too. Hon. Ebenezer Perry, who was a member of the Canadian senate, told me that he had found the leading men of Montreal and Kingston in favor of annexation.

"It would be of vast benefit in improving Canada. Property would advance in value. American enterprise and capital would come in here, and that's what we need. Look at the towns across the line and compare them with the stagnated condition of the towns on this side. Great Britain is thousands of miles away, and has no real interest in us. Annexation is what Canada needs, and must have to revive her."

This is not a random opinion, but is one which is in line with many others, the names and expressions being at hand, but withheld for purposes of brevity.

Going further back, into the manufacturing communities, the same sentiment prevails. At Hamilton, Ontario, one of the chief manufacturing points of the Dominion, the political union sentiment is very prevalent. The president of the Conservative Club, a leading organization, is one of the chief advocates of the step, and he is followed by merchants and manufacturers almost without number. At Ingersoll, another manufacturing point, Hon. A. McKay, member of Parliament, thus expressed his view:

"What I wish to see," said he, "is absolute independence from England, and I can foresee that end coming. I would not want to live in a country if I thought it were always to be a mere colony. The United States framed their declaration of independence when they had only 3,000,000 of people, and we have about 5,000,000 now. Canada has all the elements to make up a prosperous and independent country. It would be of vast benefit to us in the way of stimulating immigration. The emigrant now comes from a monarchy, and wants to get under an independent form of Government. For that reason the United States system of universal suffrage draws the emigrant there and gives him an interest in the country. He can not see the same advantages here, where we are part of the same sort of monarchy he has left. There would be no drawback to independence, such as fear of maintaining a standing army. Canada will always be too close an ally of the United States to ever have a war with her."

There is a class bearing titles and much devoted to English customs who treat any expression of political union as disloyal to the mother country. But these are comparatively few, and the general desire is to first consider Canada's interest. This idea was thus stated by Mr. John Craig, head of the agricultural society of Oxford County, Ontario, and one of the best known and conservative citizens:

"No one could well accuse me of disloyalty," said he, "for I was in the mother country for forty years before coming here, and therefore had all my predilections formed toward her. But I do not regard annexation as a disloyal feeling. The Bible doctrine is that the son must turn from his father and mother and cleave to his wife; and that's the case with us here; it means no disrespect or disloyalty to the parental roof, however. On a previous issue the cry was raised that the mother country would be injured. 'Then so much the worse for the mother country,' answered Sir John Macdonald. That's the answer now. If annexation will hurt the mother country, why, 'so much the worse for her.' That is the practical view being taken of the matter now."

In the farming communities a similar wish for political union is general. At an agricultural fair in one of the best agricultural districts I talked with leading farmers on the subject. James Anderson, a leading farmer and reeve of his locality, thus emphatically stated his observations of the farmer sentiment for political union. He was asked if there were one thousand annexationists in his locality.

"Yes," said he, "not only that, but nine-tenths of our farmers are for out and out annexation. If you will drive through the farming district in my township you will discover the remarkable prevalence of annexation sentiment. They are all for it, not alone commercial union, but political, moral, geographical, and religious union. Wipe out the dividing line absolutely—that's what they want—and make us a political part of the United States. There is but one condition imposed, and that is that the new State of Ontario shall retain her local laws, the State's rights doctrine. That could readily be arranged. New York has her own State laws and is not governed by United States Federal laws, except on Federal questions. Ontario would have the same right to make her own laws for all State questions. That overcomes the objection frequently raised that Ontario would have to surrender her good laws for the inferior ones of the United States.

"Annexation means an arising from the stagnant condition of Canada's cities and industries to-day. Why is it that Detroit has grown to a metropolis while Windsor has languished? Why is it that Woodstock here is not the size of Utica, N. Y., and other inland towns in the States? The places here have fully as many natural advantages. They are the centers and supply points for fully as rich a farming country. The products, cheese, etc., are fully as abundant. And yet they struggle along as dwarf villages, unable to progress. The reason is not in the people or the imaginary line that divides them, but in the Canadian Government and institutions. We need an infusion of American ways and means. Annexation would make Woodstock a city of 40,000 inhabitants in the next fifteen years. It would build us up with population and capital.

Going into the province of Quebec, which is largely French, the expression for political union is even more pronounced. The French have no ties of love for Britain, and they would gladly break away from the yoke put on at the Plains of Abraham. Even the monument erected by the British in memory of Wolfe, which stands in the suburbs of Quebec, on the Plains of Abraham, is pelted by the French, until it has to be rebuilt frequently. All of the cities and towns are French, not English, including Montreal, Quebec, and St. Hyacinthe. The latter is an average Quebec community, with a population of about 7,000. There are scarce 100 English-speaking people. Not only is their language French, but all their inspirations are the same, and there is not even a faint bit of sentiment of loyalty for the English Crown.

The only flag flying is the tricolored flag of France, over the skating rink. "God save the Queen" is not heard, but the "Marseillaise" rings out at the festive gatherings. As one glances over the album of M. Bernier, M. P., the pictures of Bonaparte and Josephine, Napoleon III and Eugenie are most conspicuous. They do not look to London for their ideas, but to Paris. Merely in name is it part of the English Empire. It is not even Canadian, but French. Their most cherished friend is the States, and it would take but little to arouse such people into enthusiasm for annexation. Judge William T. Mitchell, of Port Huron, the United States consul there, told me that there were constant demands for his Stars and Stripes to be used on public occasions. They seek it to fly over the race-course, to decorate the Wamaska club-house, and even to lower to half-mast on the death of a distinguished citizen.

In such communities, having no ties to Britain, but many attractions towards this country, the feeling towards political union is particularly strong. It was thus expressed by Hon. M. E. Bernier, member of the Dominion Parliament:

"If you were to go from house to house, and the people were to give a free expression of their views, you would find nine out of every ten of them in favor of annexation. I am sure of it. The idea that the clergy would oppose it is largely erroneous. The priests recognize the fact that on the other side they would not be so completely under the control of their superiors, but would have more liberties. I have heard priests compare the prosperity of their colleagues who had gone to the States with their own lack of it."

The remarkable prevalence of feeling for a union with the States was shown by Le Progres de l'Est, the leading paper of Sherbrooke, province of Quebec. This was secured through questions directed to the Canadian subscribers of a paper. The responses disclosed the surprising result of nearly two to one in favor of annexation in both the provinces of Ontario and Quebec. Here are the figures:

Provinces.	For annexation.	Against annexation.
Ontario	122	70
Quebec	18	10

Singularly, however, little Nova Scotia turned the scale the other way. But Nova Scotia's voice would be weak indeed against the two larger provinces in a general struggle. Le Progres says of this test vote, the following being a translation:

"This table is very instructive. In Ontario there has been found two to one in favor of annexation. Where, then, is all the boasted loyalty of the sister province? In the province of Quebec the result is not surprising, for there has always been as many French-Canadians for annexation as against it."

Further expressions could be multiplied indefinitely, but they would appear to be merely reiterations. They would show that the leading men—members of Parliament, journalists, business men, farmers, and workmen—are ready and anxious to become a part of an American union extending from the Gulf to the Arctic. It is not meant to state that such feeling is unanimous, for it is not; but it is substantial in all classes and communities, and merely waits the hoped-for opportunity in order to fan it into an overwhelming and irresistible movement towards a political union with the United States.

I am, sir, very respectfully,

CHARLES T. THOMPSON.

Hon. HENRY W. BLAIR,
Chairman Senate Committee on Labor and Education.

Mr. BLAIR. For my own part, I am entirely opposed to the idea of anything like retaliation or resort to unnecessary force, either of word or of action, in the discussion or in the elucidation of the relations between the Dominion and this country. I think we need the union as much as Canada needs the union, and that the line of peace for the future, the relations of these two great sections of the continent, and of the people who now and are hereafter to inhabit them, lies in the direction of conciliation and of unity, and that the project should never be put forth between these two great countries as one specially for the advantage of either, but for the unquestionable advantage of both.

I do not believe that these peoples can develop, can exist alongside of each other for any great length of time unless united, if they are to live in peace. I do not mean this as a menace, for I think, with the best disposition in the world, there will come inevitably those international conflicts, those wars, those destructive relations in the future which have existed on the continent of Europe, and which might well be avoided now that both countries are comparatively without population and without development, Canada very much more so, of course, than we. If now there could be a unity between these really homogeneous peoples and the institutions of each become homogeneous and united, and their development go on in such a symmetrical and united condition for the future as that we should be really, when there shall be 500,000,000 in the territory of the now separated nationalities, one nation, united as we are ourselves on the southern side of the line, and far more so, than Canada and Canadians ever can be unless in some way the whole is fused in one.

I believe it is as much to the advantage of this country that there should be union, and it is no just way of putting the subject when we speak in anything of an offensive sense of annexation.

Mr. HOAR. May I suggest to my honorable friend (I suppose he is speaking somewhat for the sake of having Canada hear what he says) that I think there are people in this country who believe that Canada has an objection to our annexing her, but are entirely willing that she should annex us, of course adopting our Constitution.

Mr. BLAIR. I am not willing to do that. I am willing to be united with Canada and that Canada should be united with the United States, but I am not willing that the idea of inequality upon either side should find its way into these considerations. It is nothing but political union that suits my mind, and there is a great deal in these matters of sentiment. Most of the wars of the world have been the result of matters of sentiment, and sentiment really controls the history of mankind far more than do questions of actual material development and of material consequence.

It is useless at this time to enter upon the broad field of general discussion, and I only called the subject up because I am desirous that this printed and carefully prepared matter which is given to me by Mr. Thompson may be spread before the country, and that on our side of the line we may be really informed of the general and strong inclination of the masses of the people, as this information demonstrates undoubtedly a majority of the people of Canada are to-day desirous of union with the people of the United States. I feel for one that that inclination is most earnestly and harmoniously reciprocated by the sixty-five million who make up the American nation.

Mr. HOAR. I renew my motion.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The Senator from Massachusetts moves that the Senate adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 53 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until to-morrow, Tuesday, October 16, 1888, at 12 o'clock m.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

MONDAY, *October* 15, 1888.

The House met at 12 o'clock m. Prayer by Rev. J. H. CUTHBERT, D. D.

The Journal of Friday's proceedings was read and approved.

NAVAL ASTRONOMICAL OBSERVATIONS.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore* (Mr. MCMILLIN in the chair). The Chair will lay before the House bills and resolutions from the Senate. It is not usual to do this on Monday morning, but being near the close of the session, the Chair will lay them before the House.

The Clerk read as follows:

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES, *October* 12, 1888.

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the annual volumes of the astronomical observations of the Naval Observatory for 1886, 1887, and 1888 be printed, and that 1,800 additional copies of each report be printed, of which 300 copies shall be for the use of the Senate, 700 copies for the use of the House of Representatives, and 800 copies for the use of the Navy Department.

The resolution was read a first and second time, referred to the Committee on Printing, and ordered to be printed.

BRIDGES ACROSS THE KENTUCKY RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES.

The SPEAKER laid before the House the bill (H. R. 11262) to authorize the construction of bridges across the Kentucky River and its tributaries by the Richmond, Nicholasville, Irvine and Beattyville Railroad Company, with amendments.

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Speaker, Governor MCCREARY on leaving requested me to ask that these two formal amendments be accepted by the House. They are purely formal, and I ask the concurrence of the House in the amendments. One is relative to a footway over the bridges, and the other requires that any changes in the construction of the bridges be approved by the Secretary of War.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will read the amendments.

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 1, line 12, after the word "passengers," insert "provided that the rates of toll charged by said company shall be first approved by the Secretary of War;" on page 1, line 12, after the word "passengers," strike out [.], and in page 2, line 7, after the word "war," insert "and if the Secretary of War shall at any time think any changes necessary in the plan of said bridge or bridges, or that the said bridge or bridges should be entirely removed, the said alterations or removal shall be at the expense of the company."

The amendments were agreed to.

Mr. ROGERS moved to reconsider the vote by which the amendments were agreed to; and also moved that the motion to reconsider be laid on the table.

The latter motion was agreed to.

ANDREW J. SMITH.

The SPEAKER laid before the House the bill (H. R. 2579) authorizing the President to appoint and retire Andrew J. Smith, late colonel of the Seventh United States Cavalry and a major-general of volunteers, with amendments.

Mr. WARNER. I ask that the title of the bill be again read.

The title was again reported.

Mr. WARNER. Mr. Speaker, that is a mere formal amendment, and I hope it will be acted upon at this time.

Mr. WHITE, of New York. It merely changes the rank.

Mr. WARNER. It is a mere formal amendment.

The Clerk read the amendment, as follows:

Strike out the words "brigadier-general" and insert "colonel of cavalry."

Mr. MCMILLIN. What is his rank?

Mr. WARNER. The Senate amendment reduces the rank from brigadier-general to colonel.

Mr. MCMILLIN. There was no proposition to retire him as a brigadier-general?

Mr. WARNER. The bill originally introduced was to retire him with the rank of brigadier-general. The Committee on Military Affairs of the House amended the bill and proposed to retire him with the rank of colonel, the rank that he held in the regular Army at the time of his resignation. It went to the Senate and in the Senate it was believed that the language used in the amendment was not sufficiently clear, and therefore they struck out the words suggested in the amendment and left it at the same rank as the bill passed the House, precisely.

Mr. MCMILLIN. Let it lie over for the present and I will look at it if it meets the approval of the House. I ask that it lie on the Speaker's table for the present.

There was no objection, and it was so ordered.

MARINE-HOSPITAL SERVICE.

The SPEAKER also laid before the House the bill (S. 1786) to regulate the appointment in the Marine-Hospital Service of the United States.

The Clerk read as follows:

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES, *October* 12, 1888.

Resolved, That the Senate disagree to the amendments of the House to the bill of the Senate 1786 and request a conference of the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon.

Ordered, That Mr. DOLPH, Mr. SAWYER, and Mr. COCKRELL be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The SPEAKER. This bill has reached a stage at which it is privileged. If there be no objection, the House will insist upon its amendments and agree to the conference asked.

There was no objection, and it was so ordered.

GEORGE K. OTIS.

The SPEAKER also laid before the House the bill (S. 3348) for the relief of George K. Otis; which was read twice, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

SAMUEL HEIN.

The SPEAKER also laid before the House the bill (S. 3351) for the relief of Samuel Hein; which was read twice, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

CONDEMNED CANNON FOR THE GRAND ARMY OF THE REPUBLIC.

The SPEAKER also laid before the House the bill (S. 3612) donating condemned cannon and small-arms to Naval Post No. 400, Grand Army of the Republic, Department of Pennsylvania; which was read twice, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

WIDOW OF CHIEF-JUSTICE WAITE.

The SPEAKER also laid before the House the bill (S. 3621) for the payment to the widow of the late Chief-Justice Morrison R. Waite the balance of a year's salary; which was read twice.

The SPEAKER. Unless there be objection, this bill will be referred to the Committee on the Judiciary. An objection would send it to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. MCMILLIN. I think that is where it ought to go. It stands on the same basis as any other claim.

The bill was referred to the Committee on Claims.

YELLOW-FEVER CONFERENCE.

The SPEAKER also laid before the House a joint resolution (S. R. 113) concerning the conference to be held in Washington in December next to consider the best means of preventing the introduction of yellow fever and other epidemic diseases into this country.

Mr. DOUGHERTY. I ask unanimous consent that that resolution be read and considered at this time. It does not make any appropriation.

Mr. EZRA B. TAYLOR. I object.

APPOINTMENTS IN MARINE-HOSPITAL SERVICE.

The SPEAKER appointed as managers of the conference on the part of the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the bill (S. 1786) to regulate appointments in the Marine-Hospital Service of the United States Mr. PHELAN, Mr. LAGAN, and Mr. O'NEILL of Pennsylvania.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. BACON, indefinitely, on account of important business.

To Mr. POST, indefinitely, on account of important business.

To Mr. LAWLER, indefinitely.

To Mr. NEAL, indefinitely, on account of important business.

To Mr. LYMAN, indefinitely, on account of important business.

To Mr. STRUBLE, indefinitely.

BRIDGE ACROSS THE COOSA AT GADSDEN.

The SPEAKER also laid before the House the bill (H. R. 11338) to authorize the construction of a bridge across the Coosa River at Gadsden, in the State of Alabama, with amendments of the Senate thereto.

Mr. FORNEY. I move that the House concur in the Senate amendments. The changes are immaterial. I ask that the amendments be read.

Mr. EZRA B. TAYLOR. I object.

Mr. FORNEY. I hope the gentleman will not object to this. It is simply a House bill in which the Senate has made some immaterial amendments.

Mr. EZRA B. TAYLOR. I have already given notice that there shall be no more legislation in this House this session.

Mr. FORNEY. Then you ought to have stopped it some time ago. Why do you draw the line on this bill?

Mr. EZRA B. TAYLOR. I draw it this morning on this bill.

Mr. FORNEY. You ought to have drawn it earlier. [Laughter.]

ORDER OF BUSINESS.

The SPEAKER. This being Monday, the regular order is the call of States and Territories for the introduction of bills and resolutions.

Mr. WHEELER (when the State of Alabama was called) offered a preamble and resolution in relation to the Senate tariff bill, which was read in part.

Mr. DINGLEY (before the completion of the reading). Mr. Speaker, I desire to ask if that is either a bill or a resolution within the meaning of the rule.

The SPEAKER. It seems to be a resolution.

Mr. DINGLEY. It seems to be a caucus resolution providing what the Democratic party should do, or will do.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Alabama [Mr. WHEELER] in his place on the floor offered the resolution when his State was called.

Mr. WHEELER. I have offered it in the regular order.

Mr. DINGLEY. It is not in the form of a resolution.

Mr. WHEELER. The second resolution provides for the discharge of a duty I regard as incumbent upon members of Congress.

Mr. DINGLEY. It might be very proper in a caucus, but not here.

Mr. WHEELER. I think it is eminently proper for this body.

Mr. FARQUHAR. Mr. Speaker, I suggest that that resolution is for the Democratic party and is leveled against another party, and therefore it is properly a caucus matter.

The SPEAKER. The Chair, of course, has no control over the character of resolutions offered by members, except to see that they are respectful to the House and to the other branch of Congress.

Mr. FARQUHAR. Independent of the bad taste of that resolution it is bad sense. [Laughter.]

The SPEAKER. The preamble is no part of the resolution.

Mr. DINGLEY. Does the resolution propose legislation?

The SPEAKER. It does not.

Mr. FARQUHAR. Then what is the use of it?

The SPEAKER. That is not a question for the Chair. A gentleman may introduce a proposition on any subject. The Chair has no control of the matter; but the House may take such action as it pleases. It may move to lay the proposition on the table, or it may refuse to receive it.

Mr. DINGLEY. I would like to have the rule read which relates to the introduction of bills and resolutions under this call.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will read the first clause of Rule XXIV.

The Clerk read as follows:

RULE XXIV.

ORDER OF BUSINESS.

1. Each Monday morning during a session of Congress, immediately after the Journal of the proceedings of the last day's sitting has been read and approved, the Speaker shall call all the States and Territories in alphabetical order for bills and resolutions for printing and reference without debate, on which call joint and concurrent resolutions and memorials of States and Territorial Legislatures may be presented and appropriately referred; and, on this call only, resolutions of inquiry directed to the heads of the Executive Departments shall be in order for reference to appropriate committees, which resolutions shall be reported to the House within one week thereafter.

Mr. DINGLEY. I make the point of order that this is neither a joint nor a concurrent resolution, within the meaning of the rule.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will state that this rule originally provided for the presentation on this call of joint and concurrent resolutions only. At the beginning of the Forty-ninth Congress the rule was so changed by the House as to embrace all resolutions; and words "joint and concurrent" as now embraced in the rule have reference only to resolutions of State and Territorial Legislatures, as the gentleman will see if he will examine the language of the rule.

Mr. WHEELER. I ask unanimous consent to strike out the word "Democratic" before "members." I hardly expected any aid from the other side of the House, as every member I see there to-day voted and spoke against the relief for the people which is sought to be secured by this resolution.

Mr. DINGLEY. I submit that the time of the House should not be occupied by the presentation of a resolution of this kind, which is evidently not within the intention of the rule.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will state to the gentleman from Maine that a resolution presented under this call does not necessarily go into the RECORD because it is read. It requires unanimous consent——

Mr. DINGLEY. But the time of the House is being improperly occupied by the reading of a caucus resolution.

The SPEAKER. The resolution, the Chair supposes, will go to the Committee on Rules, as it does not propose any legislation, but simply declares the sense of the House upon certain propositions.

Mr. WHEELER. The resolution was not read through.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will conclude the reading of the resolution without the preamble. The preamble is no part of the resolution.

The Clerk resumed and concluded the reading of the resolution.

The SPEAKER. This resolution will be referred to the Committee on Rules.

Mr. FARQUHAR. I desire to know whether this resolution becomes a matter of record—whether as read it goes into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The SPEAKER. It does not, except by unanimous consent of the House.

Mr. FARQUHAR. All right, then. I made the inquiry simply because the gentleman who offered the resolution is a friend of mine; and for his own good name, as well as for the credit of the House, I did not wish the resolution to appear in the RECORD.

Mr. WHEELER. I am very thankful to the gentleman for expressing a desire to take care of my good name, but I will endeavor to discharge that duty myself without the aid of any one.

I asked unanimous consent to have the word "Democratic" stricken out, because I was delighted to see gentlemen on the other side of the House indicate a willingness to unite with us in the continued effort to lighten the burdens now borne by the tax-payers, and that is the only thing to which the resolution proposes to commit the House.

Mr. EZRA B. TAYLOR. It would spoil the resolution if that word were stricken out.

Mr. FARQUHAR. It would be like the play of Hamlet with Hamlet left out.

AMENDMENT OF REVISED STATUTES.

Mr. STONE, of Kentucky, introduced a bill (H. R. 11587) to amend sections 851, 856, 857, 858, 861, and 862 of the Revised Statutes of the United States relating to the District of Columbia; which was read a first and second time, referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia, and ordered to be printed.

BRIDGE ACROSS HUDSON RIVER.

Mr. FARQUHAR (by request) introduced a bill (H. R. 11588) authorizing the building of a bridge across the Hudson River, connecting the States of New York and New Jersey, and making it a post-route; which was read a first and second time, referred to the Committee on Commerce, and ordered to be printed.

PUBLIC BUILDING AT EASTON, PA.

Mr. SOWDEN introduced a bill (H. R. 11589) for the erection of a public building at Easton, Pa.; which was read a first and second time, referred to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, and ordered to be printed.

LAND BOUNTY FOR SOLDIERS, ETC.

Mr. SOWDEN also introduced a bill (H. R. 11590) granting a bounty of 160 acres of land to all non-commissioned officers, private soldiers, and sailors who served in the Army, Navy, or Marine Corps of the United States during the late war of the rebellion, and to the heirs and legal representatives of those who were killed in battle or died while in the service; which was read a first and second time, referred to the Committee on the Public Lands, and ordered to be printed.

PENSIONS.

Mr. SOWDEN also introduced a bill (H. R. 11591) granting a pension to all honorably discharged soldiers and sailors who served in the late war of the rebellion and who are mentally or physically disabled and dependent, either wholly or in part, upon charity for support; which was read a first and second time, referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions, and ordered to be printed.

Mr. SOWDEN also introduced a bill (H. R. 11592) providing for the payment of pensions to all honorably discharged soldiers and sailors who served in the military or naval service of the United States during the late war of the rebellion, upon attaining the age of sixty-five years; which was read a first and second time, referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions, and ordered to be printed.

GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE.

Mr. RICHARDSON introduced a bill (H. R. 11593) to provide additional accommodations for the Government Printing Office; which was read a first and second time, referred to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, and ordered to be printed.

TIME FOR MEETINGS OF CONGRESS.

Mr. WHEELER introduced a bill (H. R. 11594) to designate the time for the convening of Congress; which was read a first and second time, referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and ordered to be printed.

CONFERENCE COMMITTEES.

The SPEAKER. The call of States and Territories for the introduction of bills and resolutions is now completed.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. Speaker, my attention has been called by the Senate Committee on Pensions to the fact that upon the bill for the relief of Margaret S. Heintzelman, widow of General Heintzelman, the Chair appointed as conferees on the part of the House the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CHIPMAN] and the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. THOMPSON] and the gentleman from California [Mr. THOMPSON], neither of whom is now in the city. I call the attention of the Chair to this fact in order that other conferees may be appointed.

There is another case to which my attention has been directed by the same memorandum, sent to me by the Senate committee. Upon the bill with reference to the pension of the widow of General Kilpatrick the report of the committee of conference was agreed upon, but the gentlemen representing the House on that committee have left the city without filing the report. I bring up these questions as a matter of courtesy; I am not interested personally in either of the bills.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will take proper action in the cases referred to.

ORDER OF BUSINESS.

The SPEAKER. The regular order is the call of committees for motions to suspend the rules; but there is a motion pending made by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. WARNER], which has priority, if insisted upon. The Chair thinks, however, that on the first Monday of this month, during the absence of the present occupant of the chair, a motion to suspend the rules was also made by the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. DUNN], by consent, which motion is also pending. But if the gentleman from Missouri insists upon his motion, it has priority.

Mr. WARNER. The motion of the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. DUNN] was withdrawn.

The SPEAKER. At any rate the motion of the gentleman from Missouri has priority. A second was demanded and no quorum voted. The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. WARNER] has been appointed as one of the tellers, and the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BARNES] not being present, the Chair will appoint in his place the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. CLEMENTS].

FINAL ADJOURNMENT.

Mr. OATES. I desire to offer the following resolution:

The SPEAKER. Is it privileged?

Mr. OATES. It is.

The Clerk read as follows:

Whereas the present session of Congress has continued longer than any other held in the history of the Government; and

Whereas there is much less than a quorum present in the Senate and House of Representatives, so that no legislation can be constitutionally enacted; and

Whereas there is no probability of a quorum being present in either of the said Houses of Congress during the time which the present session may by law continue: Therefore,

Be it resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives, That the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives be authorized to close the present session by adjourning their respective Houses on Wednesday the 17th day of October, at 12 o'clock m.

Mr. OATES. Mr. Speaker, I desire the indulgence of the House while I say a few words in explanation of my action in offering the resolution at this time. I understand full well the difficulty of arriving at an agreement, both among Senators and Members of the House in respect to this matter of adjournment. It is well known to the whole country that there is not a quorum present in the House, and has not been for weeks. It is also known there is not a quorum present in the Senate. It is well known to every one that this House has been waiting the action of the Senate on the tariff bill, and that they have reported a substitute for the House bill, and have it under consideration. But at the same time we have not a sufficient number present legally and constitutionally to adopt a single amendment to it if the question is made, as in my judgment it ought to be made, on every important question when there is not a quorum present in either House.

It was certainly contemplated by the framers of the Constitution that at least a quorum should be present to do business, and when it is business of such an important character a quorum should pass upon it, and nothing less than a quorum.

I would ask the reference of this resolution to the Committee on Ways and Means, which is the usual course to take, but for the fact that it is known to all of us that there is not a quorum of that committee present. No committee of this House can muster a quorum of its members, and unless there be present a quorum of the committee they can not take any legal action upon it under the rules of the House. And in the absence of such a quorum the only thing to do is for every member to act for himself, or defer action on the matter until members of the majority can get together and hold a caucus and resolve on the subject.

I am perfectly willing it should take this course. I do not wish to force a vote on it. I know it is a question of privilege and if demanded gentlemen can have a vote on it now. I am not disposed to press it, but if the House or a considerable number of gentlemen want further time, either Members of the House or Senators, I am perfectly willing the resolution I have offered may lie upon the table to give such an opportunity.

Mr. LANHAM. The recital in the preamble of the gentleman's resolution discloses the fact there is neither a quorum in this House nor in the Senate. The question I desire to ask, Mr. Speaker, is whether under the rules of the House, and I presume it is the same under the rules governing the Senate, it is competent for the House without a quorum to pass a resolution to adjourn *sine die?*

The SPEAKER. The Chair thinks not if the point is made.

Mr. LANHAM. The resolution declares in the preamble there is no quorum present.

Mr. McMILLIN. That shows the impossibility of doing the thing which is proposed.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will cause the provision of the Constitution to be read.

Mr. WHITE, of New York. I hope the gentleman from Alabama will have unanimous consent of the House to withdraw the preamble of the resolution.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will cause the Clerk to read that provision of the Constitution which prescribes what a less number than a quorum of either House may do.

The Clerk read as follows:

ARTICLE I.

SECTION 5. Each House shall be the judge of the elections, returns, and qualifications of its own members, and a majority of each shall constitute a quorum to do business; but a smaller number may adjourn from day to day, and may be authorized to compel the attendance of absent members, in such manner, and under such penalties as each House may provide.

The SPEAKER. Less than a quorum, therefore, can do nothing except to adjourn from day to day and compel the attendance of absent members.

Mr. KILGORE. I take it, Mr. Speaker, that less than a quorum could adjourn, unless the point of no quorum is made.

The SPEAKER. The Chair has so stated, but the resolution itself recites in the preamble the fact that a quorum is not present.

Mr. KILGORE. I hardly think that is a part of the resolution.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Alabama, the Chair understands, does not ask immediate action on the resolution.

Mr. EZRA B. TAYLOR. I would suggest that the gentleman from

Alabama strike out the preamble of the resolution and let it be adopted now.

Mr. OATES. I have no objection whatever to striking it out, as it is only a part of the argument in support of the motion.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman desire an immediate vote upon the resolution?

Mr. HENDERSON, of Iowa. I would suggest to my friend from Alabama that he had better let this go over until to-morrow.

Mr. OATES. I have no objection. [Cries of "Vote!" "Vote!"]

Mr. McMILLIN. Mr. Speaker, I would suggest that the question of the final adjournment of the session is one that in the present state of the Senate, there being no quorum there, could only be accomplished in the absence of any objection that might require a quorum to pass the resolution. So far as the recitation of the preamble of the resolution is concerned, about the absence of a quorum in the House as well as at the other end of the Capitol, I think it is just to the House to say that it is known here and throughout the country that the House is simply waiting to give the Senate an opportunity to act upon the bill passed by the House for the reduction of taxation, a bill that we sent to that body some months ago. We are now and have at all times been ready to act. I think I would not eulogize this House too much were I to say that there is no day upon which it may become necessary that a quorum shall be present to pass a bill for the reduction of taxation that a quorum will not be found present ready to transact that legislation. The House has done its whole duty, and only waits to force the Senate to act.

Mr. LANHAM. Will the gentleman from Tennessee permit me to ask him if it has not been demonstrated beyond question to the satisfaction both of the House and the country that that bill will not pass at this session of Congress?

Mr. McMILLIN. That, of course, is a matter about which the record shows all that can be known, either by myself or the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. LANHAM. Still I think it must be recognized that there is no prospect of reaching a conclusion upon the bill at this session.

Mr. McMILLIN. There were reasons satisfactory to the members of the Committee on Ways and Means which prevented the introduction of a resolution of this purport to-day. What they were is perhaps not properly a subject to present to the House at this time. I know the members around me will concur with me in this. I will content myself with the statement I have made, and let the House take such action upon the resolution as it may see proper.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Alabama asks consent to let this resolution lie over until to-morrow. Is there objection?

There was no objection, and it was so ordered.

ORDER OF BUSINESS.

The SPEAKER. The tellers will take their places——

Mr. WARNER. Mr. Speaker, permit me a moment, as I wish to make a statement or suggestion in that connection. If there is any business that can be done in the House to-day, I do not want to stand in the way, because we know from past experience that this can not be seconded unless a quorum is present. Hence it would be taking up the time of the House unnecessarily in going through the form of counting by tellers. If, therefore, this bill can retain its present status——

The SPEAKER. It will retain its place.

Mr. WARNER. Then I do not wish to obstruct any other business that may be transacted. If there is anything else that can be transacted without the presence of a quorum, I do not object.

Mr. McRAE. If the gentleman will permit me, I would like to submit a little bill for consideration from the Committee on the Public Lands.

Mr. WARNER. Certainly; I yield for that purpose.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will state that the next committee to be called is the Committee on Naval Affairs, then the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads, after which the Committee on the Public Lands will be called.

Mr. McMILLIN. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Ohio has announced that no legislation can be had and no business transacted in the absence of a quorum of the House; and in view of that fact, and for that reason only, I move that the House do now adjourn.

Mr. McRAE. Will the gentleman permit me a moment? I do not think the gentleman from Ohio will object to this bill.

Mr. EZRA B. TAYLOR. I adhere to the position I have taken.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Ohio assents to the statement of the gentleman from Tennessee, and declines to withdraw his objection.

Mr. McMILLIN. I have no desire to intervene with this motion to defeat the passage of the bill which the gentleman from Arkansas desires to call up, or any other legislation, and only make the motion in view of the statement of the gentleman from Ohio, and because if the measure of the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. McRAE] is called up, all further business of the House will be blocked by the gentleman from Ohio, as he has stated.

Mr. EZRA B. TAYLOR. I wish to modify my statement to this extent, to say that I shall not object to a report from the Labor Committee.

Mr. McRAE. I would like to have the title of the bill read at least, and let the gentleman from Ohio state whether or not he will object to its consideration. It is a matter involving no appropriation. I am not personally interested in the matter. It pertains to Washington Territory, the Delegate being now absent——

Mr. WHEELER. And involves laboring men.

The SPEAKER. If there be no objection, the Clerk will report the title.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 3475) granting the use of certain lands in Pierce County, Washington Territory, to the city of Tacoma for the purposes of a public park.

Mr. EZRA B. TAYLOR. I object.

Mr. McMILLIN. Mr. Speaker, as there is evidently no quorum, all we can do is adjourn, however much we desire to consider measures of other committees.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. McMILLIN], that the House do now adjourn.

Mr. McMILLIN. The gentleman from Florida [Mr. DOUGHERTY] desires to make a motion relative to a privileged matter, and I withdraw my motion temporarily to enable him to make that motion.

Mr. DOUGHERTY. I entered a motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill (S. 3620)—I think that is the number—relative to the electoral count was passed. I now move that the motion to reconsider be laid on the table.

The SPEAKER. The motion is pending.

Mr. DOUGHERTY. I desire to make a motion to lay the motion to reconsider on the table.

The SPEAKER. That motion was made, the Chair thinks, by the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. BRECKINRIDGE], and a vote was being taken by tellers.

Mr. DOUGHERTY. I withdraw the demand for a further count.

The SPEAKER. Then the ayes have it, and the motion is laid on the table.

Mr. PLUMB. I wish to inquire whether it would be in order to proceed with the unfinished business.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. McMILLIN] has moved that the House adjourn.

Mr. OATES. Before that motion is put, there was a question made on Friday last and not determined by the Chair that I would like to have disposed of. That was as to my right to print in the RECORD under a former order of the House some matter touching on the tariff, and whether it was competent for me to do it. I stated to the House that the matter I wished to publish was not of my own production, but was by an essayist.

The SPEAKER. That is a question for the House to determine, and not the Chair.

Mr. OATES. The question was whether the former order of the House was broad enough to cover the matter I desired to have printed.

The SPEAKER. The Chair can state his own recollection of the former order, and that is that there was an order allowing gentlemen to print remarks upon the subject of the tariff, or upon the bill commonly known as the Mills bill. The Chair supposes that gentlemen can incorporate in their remarks extracts from the writings of other parties.

Mr. OATES. The question is as to whether it could be done under the former order. I do not want to transgress the rules of the House. I understand that in printing speeches upon any subject, a member can incorporate in his speech whatever he deems proper.

The SPEAKER. That has been the practice; but the Chair would state that it is always under the control of the House. The House may decline to permit anything to be printed in the RECORD except what was actually spoken or read on the floor; and, therefore, the Chair thinks this is a question for the House alone, and not for the Chair.

Mr. OATES. I was calling the attention of the House to the fact that there is a continuing order allowing members to print remarks on this subject.

The SPEAKER. The Chair is aware of that.

Mr. OATES. Now, the question is whether I can adopt and print the substance of an essay as my remarks under that order of the House.

The SPEAKER. The Chair, under the law and under the rules of the House, has no control whatever over the RECORD. It is the duty of the Chair simply to revise the Journal as kept by the Clerk of the House and see that it states correctly the proceedings of the body; but the RECORD itself is in the exclusive control of the House, and the Chair has no power at all to decide or to direct whether the matter shall or shall not be printed in the RECORD. If a gentleman prints in the RECORD, under an erroneous construction of an order made by the House, any matter that ought not to have gone into it the House has the power to strike it out; but the Chair has no power in advance to decide what matter can go into the RECORD.

Mr. WHITE, of New York. I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. OATES] be given leave to print.

Mr. DINGLEY. I have no objection to that, provided I may also have the right to print a certain letter relating to foreign wages and the condition of foreign labor.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maine [Mr. DINGLEY]?

Mr. MANSUR. I object. [Laughter.]

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. Speaker, I desire to make a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. KILGORE. I desire to ask the Chair whether the motion to adjourn *sine die* is not a privileged question?

The SPEAKER. It is.

Mr. KILGORE. And that a vote can be demanded at any time?

The SPEAKER. It can.

Mr. KILGORE. I want to give notice that a vote will be demanded on that to-morrow.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. McMILLIN] that the House do now adjourn.

Mr. WASHINGTON. Pending that motion, I move that when the House adjourn to-day it be to meet on Wednesday.

Several MEMBERS. Oh, no!

Mr. PLUMB. I object.

Mr. FARQUHAR. I rise to a parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. FARQUHAR. What is the status of the electoral-count bill, after to-day's proceedings?

The SPEAKER. It has passed both Houses, and the motion to reconsider has been laid on the table. The gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. WASHINGTON] moves that when the House adjourn to-day it be to meet on Wednesday.

Mr. PLUMB. I shall raise the point of order and will object to that motion.

Mr. WASHINGTON and others. You can vote it down.

The question was put; and the motion was not agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question now recurs on the motion of the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. McMILLIN] that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; and accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 53 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned.

PRIVATE BILLS INTRODUCED AND REFERRED.

Under the rule private bills of the following titles were introduced and referred as indicated below:

By Mr. MORRILL: A bill (H. R. 11595) for the relief of William McClain—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. PLUMB: A bill (H. R. 11596) for the relief of Jane Johnson, widow of Moses Johnson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11597) for the relief of Eliza J. Preston, widow of Albert W. Preston—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11598) for the relief of Jane Payden, widow of John Payden—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Change in the reference of a bill improperly referred was made in the following case, namely:

A bill (H. R. 11586) for the relief of Stephen Williams—from the Committee on War Claims to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

PETITIONS, ETC.

The following petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk, under the rule, and referred as follows:

By Mr. D. B. HENDERSON: Resolutions of the Grand Army of the Republic of Iowa, relative to head-stones for deceased soldiers—to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. WASHINGTON: Petition of Eliza J. Ezell and of Mrs. M. B. Winbourn, of Davidson County, Tennessee, for reference of their claims to the Court of Claims—to the Committee on War Claims.

SENATE.

TUESDAY, *October* 16, 1888.

Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. J. G. BUTLER, D. D.

The Journal of yesterday's proceedings was read and approved.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore* presented a petition adopted at a meeting of the Society of Friends in session at Lawrence, Kans., representing a membership of over 8,000 members, praying for the passage of a joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution prohibiting the manufacture and sale of alcoholic liquors in the United States; which was referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

Mr. COCKRELL. I move to dispense with the call for the morning business.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. That can only be done by unanimous consent.

Mr. COCKRELL. I ask unanimous consent.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. If there be no objection——

Mr. FRYE. Will the Senator allow me to present a memorial?

Mr. PASCO. I have a paper which I desire to present.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. It requires unanimous consent to suspend the order of morning business.

Mr. COCKRELL. I yield for petitions.

Mr. PASCO. I present a paper relating to the claim of the successors in the interst of Messrs. Boyd and Monroe in aid of the petition of Mary E. Boyd, of Florida, in regard to certain land entries in Florida. I move the reference of this paper to the Committee on Claims, to which committee the petition has already been referred.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. FRYE (by request) presented the petition of Marion Guild Walport, of Washington, D. C., claiming that her family is of royal descent, that there is a conspiracy against them in which President Cleveland and foreign diplomats are implicated, and praying for an investigation of the facts; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES.

Mr. WILSON, of Maryland, from the Committee on Pensions, to whom were referred the following bills, submitted adverse reports thereon; which were agreed to, and the bills were postponed indefinitely:

A bill (S. 1120) to increase the pension of John L. Kirk; and

A bill (S. 2891) granting a pension to Mrs. N. H. Lambdin.

BILLS INTRODUCED.

Mr. EVARTS introduced a bill (S. 3637) granting an increase of pension to Amos Cross; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 3638) granting a pension to George McCreedy; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 3639) granting a pension to Magdalen Harper; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Pensions.

A. J. M'CREARY.

Mr. SPOONER. Before the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. JONES] left the city he requested me to call up during the session, stating that it was quite important, the bill (H. R. 7924) for the relief of A. J. McCreary, administrator of the estate of J. M. Hiatt, deceased, and for other purposes; and I have been requested by the Senator from Iowa [Mr. ALLISON], whose constituents are interested in it, to ask the Senate to consider the bill. It has been unanimously reported by the Committee on Indian Affairs, and I think it will only take a moment to pass it; but if the Senator from Missouri objects, I shall not insist upon it now.

Mr. COCKRELL. I do not think we ought to commence passing bills this morning.

Mr. SPOONER. Very well.

Mr. COCKRELL. If there is no further morning business, I renew my request.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The Chair will receive further morning business, if any be offered.

STEAM-PRESSES IN BUREAU OF ENGRAVING AND PRINTING.

Mr. BLAIR. I desire to make an announcement, if the morning business is to be dispensed with. I am compelled to leave the city, and understand that a motion may be made to discharge the Committee on Finance from the further consideration of the House bill relating to the use of steam-presses in the Bureau of Engraving and Printing. I desire to say that should such a motion be made, I hope it will prevail and that the bill may be passed, and my friend, the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. GEORGE], not now in the room, will please note that I desire him to vote on that question, as my vote accords with his own.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. CLARK, its Clerk, announced that the House had agreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 11139) to authorize the building of a bridge or bridges across the Mississippi River at La Crosse, Wis.

The message also announced that the House had passed the Senate concurrent resolution to print the fourth annual report of the Bureau of Animal Industry for the year 1887, with amendments in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED.

The message also announced that the Speaker of the House had signed the following enrolled bills and joint resolutions; and they were thereupon signed by the President *pro tempore:*

A bill (S. 45) for the relief of Col. James C. Duane;

A bill (S. 307) for the relief of Margaret Kennedy;

A bill (S. 1137) for the relief of Adam L. Epley;

A bill (S. 1196) for the relief of the estate of Joseph Fenno, deceased;

A bill (S. 1494) to secure to the Cherokee freedmen and others their proportion of certain proceeds of lands under the act of March 3, 1883;

A bill (S. 2110) granting the right of way for the construction of a railroad through the Hot Springs reservation, State of Arkansas;

A bill (S. 2663) granting an increase of pension to Mrs. Mary M. Ord;

A bill (S. 2802) to fix the number of unbound and bound Journals of the Senate and House of Representatives, and to provide for their distribution;

A bill (S. 3433) authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to accept the surrender of and cancel land-patents to Indians in certain cases;

A bill (S. 3559) to allow persons who have abandoned or relinquished

their homestead entries to make another entry, and for other purposes;

A bill (S. 3597) to provide for the disposal of the Fort Wallace military reservation in Kansas;

A bill (S. 3620) supplementary to the act approved February 3, 1887, entitled "An act to fix the day for the meeting of the electors of President and Vice-President, and to provide for and regulate the counting of the votes for President and Vice-President, and the decision of questions arising thereon;"

A bill (H. R. 1239) to extend the jurisdiction of the Light-House Board to the Sacramento and San Joaquin Rivers, California.

A bill (H. R. 1249) for establishing a light-house and fog-signal on Roe Island, Suisun Bay, California;

A bill (H. R. 1641) for the erection of a light-house at or near a point about midway between Barnegat and Navesink lights, in the State of New Jersey;

A bill (H. R. 2196) for the relief of S. T. Marshall;

A bill (H. R. 2972) authorizing the President to appoint and retire Alfred Pleasonton with the rank and grade of major;

A bill (H. R. 5700) to facilitate the transportation of life-saving and light supplies at Hog Island, Virginia;

A bill (H. R. 6514) for the allowance of certain claims reported by the accounting officers of the United States Treasury Department;

A bill (H. R. 6619) for the relief of Eliza A. Cutler Jones;

A bill (H. R. 7421) for establishing a light off Pamlico Point, North Carolina;

A bill (H. R. 7547) granting the right of way to the Yankton and Missouri River Railway through the Yankton reservation in Dakota;

A bill (H. R. 7604) for the establishment of a light-house and fog-signal at or near Gull Shoal, Pamlico Sound, North Carolina;

A bill (H. R. 8674) for the relief of Sterling H. Tucker and others;

A bill (H. R. 8855) for the establishment of a light-ship with a steam fog-signal at Sandy Hook, New York Harbor;

A bill (H. R. 10183) to establish a light-ship off Great Round Shoal, near Nantucket, Mass.;

A bill (H. R. 11107) to amend an act entitled "An act to authorize the Fort Smith and Choctaw Bridge Company to construct a bridge across the Poteau River, in the Choctaw Nation, near Fort Smith, Ark.;"

A bill (H. R. 11581) making an appropriation for the enforcement of the Chinese exclusion act;

Joint resolution (S. R. 59) authorizing Brig. Gen. Absalom Baird, United States Army, to accept from the President of the French Republic a diploma conferring the decoration of Commander of the National Order of the Legion of Honor; and

Joint resolution (S. R. 112) authorizing the Secretary of War to receive for instruction at the Military Academy at West Point Henry Lecomte, of Switzerland.

THE REVENUE LAWS.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. If there be no further morning business that order is closed.

Mr. ALLISON. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the tariff bill.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 9051) to reduce taxation and simplify the laws in relation to the collection of the revenue.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The Senator from Missouri [Mr. COCKRELL] is entitled to the floor.

Mr. TELLER. I desire to submit some remarks in reply partially to the Senator from Missouri [Mr. VEST] yesterday, and some remarks that will not perhaps be in the nature of a reply to what he said, and I desired to do so this morning; but I propose to wait until the Senator from Missouri [Mr. COCKRELL], who is entitled to the floor, and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. SPOONER], who desires to submit some remarks, conclude, and follow the Senator from Wisconsin, who, I understand, desires to leave the city this afternoon. When they are through, I shall ask the indulgence of the Senate to be heard.

Mr. COCKRELL. Mr. President, the question of taxation is by far the most important of all the many questions that have demanded the consideration and action of the Congress of the United States. It is a vital question with every organized government in the world; always has been and always will be such. No system of government can be administered without cost or expense. No cost or expense can be incurred and paid by any system of government without some source from which to derive the revenue or money to pay such cost or expense. No such revenue or money can be obtained by any government without some burden, some taxation, being imposed upon the subjects or citizens of such government directly or indirectly. Such burden, such taxation is the return or the equivalent borne or paid by such subject or citizen to his government for the rights, privileges, and immunities of his citizenship and the protection of his life, liberty, and property. In a perfect system of government every subject or citizen should contribute equally for the protection of his life and liberty, and in proportion to the property he possesses for the protection of such property.

In every system of government, the right and the power to determine the amount and objects of and to impose such burden, such taxation upon its citizens, must be vested in some department of such government.

Under our written Constitution such right and power are vested in Congress. Our Constitution requires "direct taxes" to—

be apportioned among the several States according to their respective numbers, counting the whole number of persons in each State, excluding Indians not taxed—

And declares that—

no capitation or other direct tax shall be laid, unless in proportion to the census or enumeration herein before directed to be taken—

And—

no tax or duty shall be laid on articles exported from any State—

And—

no preference shall be given by any regulation of commerce to the ports of one State over those of another; nor shall vessels bound to or from one State be obliged to enter, clear, or pay duties in another.

Section 8, of Article I, provides that—

The Congress shall have power to lay and collect taxes, duties, imposts, and excises, to pay the debts and provide for the common defense and general welfare of the United States; but all duties, imposts, and excises shall be uniform throughout the United States.

The grammatical construction and true meaning of which clause, in my judgment, is that Congress has the power to lay and collect taxes, duties, imposts, and excises in order to pay the debts and provide for the common defense and general welfare of the United States.

What are taxes, duties, imposts, and excises?

A tax is an excise, a duty, a custom, an impost, whatever is required by Government, national, State, municipal, and local, to be paid by the people for governmental use; a sum levied by government authority for public purposes. An excise is a tax imposed on commodities produced and consumed in our own country, and is usually called an internal or an internal-revenue tax.

A duty, a custom, an impost is a tax imposed on commodities imported from foreign countries; is a tariff tax.

What is the origin of the word "tariff?" Upon a promontory running out into the Straits of Gibraltar, at the southern point of Spain, is a fortress called "Tarifa," which commands the entrance and exit of the Mediterranean Sea. When the Moors were in possession they demanded, and having the power, exacted, of all vessels passing in or out of that sea a duty, a custom, an impost, a tax, or sum fixed according to the rates they prescribed on all commodities transported therein, and this duty, custom, tax, so levied and exacted, was called "Tarifa," or "Tariff."

The power to tax vested in Congress is not unlimited, not merely discretionary. Constitutions are made to limit, define, and restrain the powers of government.

Judge Thomas M. Cooley, in his work on Constitutional Limitations, well says:

Constitutionally a tax can have no other basis than the raising of revenues for public purposes, and whatever governmental exaction has not this basis is tyrannical and unlawful. A tax on imports, therefore, the purpose of which is not to raise revenue, but to discourage and indirectly prohibit some particular import for the benefit of some home manufacturer, may well be questioned as being merely colorable, and therefore not warranted by constitutional principles.

Mr. Justice Miller, in delivering the opinion of the Supreme Court of the United States in the case of Loan Association *vs.* Topeka (20 Wallace Reports), most ably expounds the power and objects of taxation, and says:

The theory of our Government, State and national, is opposed to the deposit of unlimited power anywhere. The executive, the legislative, and the judicial branches of these governments are all of limited and defined powers. * * * Of all the power conferred upon government that of taxation is most liable to abuse. * * *

The power to tax is, therefore, the strongest, the most pervading of all the powers of government, reaching directly or indirectly to all classes of the people. It was said by Chief-Justice Marshall, in the case of McCulloch *vs.* The State of Maryland, that the power to tax is the power to destroy. A striking instance of the truth of the proposition is seen in the fact that the existing tax of 10 per cent. imposed by the United States on the circulation of all other banks than the national banks drove out of existence every State bank of circulation within a year or two after its passage. This power can as readily be employed against one class of individuals and in favor of another, so as to ruin the one class and give unlimited wealth and prosperity to the other, if there is no implied limitation of the uses for which the power may be exercised.

To lay with one hand the power of the Government on the property of the citizen and with the other to bestow it upon favored individuals to aid private enterprises and build up private fortunes is none the less a robbery because it is done under the forms of law and is called taxation. This is not legislation. It is a decree under legislative forms.

Nor is it taxation. A "tax," says Webster's Dictionary, "is a rate or sum of money assessed on the person or property of a citizen by government for the use of the nation or State." Taxes are burdens or charges imposed by the legislature upon persons or property to raise money for public purposes.

Coulter, J., in Northern Liberties *vs.* St. John's Church, says, very forcibly:

"I think the common mind has everywhere taken in the understanding that taxes are a public imposition, levied by authority of the Government for the purpose of carrying on the Government in all its machinery and operations—that they are imposed for a public purpose.

"We have established, we think, beyond cavil that there can be no lawful tax which is not laid for a public purpose.

"If it be said that a benefit results to the local public of a town by establishing manufactures, the same may be said of any other business or pursuit which employs capital or labor. The merchant, the mechanic, the inn-keeper, the banker, the builder, the steam-boat owner, are equally promoters of the public good, and equally deserving the aid of the citizens by forced contributions. No line can be drawn in favor of the manufacturer which would not open the coffers of the public treasury to the importunities of two-thirds of the business men of the city or town."

In order to determine intelligently the question of taxation now pend-

ing we must ascertain the exact condition of our Government financially, its indebtedness, its assets and liabilities, its revenues and their sources.

First. The total debt, including all kinds of obligations, on June 30, 1888, was $1,717,784,793.72, consisting of three classes of items, to wit: First, "debt bearing no interest," $688,350,21 .32; second, "debt on which interest has ceased since maturity," $2,664,363.12; third, "interest-bearing debt," principal and accrued interest, $1,026,770,217.28.

The first class of items includes $56,807.50 of "old demand notes" outstanding; $346,681,016 of United States or legal-tender notes or greenbacks, used as money, never to be redeemed or reduced I hope till every dollar of interest-bearing debt has been paid; $14,415,000 of certificates of deposit, for which an equivalent amount has been deposited in the Treasury; $119,887,370 of gold certificates and $200,387,376 of silver certificates, for both of which an equal amount of gold coin and bullion and silver dollars has been deposited and is now in the Treasury, and $6,922,643.82 of fractional currency, being the estimated amount outstanding and undestroyed.

The second class of items, "debt on which interest has ceased since maturity," includes thirty different kinds of obligations, issued at sundry times since the organization of the Government, which have never been presented for redemption or payment and may never be.

The third class of items, "interest-bearing debt," includes $11,624,205.28 of accrued unpaid interest and $1,015,146,012 of principal bearing interest, consisting of $222,207,050 of "funded loan of 1891" bearing 4½ per cent. interest, redeemable or payable September 1, 1891; and of $714,177,400 of "funded loan of 1907," bearing 4 per cent. interest, redeemable or payable July 1, 1907; and of $138,050 of "refund certificates," bearing 4 per cent. interest, fundable in the 4 per cent. bonds of the "funded loan of 1907," and redeemable July 1, 1907; and of $64,623,512 of Pacific Railroad bonds bearing 6 per cent. and redeemable at different dates from January 16, 1895, to January 1, 1899; and of $14,000,000 of "Navy pension fund," bearing 3 per cent. interest, being simply a fund for Navy pensioners, the amount of 3 per cent. interest on which is appropriated to pay Navy pensions, and will probably never be extinguished. This sum should not be considered as an interest-bearing obligation to be paid. Excluding the "Navy pension fund" and the accrued unpaid interest, we had on June 30, 1888, an interest-bearing debt of $1,001,146,012, principal payable as above stated.

Second. The aggregate assets, cash in the Treasury on June 30, 1888, amounted to $714,033,484.77, consisting of—

Gold coin and bullion	$313,753,616.89
Silver dollars and bullion	248,022,218.54
United States notes or legal tenders	52,398,204.07
Trade-dollar bullion, national-bank notes, and funds in depositories	66,739,903.45
Paid bonds, coupons, etc	185,384.97
National-bank notes in process of redemption	6,770,380.08
Minor and fractional silver coin	26,163,776.77

The aggregate liabilities of the Treasury were $584,649,243.29, consisting of the following items:

Outstanding gold certificates	$119,887,330.00
Outstanding silver certificates	200,387,376.00
Outstanding certificates for United States notes	14,415,000.00
Held to pay matured debt, interest, etc	14,289,926.37
Held for redemption of United States notes or legal tenders	100,000,000.00
Held for redeeming national-bank notes "failed," "in liquidation," etc	98,929,571.27
Held to meet current liabilities, checks, etc	36,739,999.65

Deducting the aggregate liabilities from assets we had $129,384,241.48 cash in the Treasury, June 30, 1888.

Of this sum there were $112,035.58 in minor coins—1, 2, and 3 cent pieces—and $26,051,741.19 in fractional or subsidiary silver coins, accumulated under act of June 9, 1879, which made such coins and United States notes interchangeable in sums of $20 or any multiple and such coins a legal tender in sums not exceeding $10.

Deducting the minor and fractional silver coin we had on June 30, 1888, a net surplus of cash in the Treasury of $103,220,464.17, and on September 30 we had an aggregate surplus of $121,290,666.06, and, deducting minor coin and fractional silver coin, a net surplus of cash of $96,444,845.84.

We have not a dollar of interest-bearing debt either redeemable or payable prior to September 1, 1891, and the surplus now existing and sure to accrue during fiscal year 1889 would be sufficient to extinguish the debt maturing in 1891, and then we would have no debt redeemable or payable till July 1, 1907.

This condition, this congestion of the Treasury has not arisen suddenly from unforeseen causes, but from causes long foreseen and understood, as I will clearly prove.

On the 31st of August, 1865, the public debt reached the highest point, and was made up of the following items, to wit:

Funded debt	$1,109,568,191.80
Matured debt	1,503,020.09
Temporary loans	107,148,713.16
Certificates of indebtedness	85,093,000.00
Five per cent. legal-tender notes	33,954,230.00
Compound interest legal-tender notes	217,024,160.00
Seven-thirty notes	830,000,000.00
United States legal-tenders	433,160,569.00
Fractional currency	26,344,742.51
Suspended requisitions uncalled for	2,111,000.00
Total	2,845,907,626.56

Of these obligations, $684,138,949 were a legal tender, not counting the fractional currency also circulating as money.

During the fiscal year ending June 30, 1866, for the first time since 1860, we had a surplus in the Treasury, after paying all net ordinary expenditures, including interest on public debt and premiums, of $37,223,203.07, and during each of the fiscal years since we have had a surplus. The aggregate amount of the surplus for the years 1866 to 1888, both inclusive, is $1,603,187,227.75.

The surplus in 1870 was over one hundred and one millions, in 1880 over sixty-five millions, in 1881 over one hundred millions, in 1882 over one hundred and forty-five millions, in 1883 over one hundred and thirty-two millions, in 1884 over one hundred and four millions, in 1885 over sixty-three millions, in 1886 over ninety-three millions, in 1887 over one hundred and three millions, and in 1888 over one hundred and three millions. These sums remained after paying all interest and other net ordinary expenses.

During these twenty-three years, from July 1, 1865, to June 30, 1888, being the fiscal years 1866 to 1888, both inclusive, we have paid from the Treasury of the United States—

Principal of bonds or funded debt	$1,199,970,200.00
Principal of other obligations, such as temporary loans, 6 per cent. compound interest, and United States legal-tender and 7.30 Treasury notes, etc	403,217,027.75
Interest on public debt	2,197,803,200.41
Net ordinary expenses, exclusive of interest	4,447,676,414.52
Aggregate payments	8,248,666,842.68

Third. Enormous revenues, with prolific sources, were essential to enable the Government to collect and expend this bewildering amount in twenty-three years.

These vast amounts have been received into the Treasury during said period from taxes imposed by our laws upon and collected from the people, in sums and from sources, as follows:

Customs or tariff taxes	$4,197,588,329.33
Internal-revenue taxes	3,313,462,178.35
Direct taxes	10,430,595.43
Sales of public lands	83,362,504.71
Premiums on loans and sales of gold coin	169,265,420.90
Other miscellaneous sources	474,617,813.96
Aggregate receipts	8,248,666,842.68

During these twenty-three years the people of the United States, the toiling masses, have paid in taxes imposed by the tariff laws upon the numerous articles of imported merchandise consumed and used by them the vast sum of $4,197,588,329.33, which has actually been received into the Treasury. They have also paid into the Treasury in taxes imposed by the internal revenue laws upon the taxable articles they have used the sum of $3,313,462,178.35. Of this sum the taxes on "distilled spirits" yielded $1,273,639,807.06; on fermented liquors, $273,616,446.33; on manufactured tobacco, $755,552,749.18; and on all other sources under said laws, $1,011,356,303.80.

We will receive no more revenue from the two sources of "direct taxes" and "premiums on loans and sales of gold coin."

The revenues for the fiscal year 1888 were:

Customs or tariff taxes	$219,091,173.63
Internal-revenue taxes	124,290,871.98
Sales of public lands	11,202,617.23
Other miscellaneous items	24,674,446.10
Direct taxes	1,565.82
Total revenue for 1888	379,266,074.76

In the probable event of a change in the public land laws by reserving such lands for actual homestead settlers the revenue from that source may greatly diminish, if not entirely cease. There will be no more revenue from direct taxes. The revenues from "other miscellaneous items" vary from year to year, and may continue at from fifteen to twenty-five million dollars annually.

The two main sources of revenue are the customs or tariff and the internal revenue, and will, with reasonable certainty, continue to yield sums of net revenue equal to or even greater than the sums yielded the past year. The surplus must therefore continue to accumulate in the Treasury as long as the existing tariff and internal-revenue laws remain unchanged and the people are able to purchase the articles so taxed.

With this condition of an idle, demoralizing surplus now in the Treasury, and the reasonable certainty of its continued increase under existing laws, what is the wisest and best remedy for relieving the Treasury?

This is the great, vital question, overshadowing all others in its magnitude and demanding the most serious, painstaking thought and laborious efforts of every patriot, tax-payer, and voter.

Three remedies, and only three, are apparently available.

First. To pay out the surplus in the purchase of the interest-bearing debt at whatever premium the holders of the funded bonds may have the conscience to ask, and also in the redemption and absolute retirement of the United States legal-tender notes or greenbacks.

This would only give temporary relief; for the existing and the reasonably certain surplus for the next ten or eleven years would purchase and extinguish the funded debt and, in two or three years more, redeem and absolutely retire the greenbacks, and then we would have no debt of any kind.

This is neither a wise nor judicious remedy and only a *dernier ressort* for temporary relief.

Second. Larger expenditures, extravagant, generous, liberal appropriations, to be made by Congress for objects and purposes other than those necessary for a wise, judicious, and economical administration of our Government, so that the annual appropriations shall equal total receipts from taxation.

This proposal, in my judgment, would not be a remedy for any condition of the Treasury, but would be a crime, and nothing less, committed by the agents and representatives of the people—the tax-payers—which should relegate to private life every Representative and Senator who supports such policy.

Third. A change in the existing laws, imposing the internal-revenue and customs or tariff taxes so as to reduce the amount of such taxes collectible from the consumers of the articles taxed under such laws to the amount actually required to pay the expenses of the Government economically administered, and to make the annual receipts from such taxes equal to the expenses of the Government.

This seems to me to be the only wise and just remedy against surplus revenues arising from taxes imposed by law upon the people.

What have been the policies of the Republican and Democratic parties touching the accumulating surplus and the remedies therefor?

The Republican party had a two-thirds majority in the House and Senate from July 1, 1865, to March 4, 1869, and could pass any party measure over the veto of President Johnson. From March 4, 1869, to March 4, 1875, the beginning of the Forty-fourth Congress, that party had the complete control of the Government in all the three branches—executive, legislative, and judicial. From March 4, 1875, to March 4, 1885, it had complete control of the executive department—the President, Cabinet, and all appointive officers—and the President, by his veto, could defeat any inimical measure of Congress. From 1865 to date that party has had and now has control of the Senate, excepting only that from March 4, 1879, to March 4, 1881, during the Forty-sixth Congress, the Democratic party had control of the Senate. During the Forty-seventh Congress, from March 4, 1881, to March 4, 1883, the Republican party had control of both Senate and House. From March 4, 1875, to March 4, 1879, during the Forty-fourth and Forty-fifth Congresses, the Democratic party had control of the House, and from March 4, 1879, to March 4, 1881, during the Forty-sixth Congress, had control of both the Senate and House. From March 4, 1883, to date, the Democratic party has had control of the House. And from March 4, 1885, to date, has also had control of the executive department.

To ascertain what has heretofore been the policy of the Republican party in regard to the continuously accumulating surplus, we will examine the official records of the Republican executive administration from 1865 to March 4, 1885. The Treasury Department is specially charged by the laws with the administration of the finances—taxation, revenue, etc. The Secretary of the Treasury is required by law to submit to Congress, annually, a finance report showing the receipts and expenditures of the revenues, with such recommendations as he may deem proper for the consideration of Congress. Hon. Hugh McCulloch, a distinguished Republican statesman and financier, was Secretary of the Treasury under Presidents Lincoln and Johnson, from March 7, 1865, to March 4, 1869, and in his finance report for 1866, says:

A further diminution of internal taxes and a modification of the tariff, which will doubtless lead to a reduction of customs duties on many articles, will be required in order that production may be increased and new life infused into certain branches of industry that are now languishing under the burdens which have been imposed upon them.

And recommended:

Third. In a careful revision of the tariff for the purpose of harmonizing it with our internal taxes, removing the oppressive burdens now imposed upon certain branches of industry, and relieving altogether or greatly relieving raw materials from taxes, in order that the product of labor may be enhanced and the production and exportation increased.

And in his instructions to Hon. David A. Wells, special commissioner of the revenue, touching the preparation of a system of taxation, said:

You will therefore endeavor, first, to secure for the Government a revenue commensurate with its necessities, and, secondly, to propose such modifications of the tariff laws now in force as will better adjust and equalize the duties upon foreign imports with the internal taxes upon home productions. If this last result can be obtained without detriment to the revenue by reducing taxation upon raw materials and the machinery of home productions rather than by increasing the rates of imports, it would, in my opinion, by decreasing the cost of production and increasing the purchasing power of wages, greatly promote the interests of the whole country.

And said in his recommendation to Congress:

The Secretary does not, as before stated, intend to discuss it, but he ventures to suggest that the following general principles, some of which have been acted upon by Congress, and the correctness of all of which have been proved by other nations, may be safely adopted as a guide to the legislation that is now required:

First. That the fewest number of articles, consistent with the amount of the revenue to be raised, should be subject to internal taxes, in order that the system may be simple in its execution and as little offensive and annoying as possible to the tax-payers.

Second. That the duties upon imported commodities should correspond and harmonize with the taxes upon home productions, and that these duties should not be so high as to be prohibitory, nor to build up home monopolies, nor to prevent the free exchange of commodities which is the life of commerce. Nor, on the other hand, should they be so low as to seriously impair the revenues, nor to subject the home manufacturers, burdened with heavy internal taxes, to a competition with cheaper labor and larger capital which they may be unable to sustain.

Third. That the raw materials used in building and manufacturing, and which are to be largely enhanced in value by the labor which is to be expended upon them, should be exempted from taxation, or that the taxes upon them should be low in comparison with the taxes upon other articles. This is the policy of other enlightened nations, and it is believed that the diminution of direct revenue which it would involve, if adopted by the United States, would be more than made up by the augmented value which it would give to labor and by the increase of productions and exports which would be sure to result from it. It should be constantly borne in mind that taxes upon raw materials directly increase the cost of production, and thus tend either to reduce the product of labor or to prevent exportations to foreign markets.

Fourth. That the burdens of taxes should fall chiefly upon those whose interests are protected by taxation and upon those to whom the public debt is a source of wealth and profit, and lightly upon the laboring classes, to whom taxation and the debt are without so many compensatory advantages.

And in his finance report for 1867, said:

Inasmuch as large and permanent revenues can not be realized unless laws are so framed as not to bear heavily upon the industrial pursuits, a tariff which, harmonizing with internal taxes, should year by year yield the largest revenues, would undoubtedly prove to be the least prejudicial to national growth and prosperity.

And in his finance report for 1868, when it was uncertain whether too large a reduction of the internal-revenue taxes might have been made, said:

The Secretary does not doubt, however, that the best interests of the country will be subserved by a reduction of the tariff and an increase of excise duties.

Hon. George S. Boutwell, a distinguished Republican from Massachusetts, was Secretary of the Treasury from March 11, 1869, to March 16, 1873, and in his finance report for 1869, in discussing the revenue question and speaking of its unexpected success, said:

We shall then be in a condition to enter upon the work of reducing taxation at the commencement of the next session of Congress.

And in his finance report for 1870 said:

The financial prospect, although highly favorable, is not such as to warrant important changes in the revenue system at the present session of Congress; but should the result during the coming year meet my expectations, it will be possible at the December session of the Forty-second Congress to make a very material reduction in the revenues without impairing the ability of the Government to make satisfactory payments of the public debt.

And in his finance report for 1871 said:

It is practicable to dispense with all revenue from internal sources except that derived from stamps, spirits, tobacco, and malt liquors.

And in speaking of reduction of the customs duties, said:

In this view, I respectfully recommend to the consideration of Congress the reduction of the duties on salt to the extent of 50 per cent.; the duty on bituminous coal to 50 cents per ton; the reduction of the duty on raw hides and skins; and the removal of all duties from a large class of articles produced in other countries, which enter into the arts and manufactures of this country, and which are not produced in the United States, and the revenue from which is inconsiderable. Such a list, with the revenue derived from each article, is in course of preparation, and will be submitted to Congress. * * * While nothing, as the consequence of legislation, could be more disastrous to the public prosperity than a policy which should destroy or seriously disturb the manufacturing interest of the country, it is still possible, by wise and moderate changes adapted to the condition of business and labor, to reduce the rates of duties with benefit to every class of people.

And in his finance report for 1872, said:

Anticipating a condition of peace, we may also anticipate a general reduction in the percentage of customs duties. This reduction, however, should not be measured solely by the wants of the Treasury; but regard should be had also to the condition of the various branches of industry in which the people are engaged. In presence of the fact that the leading pursuits of the country are stronger than ever before in the possession of adequate capital and a supply of intelligent laborers, there may be a moderate reduction from time to time in the rate of duties, as the diminishing expenses of the Government shall permit, without either alarming capital or injuring labor.

Hon. JOHN SHERMAN, the most distinguished financier in the Republican party and the ablest, and a statesman of unquestioned ability, varied attainments, and long experience, was Secretary of the Treasury from March 9, 1877, to March 4, 1881, and in his finance report for 1878, said:

The needs of the public service require that no reduction of internal-revenue taxes be made. The commodities from which the internal revenue is mostly collected, namely, spirits, tobacco, fermented liquors, and stamps, are those which properly bear the burden of the tax, and the present rates are, in the main, equitable and satisfactory; and to them the trade in those commodities has become adjusted. Any change in these rates, or agitation of change, disturbs the course of business, and is prejudicial both to dealers and the revenue. Stability in the rates of taxation is, in view of the present condition of the country, especially desirable.

And in his finance report for 1879, in discussing the internal-revenue taxes, said:

The very large proportion of the revenue derived from those sources is of itself an argument for the stability of the rates of taxation upon them. If the proportion were small, fluctuation in the rates of taxation would be of less consequence. * * * The demand for change of rates does not originate with the consumers, who pay the greater part of the tax, but chiefly with those who seek an enhancement of profit on the capital invested in the manufacture.

And in his finance report for 1880, said:

If it should be determined by Congress to reduce taxes, it is respectfully recommended that all the taxes imposed by the internal-revenue law, other than those on bank-circulation and on spirits, tobacco, and fermented liquors, be repealed.

And further said:

The Secretary can not too strongly urge the importance of stability in the rates imposed on spirits, tobacco, and fermented liquors. These articles are regarded by all governments as proper objects of taxation. Any reduction in the rates imposes a heavy loss to the owner of the stock on hand, while an increase operates as a bounty to such owner. When the rate is fixed the trade adapts itself to it. A change disturbs the collection of the tax and the manufacture of the article. As already suggested, the time is opportune for reducing the subjects of internal taxation to the articles named and the taxes on circulating notes of banks.

Hon. Charles J. Folger, a distinguished Republican statesman and jurist from New York, was Secretary of the Treasury from November 14, 1881, to his death, on September 4, 1884; and in his finance report for 1881 said:

Meanwhile the daily receipts from the community by the Treasury continue, the surplus over its needs increases, and money lies idle. It seems that the plan most just for giving relief is to reduce taxation, and thereby diminish receipts and surplus.

* * * And is it a beneficial exercise of governmental power to raise money by taxation in greater sums than the lawful demands upon the Government require, when those demands are of themselves a heavy burden upon the industry and business of the country?

And in speaking of the amount of taxes derived from spirits, tobacco, and fermented liquors, said:

The tax on these articles is a tax on appetite or indulgences, legitimate subjects of taxation when taxation is needful. A reduction of that tax is not recommended.

And in his finance report for 1882, said:

I respectfully refer to my last report for my views upon this subject. They have not materially changed. Now, as then, it is recommended to retain a tax on spirits, tobacco, and fermented liquors, as legitimate subjects of needful taxation. They are, in the main, the means of indulgence, and should come before necessaries as subjects of taxation. * * * Propositions have recently been made to abolish the whole sytem of internal revenue, but neither public sentiment nor political action indicates a desire on the part of the tax-paying citizens to strike out this class of taxes.

To complete an effectual reduction of taxation it must be made on some principal source of revenue, and such an one is the duties on imports collected under the tariff laws, and an additional obvious method of avoiding a surplus in the Treasury is a reduction of the revenues from those.

He further said:

In reading the testimony before the Tariff Commission it is to be observed that with scarcely an exception the representative of every industry, while conceding that a general reduction of the tariff is proper and necessary, has claimed that its peculiar product can submit to no reduction of the protection now afforded.

He further said:

* * * The classes of merchandise paying the largest amount of duties from customs are the following, in the order named: Sugar and molasses, wool and manufactures from it, iron and steel and the manufactures from them, manufactures of silk, manufactures of cotton, amounting to about one hundred and thirty-seven and a half millions. A substantial reduction upon each of the classes of articles named is recommended. And it is believed that the time has arrived when a reduction of duties on nearly all the articles in our tariff is demanded and is feasible.

And in his finance report for 1883, made after the passage of the present tariff law, he said:

That there is likely to be a continuing surplus in the Treasury over the ordinary expenses of the Government, so long as the present revenue laws remain, is seen by those attentive to fiscal affairs.

He further said:

In the recommendations of the President and those of this Department, and the action of Congress, and in the expression of public opinion, there has been substantial concord as to how the needed reduction of the revenue should be brought about. It has been generally conceded that the internal-revenue taxes, except those upon spirits, fermented liquors, and upon the circulation of banks, might well be abolished.

There has been difference whether the tax upon tobacco should be abolished or modified. There were but few advocates of the immediate total abolition of taxes upon spirits or fermented liquors. My last report said that taxes upon spirits and tobacco, being upon things not needful, should be retained rather than those upon the common necessaries of life; which as a proposition is not to be controverted.

But it was conceded by all that a substantial reduction should be made upon nearly all imported articles subject to duties.

To make a start in the proposed reduction of revenue from imports, the Tariff Commission had been created. In good faith it undertook the work. * * *

He further said:

* * * On the whole, then, this Department does not recommend an immediate revision of the tariff act. It adheres, however, to its conviction, that ultimately the just and expedient method of relief from taxation and of limiting the revenues to the needs of an economical government must be found in a reduction of the duties on imports.

He further said:

Propositions are made to repeal the whole system of internal revenue. As to this, I repeat my remark of last year: I see no public sentiment or political action, indicating a desire on the part of tax-paying citizens to strike out this class of taxes.

Hon. Hugh McCulloch was again Secretary of the Treasury from the 28th day of October, 1884, to the incoming of the present Democratic Executive, and in his finance report for 1884, touching the necessity for a reduction of import duties, says:

First. That the existing duties upon raw materials which are to be used in manufacture should be removed. This can be done in the interest of our foreign trade.

Second. That the duties upon articles used or consumed by those who are the least able to bear the burden of taxation should be reduced. This also can be effected without prejudice to export trade.

The tax upon whisky could not be repealed without a disregard of public sentiment nor without creating a necessity for higher duties upon imported goods; but while this is true the tax upon the alcohol used in manufacturing might be removed with decided benefit to home industry and foreign trade.

Now consider the official records of the Republican Presidents in their messages to Congress. President Grant in his first annual message of December 6, 1869, said:

The subject of tariff and internal taxation will necessarily receive your attention. The revenues of the country are greater than the requirements and may with safety be reduced. But as the funding of the debt in a 4 or 4½ per cent. loan would reduce annual current expenses largely, thus, after funding, justifying a greater reduction of taxation than would now be expedient, I suggest postponement of this question until the next meeting of Congress.

In his second annual message, December 5, 1870, he said:

With the revenue stamp dispensed by postmasters in every community, a tax upon liquors of all sorts and tobacco in all forms, and by a wise adjustment of the tariff which will put a duty only upon those articles which we could dispense with, known as luxuries, and on those which we use more of than we produce, revenue enough may be raised, after a few years of peace and consequent reduction of indebtedness, to fulfill all our obligations. * * * The necessities of the country compel us to collect revenue from our imports. An army of assessors and collectors is not a pleasant sight to the citizen, but that or a tariff for revenue is necessary.

In his third annual message, December 4, 1871, he said:

I therefore recommend a modification of both the tariff and internal-tax laws. I recommend that all taxes from internal sources be abolished, except those collected from spirituous, vinous, and malt liquors, tobacco in its various forms, and from stamps.

In readjusting the tariff I suggest that a careful estimate be made of the amount of surplus revenue collected under the present laws, after providing for the current expenses, etc., * * * and that this surplus be reduced in such a manner as to afford the greatest relief to the greatest number. There are many articles not produced at home, but which enter largely into general consumption, through articles which are manufactured at home, such as medicines compounded, etc., from which very little revenue is derived but which enter into general use. All such articles I recommend to be placed on the free-list.

And in his annual message of December 7, 1874, said:

I would suggest to Congress the propriety of readjusting the tariff so as to increase the revenue and at the same time decrease the number of articles upon which the duties are levied. Those articles which enter into our manufactures, and are not produced at home, it seems to me, should be entered free. Those articles of manufacture which we produce a constituent part of, but do not produce the whole, that part which we do not produce should be entered free also.

I will instance fine wools, dyes, etc. These articles must be imported to form a part of the manufacture of the highest grades of woolen goods.

Chemicals used as dyes, compounded in medicines, and used in various ways in manufactures come under this class. The introduction, free of duty, of such wools as we do not produce would stimulate the manufacture of goods requiring the use of those we do not produce, and therefore would be a benefit to home production. There are many articles entering into "home manufactures" which we do not produce ourselves the tariff upon which increases the cost of producing the manufactured article. All the corrections in this regard are in the direction of bringing labor and capital in harmony with each other, and of supplying one of the elements of prosperity so much needed.

In his annual message in December, 1875, in speaking of the articles which should be entered free, he said:

I would mention those articles which enter into manufactures of all sorts. All duty paid upon such articles goes directly to the cost of the article when manufactured here, and must be paid for by the consumer. These duties not only come from the consumers at home, but act as a protection to foreign manufacturers in our own and distant markets.

President Arthur, in his first annual message of December 6, 1881, said:

In view of the heavy load of taxation which our people have already borne, we may well consider whether it is not the part of wisdom to reduce the revenues, even if we delay a little the payment of the debt. It seems to me that the time has arrived when the people may justly demand some relief from their present onerous burden, and that by due economy in the various branches of the public service this may readily be afforded. I therefore concur with the Secretary in recommending the abolition of all internal-revenue taxes except those upon tobacco in its various forms and upon distilled spirits and fermented liquors, and except also the special tax upon manufacturers of and dealers in such articles. * * *

If a careful revision can not be made at this session, a commission such as was lately approved by the Senate, and is now recommended by the Secretary of the Treasury, would doubtless lighten the labors of Congress whenever this subject shall be brought to its consideration.

In his second annual message of December 4, 1882, he said:

It will be remembered that I urged upon Congress at its last session the importance of relieving the industry and enterprise of the country from the pressure of unnecessary taxation. It is one of the tritest maxims of political economy that all taxes are burdensome, however wisely and prudently imposed.

And though there have always been among our people wide differences of sentiment as to the best methods of raising national revenues, and indeed as to the principles upon which taxation should be based, there has been substantial accord in the doctrine that only such taxes ought to be levied as are necessary for a wise and economical administration of the Government. * * *

Either the surplus must lie idle in the Treasury or the Government will be forced to buy at market rates its bonds not then redeemable, which under such circumstances can not fail to command an enormous premium, or the swollen revenues will be devoted to extravagant expenditures, which, as experience has taught, is ever the bane of an overflowing Treasury. It was made apparent in the course of the animated discussions which this question aroused at the last session of Congress, that the policy of diminishing the revenue by reducing taxation commanded the general approval of the members of both Houses. * * *

The present tariff system is in many respects unjust. It makes unequal distributions both of its burdens and its benefits. This fact was practically recognized by a majority of each House of Congress in the passage of the act creating the Tariff Commission. * * * If the tax on domestic spirits is to be retained it is plain, therefore, that large reductions from the customs revenues are entirely feasible.

It must be remembered that these recommendations of President Arthur were made to the Forty-seventh Congress, Republican in both Senate and House. The Tariff Commission, created by the act of May 15, 1882, and composed largely of Republicans, made its report to the House on December 4, 1882, and the so-called tariff act of March 3, 1883, entitled "An act to reduce internal-revenue taxation, and for other purposes," was passed by that Republican Congress.

President Arthur, in his first message thereafter, on December 4, 1883, said:

Hitherto the surplus as rapidly as it has accumulated has been devoted to the reduction of the national debt.

As a result, the only bonds now outstanding which are redeemable at the pleasure of the Government are the 3 percents, amounting to about $305,000,000. The 4½ percents, amounting to $250,000,000, and the $737,000,000 4 percents are not payable until 1891 and 1907, respectively. * * * There are cogent reasons, however, why the national indebtedness should not be thus rapidly extinguished. Chief among them is the fact that only by excessive taxation is such rapidity attainable.

In his last message, on December 1, 1884, he said:

Our system of tax and tariff legislation is yielding a revenue which is in excess of the present needs of the Government. These are the elements from which it is sought to devise a scheme by which, without unfavorably changing the condition of the workingman, our merchant marine shall be raised from its enfeebled condition, and new markets provided for the sale beyond our borders of the manifold fruits of our industrial enterprises. The problem is complex and can be solved by no single measure of innovation or reform.

The countries of the American continent and the adjacent islands are, for the United States, the natural marts of supply and demand. * * * It is by no means desirable, however, that the policy under consideration should be applied to these countries alone. The healthful enlargement of our trade with Europe, Asia, and Africa should be sought by reducing tariff burdens on such of their wares as neither we nor the other American states are fitted to produce, and thus enabling ourselves to obtain in return a better market for our supplies of food, of raw materials, and of the manufactures in which we excel.

It seems to me that many of the embarrassing elements in the great national conflict between protection and free trade may thus be turned to good account; that the revenue may be reduced so as no longer to overtax the people; that protective duties may be retained without becoming burdensome; that our shipping may be judiciously encouraged; the currency fixed on firm basis; and, above all, such a unity of interests established among the states of the American system as will be of great and ever-increasing advantage to them all.

Now examine the policies as declared in the national Republican platforms.

The national Republican convention at Chicago, in May, 1868, which nominated General Grant, declared in its fourth plank:

Fourth. It is due to the labor of the nation that taxation should be equalized and reduced as rapidly as the national faith will permit.

The convention in 1872, which renominated General Grant, in the seventh plank declared:

Seventh. The annual revenue after paying current expenditures, pensions, and the interest on the public debt, should furnish a moderate balance for the reduction of the principal; and that revenue, except so much as may be derived from a tax upon tobacco and liquors, should be raised by duties upon importations, the details of which should be so adjusted as to aid in securing remunerative wages to labor and promote the industries, prosperity, and growth of the whole country.

The convention which nominated Mr. Hayes in 1876 in eighth plank declared:

Eighth. The revenue necessary for current expenditures and the obligations of the public debt must be largely derived from duties upon importations which, so far as possible, should be adjusted to promote the interests of American labor and advance the prosperity of the whole country.

The convention which nominated General Garfield in 1880, in Chicago, in fifth plank declared:

Fifth. We affirm the belief avowed in 1876, that the duties levied for the purpose of revenue should so discriminate as to favor American labor.

The convention which in 1884 nominated Mr. Blaine declared in fourth, fifth, and sixth planks:

Fourth. * * * We therefore demand that the imposition of duties on foreign imports shall be made not for revenue only, but that in raising the requisite revenues for the Government, such duty shall be so levied as to afford security to our diversified industries and protection to the rights and wages of the laborer, to the end that active and intelligent labor as well as capital may have its just reward, and the laboring man his full share in the national prosperity.

Fifth. Against the so-called economic system of the Democratic party, which would degrade our labor to the foreign standard, we enter our most earnest protest. The Democratic party has failed completely to relieve the people of the burden of unnecessary taxation by a wise reduction of the surplus.

Sixth. The Republican party pledges itself to correct the irregularities of the tariff and to reduce the surplus, not by the vicious and indiscriminating process of horizontal reduction, but by such methods as will relieve the tax-payer without injuring the laborer or the great protective industries of the country.

In order to make no mistake as to the declared policy of the Republican party, examine the declarations of some of the leading Republican States in their State platforms, and some other States.

The Republican party of Illinois in State convention, September 20, 1871, declared in third and fourth planks:

Third. That as it will be necessary and desirable to obtain from duties on imports a large portion of the revenue needed to defray the expenses of the Government, to pay the interest on the national debt, and the principal as it matures, such duties should be so adjusted as not to prejudice, but promote the interests of every section and branch of industry as far as may be possible.

Fourth. That the large surplus remaining in the national Treasury after the payment of all the expenses of the Government, including the interest on its public debt, calls for a still further reduction of the public burdens, and that in effecting that reduction regard should be had to relief from that species of taxation which, while it adds but slightly to the revenue of the country, taxes heavily its labor and productive interests; and we heartily approve the bills repealing the duty on coal and salt which have already passed the House of Representatives.

The Republicans of Illinois, in State convention, May 22, 1872, in seventh and eighth planks, declared:

Seventh. That the necessities of the Government require so large a tariff upon importation that the question of free trade is not one now before the American people. The only question left is how to so adjust the tariff that it will most promote the labor industry and general welfare of the country without being oppressive to any interests of society, and we know of no better way to dispose of this subject than that adopted by the Republican party in Congress—to learn wisdom by experience, reduce taxation as fast as possible, and remove unnecessary burdens upon the necessities of life.

Eighth. That in adjusting the details of a system for raising a revenue to cover the necessary requirements of the Government, and meet its liabilities, care should be taken to so regulate the imports that they will press least upon the growing industries of the country, cheapen the necessaries of life, and afford to labor the fairest promise of permanent reward.

Illinois Republicans, in their State platform, on June 28, 1882, declared:

Fifth. That the Republican party now, as in the past, is in favor of such just laws as shall protect the agriculturist, the manufacturer, and the workingman from the oppression of monopolists.

Republicans of Indiana, February 22, 1870, in fifth plank, declared:

Fifth. That a reduction of taxation is demanded both of tariff and internal taxes, until it reaches the lowest amount consistent with the credit and necessities of the Government; and that we are in favor of a tariff for revenue, believing that a proper adjustment of duties must necessarily afford all the incidental protection to which any interest is entitled.

And in their State convention of February 22, 1876, further declared:

Eleventh. Taxes should give the greatest possible exemption to necessities, and be placed more heavily upon the luxuries and wealth of the country.

The Republicans of Ohio, in their State convention of June 2, 1875, declared:

Third. We are in favor of a tariff for revenue with incidental protection to American industry.

And in their State convention of March, 1876, in their sixth plank, again declared:

Sixth. We are in favor of a tariff for revenue with incidental protection to American industry.

And in their State convention of June 12, 1878, declared:

A tariff for revenue should be maintained and so adjusted as to secure incidental protection to home industry.

The Republicans of Iowa, in State convention, August 17, 1871, declared in third plank:

Third. That a tariff for revenue is indispensable and should be so adjusted as not to become prejudicial to the industrial interests of any class or section of the country, while securing to our home producers fair competition with foreign capital and labor.

And in their State convention of June 19, 1878, declared:

Tenth. A tariff wisely adjusted for revenue.

The Republicans of Wisconsin, in State convention, on August 31, 1871, declared in fifth plank:

Fifth. That in our judgment the most efficient and satisfactory means of raising the larger portion of revenue to meet the obligations of the Government is from duties on imports; that such duties should be so laid as, first, to make sure of the amount required; second, to fairly distribute the burdens of the nation upon all sections of the country, all classes of people; and third, so as never to burden one interest that another may thrive.

The Republicans of Connecticut, in State convention, on January 24, 1872, declared in fifth plank:

Fifth. In national affairs we urge, first, a large reduction of taxation; * * * third, retaining a tariff sufficient to raise the needed revenue, we would have it carefully adjusted to favor American industry, working rather to interests widely extended than to merely local and limited pursuits. * * *

The Republicans of New York, in State convention, September 28, 1871, declared in third plank:

Third. That we call upon Congress, as far as may be compatible with the national credit, to continue to reduce taxation, and as rapidly as possible remove the burdens from the national industry; that while our interest accounts, our pension-rolls, and other obligations entailed by the rebellion shall remain, we are in favor of such a tariff as will yield the needed revenue with the least injury to the people, at the same time affording protection to our own rather than to foreign manufactures.

And in their State convention of May 15, 1872, declared:

Sixth. That there should be a tariff for revenue so adjusted as to bear as equally as possible upon every kind of labor, property, and industry.

In order to determine more definitely still the declared policy of the Republican party heretofore, consider the report of the Tariff Commission of 1882.

The Republican Congress, the House and Senate both being Republican, enacted the law of May 15, 1882, creating the "Tariff Commission," to be composed of nine members to be appointed by a Republican President. Section 3 of this law is as follows:

SEC. 3. That it shall be the duty of said commission to take into consideration and to thoroughly investigate all the various questions relating to the agricultural, commercial, mercantile, manufacturing, mining, and industrial interests of the United States, so far as the same may be necessary to the establishment of a judicious tariff or a revision of the existing tariff, upon a scale of justice to all interests; and for the purpose of fully examining the matters which may come before it, said commission, in the prosecution of its inquiries, is empowered to visit such different portions and sections of the country as it may deem advisable.

Said commission made its investigation—took 2625 pages of printed testimony, not, however, verified by the affidavits or oaths of the witnesses—and submitted its report to a Republican Congress December 4, 1882, saying:

Early in its deliberations the commission became convinced that a substantial reduction of tariff duties is demanded, not by a mere indiscriminate popular clamor, but by the best conservative opinion of the country, including that which has in former times been most strenuous for the preservation of our national industrial defenses. Such a reduction of the existing tariff the commission regards not only as a due recognition of public sentiment and a measure of justice to consumers, but one conducive to the general industrial prosperity, and which, though it may be temporarily inconvenient, will be ultimately beneficial to the special interests affected by such reduction.

No rates of defensive duties, except for the establishment of new industries which more than equalize the conditions of labor and capital with those of foreign competitors, can be justified. Excessive duties, or those above such standard of equalization, are positively injurious to the interests which they are supposed to benefit. They encourage the investment of capital in manufacturing enterprise by rash and unskilled speculators, to be followed by disaster to the adventurers and their employés, and a plethora of commodities which deranges the operations of skilled and prudent enterprise. Numerous examples of such disaster and derangements occurred during and shortly after excessively protective periods of the late war, when tariff duties were enhanced by the rates of foreign exchange and premiums upon gold. Excessive duties, generally, or exceptionally high duties in particular cases, discredit our whole national economic system, and furnish plausible arguments for its complete subversion.

They serve to increase uncertainty on the part of industrial enterprise, whether it shall enlarge or contract its operations and take from commerce as well as production the sense of stability required for extended undertakings. It would seem that the rates of duties under the existing tariff—fixed for the most part during the war, under the evident necessity at that time of stimulating to its utmost extent all domestic production—might be adapted through reduction to the present condition of peace, requiring no such extraordinary stimulus.

* * * * * * *

Entertaining these views, the commission has sought to present a scheme of tariff duties in which substantial reduction should be the distinguishing feature. The average reduction in rates, including that from the enlargement of the free-list and the abolition of duties on charges and commissions, at which the commission has aimed, is not less on the average than 20 per cent., and it is the opinion of the commission that the reduction will reach 25 per cent. The reduction—slight in some cases, in others not attempted—is in many cases from 40 to 50 per cent. The actual amount of the total reduction can not be stated with precision, partly from want of time to make the calculations required for such details in the brief period intervening between the final determination in particular cases and the preparation of this report, and there is no exact standard by which to estimate the amount of reduction in revenue on account of the varying character, amount, and price of commodities in the importations of different years.

These numerous quotations from official Republican authorities show conclusively that the policy of that party touching the surplus and the remedies therefor, as declared prior to 1888 to the voters to secure their votes and retain power, has been to retain the internal-revenue taxes on spirits, beer, and tobacco, and remove the others, and to reduce the rates of tariff duties on imported articles and add dutiable articles to the free-list, and thus remove the onerous burdens of unnecessary taxation and reduce the surplus accumulating in the Treasury to the wants of the Government economically administered.

Is this the policy of the national Republican party in this contest of 1888? How can their present policy be ascertained? The Chicago national Republican convention, composed of delegates from every Congressional district, State, and Territory, alone had the right and authority to declare the policy of the party in this contest, and did so declare it, which I now quote:

We are uncompromisingly in favor of the American system of protection; we protest against its destruction, as proposed by the President and his party. They serve the interests of Europe; we will support the interests of America. We accept the issue, and confidently appeal to the people for their judgment. The protective system must be maintained. Its abandonment has always been followed by general disaster to all interests, except those of the usurer and the sheriff. We denounce the Mills bill as destructive to the general business, the labor and farming interests of the country, and we heartily indorse the consistent and patriotic action of the Republican representatives in Congress in opposing its passage.

We condemn the proposition of the Democratic party to place wool on the free-list, and we insist that the duties thereon shall be adjusted and maintained so as to furnish full and adequate protection to that industry.

The Republican party would effect all needed reduction of the national revenue by repealing the taxes upon tobacco, which are an annoyance and burden to agriculture, and the tax upon spirits used in the arts and for mechanical purposes, and by such revision of the tariff laws as will tend to check imports of such articles as are produced by our people, the production of which gives employment to our labor, and release from import duties those articles of foreign production (except luxuries) the like of which can not be produced at home. If there shall still remain a larger revenue than is requisite for the wants of the Government, we favor the entire repeal of internal taxes rather than the surrender of any part of our protective system, at the joint behest of the whisky ring and the agents of foreign manufacturers.

They now declare "the protective system must be maintained" and "the needed reduction" of revenues effected—

By repealing the taxes upon tobacco, and the tax upon spirits used in arts and manufactures, and by such revisions of the tariff laws as will tend to check imports of such articles as are produced by our people, and release from import duties those articles of foreign production except luxuries not produced at home, and if there still remain a surplus revenue then by the entire repeal of internal taxes rather than the surrender of any part of our protective system.

By this platform the Republican convention has issued the command to all the former adherents of its party "to right about march," and to abandon all the lines of policy heretofore declared for party guidance.

It now reverses and denounces all the declared policies and recommendations of Secretaries McCulloch, Boutwell, Sherman, and Folger, and of Presidents, Grant and Arthur, and the national Republican platforms of 1868, 1872, 1876, 1880, and 1884, and the Republican State platforms of Illinois, Indiana, Ohio, Iowa, Wisconsin, Connecticut, and New York, and the findings and recommendations of the Republican tariff commission of 1882.

It is a radical departure from all past policies in this country, and practically a bold declaration for a paternal Government, supported by exorbitant, unnecessary taxes imposed for the enrichment of millionaires and the impoverishment and degradation of the laboring masses.

No such declaration of policies and principles has ever before been adopted in this country by any political organization or party claiming the confidence and suffrages of the voters.

I appeal to the record for the truth of this statement.

The Whig platform at Baltimore, May 1, 1844, adopted by the convention which nominated Henry Clay for President and Theodore Frelinghuysen for Vice-President, declared for—

A tariff for revenue to defray the necessary expenses of the Government, and discriminating with special reference to the protection of the domestic labor of the country.

The national Whig convention at Baltimore, June 16, 1852, which nominated General Scott, declared in fifth plank:

Fifth. Governments should be conducted on the principles of the strictest economy; and revenue sufficient for the expenses thereof in time of peace ought to be derived mainly from a duty on imports, and not from direct taxes; and on laying such duties, sound policy requires a just discrimination, and, when practicable, by specific duties, whereby suitable encouragement may be afforded to American industry equally to all classes and all portions of the country.

The Labor Reform platform adopted at Columbus, Ohio, February 21, 1872, declared in the fifth plank:

Fifth. That Congress should modify the tariff so as to admit free of duty such articles of common use as we can neither produce nor grow, and lay duties for revenue mainly upon articles of luxury, and upon such articles of manufacture as will, we having the raw materials, assist in further developing the resources of the country.

The Liberty party in the Buffalo convention at Utica, N. Y., June 22, 1848, which nominated John P. Hale for President and Leicester King for Vice-President, declared:

15. *Resolved*, That the obligations of honor and patriotism require the earliest practical payment of the national debt, and we are therefore in favor of such a tariff of duties as will raise revenue adequate to defray the expenses of the Federal Government and pay annual installments of our debt and the interest thereon.

The Free-Soil party in the convention at Pittsburgh, Pa., August 11, 1852, which nominated John P. Hale for President and George W. Julian for Vice-President, declared in their thirteenth plank—

That no more revenue should be raised than is required to defray the strictly necessary expenses of the public service and to pay off the public debt.

I have already quoted the Republican national platforms of 1868 and subsequently. I will now quote from earlier platforms.

The Republican convention at Philadelphia, Pa., June 17, 1856, which nominated John C. Frémont for President and William L. Dayton for Vice-President, made no declaration as to revenue or tariff; and at Chicago May 17, 1860, having nominated Abraham Lincoln for President and Hannibal Hamlin for Vice-President, declared in the twelfth plank:

Twelfth. That, while providing revenue for the support of the General Government by duties on imports, sound policy requires such an adjustment of these imports as to encourage the development of the industrial interest of the whole country; and we commend that policy of national exchanges which secures to the workingmen liberal wages, to agriculture remunerative prices, to mechanics and manufacturers an adequate reward for their skill, labor, and enterprise, and to the nation commercial prosperity and independence.

The Republican convention of 1864 at Baltimore, June 7, which renominated President Lincoln, declared:

Resolved, That the national faith, pledged for the redemption of the public debt, must be kept inviolate, and that for this purpose we recommend economy and rigid responsibility in the public expenditures and a vigorous and just system of taxation.

The Republican party now declares for an embargo tariff, a prohibition of imports of such articles as are produced in this country, a Chinese wall around our borders on sea and land, and, rather than surrender any part of their protective system, for free whisky; for if you remove the internal-revenue tax from whisky it will be beyond dispute free. Unless all the States and Territories could agree upon a uniform tax, the manufacture of whisky would be practically free. If any one State should levy a tax on whisky higher than in any other, the production of whisky in such State would be driven out and the manufacture confined to such State or States as imposed no tax or the lowest tax.

But whisky is an article "produced by our people the production of which gives employment to our labor," and in various forms is imported into this country and pays a high tariff tax, and is a "part of the protective system" which this platform says must be maintained and not surrendered. Therefore the Republican party declares for the repeal of all internal taxes upon distilled spirits and for the maintenance of the protective system thereon—that is, the tariff taxes upon all imports of distilled spirits, which is greater than the internal taxes. Who will be benefited, who will be enriched by this policy? Certainly not the consumers of such spirits, but most unquestionably the manufacturers and distillers of such spirits—the whisky ring. For with the repeal of all internal taxes and the retention of all tariff taxes upon imports you protect the home manufacturers and distillers to the amount of the internal taxes so repealed and enable them to sell their home-distilled spirits at the same prices they do now with the internal taxes added. These internal taxes on spirits distilled from materials other than apples, peaches, or grapes, excluding all special taxes, licenses, etc., were in 1884 over seventy millions, in 1885 over sixty millions, in 1886 over sixty-two millions, and in 1887 over fifty-nine millions, and in 1888 about the same. The Republican party thus proposes to protect and enrich the whisky ring annually to the amount of $60,000,000 rather than surrender any part of the protective system.

This policy is in direct antagonism with the declared policies of Alexander Hamilton, the progenitor of the Republican party, Henry Clay, the father of the so-called but misnamed "American system," and James G. Blaine, the bold, impetuous, and reckless leader of the Republican forces in this campaign, as I will now show by quotations from each of them.

Alexander Hamilton, the first Secretary of the Treasury under President Washington, in his first finance report, in speaking of the necessity for an increase of the revenue to the amount of $600,000, recommended that the increase—

Be made on wines, spirits (including those distilled within the United States), teas, and coffee. * * *

And said—

They are all of them in reality luxuries, the greatest part of them foreign lux-

uries; some of them, in the excess in which they are used, pernicious luxuries; and there is perhaps none of them which is not consumed in so great abundance as may justly denominate it a source of national extravagance and impoverishment. The consumption of ardent spirits particularly, no doubt very much on account of their cheapness, is carried to an extreme which is truly to be regretted, as well in regard to the health and the morals as to the economy of the community.

Henry Clay, on the 26th day of April, 1820, in speaking of the probable necessity of increase of revenue, says:

And I am for one ready to exclude foreign spirits altogether, and substitute for the revenue levied on them a tax upon the spirits made within the country. No other nation lets in so much of foreign spirits as we do. By the encouragement of home industry you will lay a basis of internal taxation, when it gets strong, that will be steady and uniform, yielding alike in peace and war.

Clay proposed to exclude importations of foreign spirits and impose an internal tax upon the home product—just the reverse of the proposed Republican policy of to-day.

Hon. James G. Blaine in his Paris pronunciamento in December last, when asked if he would advise the repeal of the whisky tax, replied:

No, I would not. Other considerations than those of financial administration are to be taken into account with regard to whisky. There is a moral side to it. To cheapen the price of whisky is to increase the consumption enormously. There would be no sense in urging the reform wrought by high license in many States if the National Government neutralizes the good effect by making whisky within reach of every one at 20 cents a gallon. Whisky would be everywhere distilled if the surveillance of the Government were withdrawn by the remission of the tax, and illicit sales could not then be prevented even by a policy as rigorous and searching as that with which Russia pursues the Nihilists. It would destroy high license at once in all the States. Whisky has done a vast deal of harm in the United States. I would try to make it do some good.

He further said:

So long as there is whisky to tax I would tax it, and when the National Government should have no use for the money I would divide the tax among the Federal Union with the specific object of lightening the tax on real estate. * * * Some honest but misguided friends of temperance have urged that the Government should not use the money derived from the tax on whisky. My reply is that the tax on whisky by the Federal Government, with its suppression of illicit distillation and consequent enhancement of price, has been a powerful agent in the temperance reform by putting it beyond the reach of so many. The amount of whisky consumed in the United States per capita to-day is not more than 40 per cent. of that consumed thirty years ago.

Now let us ascertain the policy and principles of the Democratic party in regard to a tariff taxation, the accumulating surplus in the Treasury, and the proper remedy for its prevention. The national Democratic party in convention, in 1840, declared in its fourth and fifth planks:

Fourth. *Resolved*, That justice and sound policy forbid the Federal Government to foster one branch of industry to the detriment of another, or to cherish the interests of one portion to the injury of another portion of our common country; that every citizen and every section of the country has a right to demand and insist upon an equality of rights and privileges, and to complete and ample protection of person and property from domestic violence or foreign aggression.

Fifth. *Resolved*, That it is the duty of every branch of the Government to enforce and practice the most rigid economy in conducting our public affairs, and that no more revenue ought to be raised than is required to defray the necessary expenses of the Government.

These resolutions were expressly reaffirmed in the platforms of the national Democratic party in the conventions of 1844, 1848, 1852, 1856, and 1860.

And in the platform of 1868 the Democratic party declared for—

A tariff for revenue upon foreign imports, and such equal taxation under the internal-revenue laws as will afford incidental protection to domestic manufactures, and as will, without impairing the revenue, impose the least burden upon and best promote and encourage the great industrial interests of the country.

And in the platform of 1876 declared—

We denounce the present tariff levied upon nearly four thousand articles as a masterpiece of injustice, inequality, and false pretense. It yields a dwindling, not a yearly rising revenue. It has impoverished many industries to subsidize a few. It prohibits imports that might purchase the products of American labor. It has degraded American commerce from the first to an inferior rank on the high seas. It has cut down the sales of American manufactures at home and abroad, and depleted the returns of American agriculture, an industry followed by half our people. It costs the people five times more than it produces to the Treasury, obstructs the process of production, and wastes the fruits of labor. It promotes fraud, fosters smuggling, enriches dishonest officials, and bankrupts honest merchants. We demand that all custom-house taxation shall be only for revenue.

The national Democratic party in convention in 1880 pledged itself—

Anew to the constitutional doctrines and traditions of the Democratic party, as illustrated by the teachings and examples of a long line of Democratic statesmen and patriots and embodied in the platform of the last national convention of the party.

And declared for—

A tariff for revenue only. * * * Public money and public credit for public purposes solely, and public land for actual settlers.

And—

The Democratic party is the friend of labor and the laboring man, and pledges itself to protect him alike against the cormorants and the commune.

And in 1884 declared—

From the foundation of this Government taxes collected at the custom-house have been the chief source of Federal revenue. Such they must continue to be. Moreover, many industries have come to rely upon legislation for successful continuance, so that any change of law must be at every step regardful of the labor and capital thus involved. The process of the reform must be subject in the execution of this plain dictate of justice—all taxation shall be limited to the requirements of economical government. The necessary reduction in taxation can and must be effected without depriving American labor of the ability to compete successfully with foreign labor, and without imposing lower rates of duty than will be ample to cover any increased cost of production which may exist in consequence of the higher rate of wages prevailing in this country. Sufficient revenue to pay all the expenses of the Federal Government economically administered, including pensions, interest, and principal of the public debt, can be got under our present system of taxation from custom-house taxes on fewer imported articles, being heaviest on articles of luxury and bearing lightest on articles of necessity. We therefore denounce the abuses of the existing tariff; and subject to the preceding limitations, we demand that Federal taxation shall be exclusively for public purposes, and shall not exceed the needs of the Government economically administered.

The national Democratic convention of 1888 declared—

The Democratic party of the United States, in national convention assembled, renews the pledge of its fidelity to Democratic faith, and reaffirms the platform adopted by its representatives in the convention of 1884, and indorses the views expressed by President Cleveland in his last earnest message to Congress as the correct interpretation of that platform upon the question of tariff reduction; and also indorses the efforts of our Democratic Representatives in Congress to secure a reduction of excessive taxation.

All unnecessary taxation is unjust taxation. It is repugnant to the creed of Democracy that by such taxation the cost of the necessaries of life should be unjustifiably increased to all our people. Judged by Democratic principles, the interests of the people are betrayed when by unnecessary taxation trusts and combinations are permitted to exist, which, while unduly enriching the few that combine, rob the body of our citizens by depriving them of the benefits of natural competition. Every Democratic rule of governmental action is violated when, through unnecessary taxation, a vast sum of money, far beyond the needs of an economical administration, is drawn from the people and the channels of trade and accumulated as a demoralizing surplus in the national Treasury.

The Democratic policy is to enforce frugality in public expense and to abolish unnecessary taxation. Our established domestic industries and enterprises should not and need not be endangered by the reduction and correction of the burdens of taxation; on the contrary, a fair and careful revision of our tax laws, with due allowance for the difference between the wages of American and foreign labor, must promote and encourage every branch of such industries and enterprises by giving them assurance of an extended market and steady and continuous operations. In the interests of American labor, which should in no event be neglected, the revision of our tax laws contemplated by the Democratic party should promote the advantage of such labor by cheapening the cost of necessaries of life in the home of every workingman and at the same time securing to him steady and remunerative employment.

President Cleveland, in his first annual message, of December 8, 1885, after pointing out the excess of revenues, said:

The proposition with which we have to deal is the reduction of the revenue received by the Government and indirectly paid by the people from customs duties. The question of free trade is not involved, nor is there now any occasion for the general discussion of the wisdom or expediency of a protective system.

Justice and fairness dictate that in any modification of our present laws relating to revenue, the industries and interests which have been encouraged by such laws, and in which our citizens have large investments, should not be ruthlessly injured or destroyed.

In his second annual message, of December 6, 1886, he again called attention to the continuing excess of revenues, which would soon pay off all that part of our public debt which could be paid at our option, and said:

When more of the people's substance is exacted through the form of taxation than is necessary to meet the just obligations of the Government and the expense of its economical administration, such exaction becomes ruthless extortion and a violation of the fundamental principles of a free Government. * * * It has been the policy of the Government to collect the principal part of its revenues by a tax upon imports, and no change in this policy is desirable. But the present condition of affairs constrains our people to demand that by a revision of our revenue laws the receipts of the Government shall be reduced to the necessary expense of its economical administration; and this demand should be recognized and obeyed by the people's representatives in the legislative branch of the Government. In readjusting the burdens of Federal taxation a sound policy requires that such of our citizens as have built up large and important industries under present conditions should not be suddenly and to their injury deprived of advantages to which they have adapted their business, but if the public good requires it, they should be content with such consideration as shall deal fairly and cautiously with their interests, while the just demand of the people for relief from needless taxation is honestly answered. * * *

And these considerations suggest such an arrangement of Government revenues as shall reduce the expense of living, while it does not curtail the opportunity for work nor reduce the compensation of American labor and injuriously affect its condition and the dignified place it holds in the estimation of our people.

But our farmers and agriculturists, those who from the soil produce the things consumed by all, are perhaps more directly and plainly concerned than any other of our citizens in a just and careful system of Federal taxation. * * *

I recommend that, keeping in view all these considerations, the increasing and unnecessary surplus of national income annually accumulating be released to the people by an amendment to our revenue laws which shall cheapen the price of the necessaries of life and give freer entrance to such imported materials as, by American labor, may be manufactured into marketable commodities.

In his message of December 6, 1887, he clearly and concisely presented the whole question of surplus, excessive taxation, its dangers, and the remedies, and showed that after paying all the public debt which we could pay at its face value, all which was payable at our option, and the purchase of over twenty-seven millions of bonds in the market at a high rate of premium, because not yet either due or payable at our option, there was still a surplus, which must continue to increase under existing laws, and said:

Our scheme of taxation, by means of which this needless surplus is taken from the people and put into the public Treasury, consists of a tariff or duty levied upon importations from abroad, and internal-revenue taxes levied upon the consumption of tobacco and spirituous and malt liquors. It must be conceded that none of the things subjected to internal-revenue taxation are, strictly speaking, necessaries; there appears to be no just complaint of this taxation by the consumers of these articles, and there seems to be nothing so well able to bear the burden without hardship to any portion of the people.

But our present tariff laws, the vicious, inequitable, and illogical source of unnecessary taxation, ought to be at once revised and amended. These laws, as their primary and plain effect, raise the price to consumers of all articles imported and subject to duty by precisely the sum paid for such duties. Thus the amount of duty measures the tax paid by those who purchase for use these imported articles. Many of these things, however, are raised or manufactured in our own country, and the duties now levied upon foreign goods and products are called protection to these home manufactures because they render it possi-

ble for those of our people who are manufacturers to make these taxed articles and sell them for a price equal to that demanded for the imported goods that have paid customs duty. So it happens that while comparatively a few use the imported articles, millions of our people, who never used and never saw any of the foreign products, purchase and use things of the same kind made in this country, and pay therefor nearly or quite the same enhanced price which the duty adds to the imported articles. Those who buy imports pay the duty charged thereon into the public Treasury, but the great majority of our citizens, who buy domestic articles of the same class, pay a sum at least approximately equal to this duty to the home manufacturer. This reference to the operation of our tariff laws is not made by way of instruction, but in order that we may be constantly reminded of the manner in which they impose a burden upon those who consume domestic products as well as those who consume imported articles, and thus create a tax upon all our people.

It is not proposed to entirely relieve the country of this taxation. It must be extensively continued as the source of the Government's income; and in a readjustment of our tariff the interests of American labor engaged in manufacture should be carefully considered, as well as the preservation of our manufacturers. It may be called protection, or by any other name, but relief from the hardships and dangers of our present tariff laws should be devised with especial precaution against imperiling the existence of our manufacturing interests. But this existence should not mean a condition which, without regard to the public welfare or a national exigency, must always insure the realization of immense profits instead of moderately profitable returns. As the volume and diversity of our national activities increase, new recruits are added to those who desire a continuation of the advantages which they conceive the present system of tariff taxation directly affords them. So stubbornly have all efforts to reform the present condition been resisted by those of our fellow-citizens thus engaged that they can hardly complain of the suspicion, entertained to a certain extent, that there exists an organized combination all along the line to maintain their advantage.

We are in the midst of centennial celebrations, and with becoming pride we rejoice in American skill and ingenuity, in American energy and enterprise, and in the wonderful natural advantages and resources developed by a century's national growth. Yet, when an attempt is made to justify a scheme which permits a tax to be laid upon every consumer in the land for the benefit of our manufacturers, quite beyond a reasonable demand for governmental regard, it suits the purposes of advocacy to call our manufactures infant industries, still needing the highest and greatest degree of favor and fostering care that can be wrung from Federal legislation. * * *

But the reduction of taxation demanded should be so measured as not to necessitate or justify either the loss of employment by the workingman nor the lessening of his wages; and the profits still remaining to the manufacturer, after a necessary readjustment, should furnish no excuse for the sacrifice of the interests of his employés either in their opportunity to work or in the diminution of their compensation.

The farmer and agriculturist, who manufacture nothing, but who pay the increased price which the tariff imposes, upon every agricultural implement, upon all he wears, and upon all he uses and owns, except the increase of his flocks and herds and such things as his husbandry produces from the soil, is invited to aid in maintaining the present situation; and he is told that a high duty on imported wool is necessary for the benefit of those who have sheep to shear, in order that the price of their wool may be increased. They, of course, are not reminded that the farmer who has no sheep is by this scheme obliged, in his purchases of clothing and woolen goods, to pay a tribute to his fellow farmer as well as to the manufacturer and merchant; nor is any mention made of the fact that the sheep-owners themselves and their households must wear clothing and use other articles manufactured from the wool they sell at tariff prices, and thus as consumers must return their share of this increased price to the tradesman. * * *

In speaking of the increased cost to the consumer of our home manufactures, resulting from a duty laid upon imported articles of the same description, the fact is not overlooked that competition among our domestic producers sometimes has the effect of keeping the price of their products below the highest limit allowed by such duty. But it is notorious that this competition is too often strangled by combinations, quite prevalent at this time and frequently called trusts, which have for their object the regulation of the supply and price of commodities made and sold by members of the combination. The people can hardly hope for any consideration in the operation of these selfish schemes.

The necessity for combination to maintain the price of any commodity to the tariff point furnishes proof that some one is willing to accept lower prices for such commodity and that such prices are remunerative; and lower prices produced by competition prove the same thing. Thus where either of these conditions exists a case would seem to be presented for an easy reduction of taxation.

The difficulty attendiug a wise and fair revision of our tariff laws is not underestimated. It will require on the part of the Congress great labor and care, and especially a broad and national contemplation of the subject, and a patriotic disregard of such local and selfish claims as are unreasonable and reckless of the welfare of the entire country. * * *

Under our present laws more than four thousand articles are subject to duty. Many of these do not in any way compete with our own manufacturers, and many are hardly worth attention as subjects of revenue. A considerable reduction can be made in the aggregate by adding them to the free-list. The taxation of luxuries presents no features of hardship; but the necessaries of life used and consumed by all the people, the duty upon which adds to the cost of living in every home, should be greatly cheapened.

The radical reduction of the duties imposed on raw material used in manufactures, or its free importation, is of course an important factor in any effort to reduce the price of these necessaries; it would not only relieve them from the increased cost caused by the tariff on such material, but the manufactured product being thus cheapened, that part of the tariff now laid upon such product, as a compensation to our manufacturers for the present price of raw material, could be accordingly modified. Such reduction, or free importation, would serve beside to largely reduce the revenue. It is not apparent how such a change can have any injurious effect upon our manufacturers. On the contrary, it would appear to give them a better chance in foreign markets with the manufacturers of other countries, who cheapen their wares by free material. Thus our people might have the opportunity of extending their sales beyond the limits of home consumption—saving them from the depression, interruption in business, and loss caused by a glutted domestic market, and affording their employés more certain and steady labor, with its resulting quiet and contentment.

Our progress toward a wise conclusion will not be improved by dwelling upon the theories of protection and free trade. This savors too much of bandying epithets. It is a condition which confronts us, not a theory. Relief from this condition may involve a slight reduction of the advantages which we award our home productions, but the entire withdrawal of such advantages should not be contemplated. The question of free trade is absolutely irrelevant; and the persistent claim made in certain quarters that all efforts to relieve the people from unjust and unnecessary taxation are schemes of so-called free-traders is mischievous and far removed from any consideration for the public good.

The simple and plain duty which we owe the people is to reduce taxation to the necessary expenses of an economical operation of the Government, and to restore to the business of the country the money which we hold in the Treasury through the perversion of governmental powers. These things can and should be done with safety to all our industries, without danger to the opportunity for remunerative labor which our workingmen need, and with benefit to them and all our people by cheapening their means of subsistence and increasing the measure of their comforts.

While the Republican party in its last platform has abandoned and renounced all its former-declared policies and remedies, the Democratic party stands undismayed, boldly and fearlessly maintaining and proclaiming its undying principles and its wise and judicious policies for the encouragement and development of the interests of our whole country, the interests of agriculture, manufactures, commerce, and navigation, the four pillars of our national prosperity and greatness. We are the friends of each of these great interests, and of the toiling masses engaged therein. We propose measures of relief from the condition confronting us—an idle, accumulating surplus in the Treasury, arising from burdensome, unnecessary taxation—by such a wise and just, fair and careful revision of our existing internal-revenue and tariff laws as will reduce the receipts of revenues to the amount necessary for an economical administration of the Government, and at the same time best promote and encourage the development and permanent prosperity of all our industrial interests, and give to them assurance of, and the means for, securing more remunerative and extended home and foreign markets, and more steady and continuous operations, and to American labor—the toiling millions in our own country—increased advantages and opportunities, and better wages.

The Republican party in its platform of 1884 arraigned the Democratic party, charging that "the Democratic party has failed completely to relieve the people of the burden of unnecessary taxation by a wise reduction of the surplus," thus admitting the burden of unnecessary taxation, and that the proper relief was "by a wise reduction of the surplus."

The Democratic party in the House of Representatives has passed a bill (H. R. 9051), commonly called the Mills bill, proposing to correct the irregularities of the tariff and to reduce the surplus—

by such methods as will relieve the tax-payer without injuring the laborer or the great productive industries of the country—

and thus, in enforcing its own principles and policies, practically carries out the recommendations of the Republican party heretofore made by its Secretaries of the Treasury, Presidents, national platforms, State platforms, and Tariff Commission.

This proposed measure of relief was met in the House by a persistent refusal of the Republican minority to propose any substitute or any better measure, notwithstanding all their party's pledges.

I hold in my hand a tabular statement, prepared in the Bureau of Statistics at my instance, which I will have printed in the RECORD to save time of reading, and which compares the existing laws and the House bill and Senate substitute as applied to imports in 1887.

What is this House bill No. 9051, entitled "A bill to reduce taxation and simplify the laws in relation to the collection of the revenue?" This bill proposes a revision of both the internal-revenue or excise and customs or tariff laws, and a reduction of the revenues derived from each. It proposes to repeal all restrictions on sales of tobacco by the producer, all taxes on tobacco, excepting on cigars, cigarettes, and cheroots, and all privilege and license taxes, excepting those for manufacturing and selling cigars, cigarettes, and cheroots. The excise duties so proposed to be repealed yielded during the fiscal year 1887, $17,381,161 in revenue, and a reduction of this sum is proposed. This bill also proposes to repeal all the special taxes under the internal-revenue laws imposed upon manufacturers of stills and retail dealers in liquors and in malt liquors. These taxes in the fiscal year 1887 yielded a revenue of about $4,814,895, and a reduction by such sum is proposed.

These are the proposed changes and reductions in and under the internal-revenue laws, amounting to about $22,196,056.

This table shows clearly the results of the present tariff laws in 1887, applied to the dutiable imports, and also of the proposed law applied to the same imports.

All dutiable articles under the present and proposed laws are grouped under fourteen schedules, as shown in the table, and each schedule includes a large number of kindred articles. The proposed bill makes no changes in the present law in the schedules F, "tobacco," leaving the average ad valorem rate of duty at $83.32 on the $100; or H, "liquor," leaving the same rate of 72.64 per cent.; or L, "silk goods," leaving the same rate of 49.71 per cent., and makes only a very slight change in schedule I, "cottons," so as to correct certain irregularities and inequalities in the present law, and reduces the present average ad valorem rate of duty of 39.99 per cent. to 39.07 per cent., a reduction of only 92 cents on the $100 in value.

The proposed bill takes from the list of dutiable merchandise under the present law and places on the free-list sundry articles of which the imports in 1887 were of the value of $70,443,012.64, and the amount of duties thereon collected under present law at the average ad valorem rate of 28.07 per cent. was $19,773,598.34, and by this amount reduces the surplus revenue.

Under the present law the dutiable merchandise imported in 1887 was of the value of $449,945,271.18; the amount of duties collected thereon was $211,811,632.49, and the average ad valorem rate thereon was $47.07 on the $100 in value, or 47.07 per cent.

The value of the merchandise dutiable under the present and also under the House bill imported in 1887 was $379,502,258.54, and the duties collected thereon amounted to $192,038,034.15 under the present law, and the average ad valorem rate of duty was $50.60 on the $100 in value, or 50.60 per cent.; and the duties collectible thereon under the House bill amount to $162,325,392.74, and the average ad valorem rate of duty thereon is $42.77 on the $100 in value, or 42.77 per cent.

The House bill therefore reduces the average ad valorem rate of duty, based upon the imports of 1887, from $50.60 on the $100 in value, or 50.60 per cent., to $42.67 on the $100 in value, or 42.77 per cent., being a reduction of only 7.83 per cent., and reduces the revenues from $192,038,034.15 to $162,325,392.74, being $29,712,641.41, and by this amount reduces the surplus revenues. The total reductions by the proposed bill, therefore, are $19,773,598.34 by the free-list and $29,712,641.41 by reduced rates of duties from 50.60 per cent. to 42.77 per cent., making $49,486,239.75. Briefly, the proposed bill takes from the merchandise imported in 1887 to the value of $449,945,271.18, and taxed by present tariff laws at 47.07 per cent., and places on the free-list articles of the value of $70,443,012.64, taxed by present law at 28.07 per cent., and reduces the average ad valorem rates of duty on the remaining $379,502,258.54 worth imported in 1887 from $50.60 on the $100 in value, the tax of the present law, to $42.77 on the $100 in value, a reduction of only $7.83 on the $100 in value, or 7.83 per cent.

Based on importations of 1887, the following table shows reductions in rate of duty and amount placed on the free-list, by schedules:

Schedules.	Reduction in duty.	Amount placed on free-list.
	Per cent.	
Chemicals	5.24	$4,535,557.96
Earthen and glass ware	6.03	30,789.97
Metals	3.44	18,323,612.91
Wooden ware	4.68	6,679,202.12
Sugar	14.74	None.
Provisions	1.04	3,334,013.86
Hemp, flax, and jute	9.56	14,490,501.40
Wool and woolens	28.91	18,206,987.97
Books, papers, etc	.06	None.
Sundries	2.02	4,842,346.45

This House bill, proposing a reduction of the surplus arising from internal-revenue taxes by about $22,196,056 and from tariff taxes by free-list and reduction of rates of tariff duties by $49,486,239.75, being an aggregate reduction of $71,682,295.75, is denounced as a direct attempt to fasten on this country the British policy of free foreign trade, and declared to be free trade. This is absolutely false, as the record shows. The statute laws of the United States from July 4, 1789, the date of the first law imposing tariff duties on imported merchandise, to March 3, 1883, the date of the existing law, show that as many as fifty-five or more laws have been enacted affecting tariff taxation, and such laws were enacted in forty-five different years during this period of ninety-four years, and in some years more than one such was passed. The longest period in our whole history during which no such law was passed was from July 30, 1846, the date of the so-called Walker tariff, to March 3, 1857, when duties were reduced.

The principal tariff laws are popularly known by the names of their supposed authors. The following table gives the popular names, dates, and average ad valorem rates of duties as nearly as can be determined:

Popular name.	Date of passage.	Average ad valorem rate of duty.
Hamilton tariff	July 4, 1789	About 10 per cent.
Calhoun tariff	Apr. 27, 1816	About 20 to 25 per cent.
Clay tariff	May 22, 1824	About 32 to 37 per cent.
Abominations tariff	May 19, 1828	About 45 to 48 per cent.
Clay's compromise tariff	Mar. 2, 1833	About 30 to 20 per cent.
Whig tariff	Aug. 30, 1842	About 35 per cent.
Walker tariff	July 30, 1846	About 25 per cent.
Morrill tariff	Mar. 2, 1861	About 48 per cent.

With these facts and figures before him, how can any intelligent man say that the House bill is a free-trade measure?

FREE TRADE.

In the minority report by the Republican members on the House bill, in the majority report of the Republican Senators, in the Republican press, and by Republican speakers free trade is held up as a scarecrow to frighten voters and deter them from supporting the Democratic party.

Why is this done? There must be some object sought to be accomplished.

What is it?

What is free trade? It has two separate and entirely different meanings?

1. The dictionaries define free trade to mean:

Commerce unrestricted by tariff regulations or customs duties; free interchange of commodities or liberty of introducing merchandise into a country from any other country without payment of government duties; trade or commerce between people and nations without restrictions, taxation, duties, imposts, or burdens.

Under our Constitution we have free trade, as defined by dictionaries, pure and simple, among all our people throughout all our States and Territories.

No man can truthfully say that the House bill proposes or favors such free trade. The charge is absolutely without any foundation.

2. Free trade in the United States, when applied and used to indicate a policy of revenue, means a tariff for raising revenue, with such incidental protection as all tariff duties necessarily afford. It means a policy for revenue tariff as distinguished from a policy for protective tariff. To establish the correctness of this definition I will quote from so-called free-traders and protectionists.

The free-trade convention of many delegates from many States held in Philadelphia in 1831, by Albert Gallatin, chairman of the committee, presented a memorial to Congress in 1832 protesting against the then existing tariff, and asking—

That duties be so reduced as to leave after extinguishment of the public debt only that amount of revenue which may be necessary to meet the ordinary exigencies of the Government.

The American Free-Trade League of New York, in 1870 or 1871, in response to inquiries from Edward Young, Chief of the Bureau of Statistics, said:

We believe in the utmost possible freedom for all citizens of the United States in trade as well as in all the other relations of life; but we recognize that absolute freedom of trade must be limited to the revenue necessities of the Government, just as absolute freedom in other respects is necessarily limited by government; and therefore the Free-Trade League willingly submits to taxation and duties to meet the necessities of government, while it denounces as robbery and tyranny all taxation for the benefit of special classes.

Henry Clay, in his speech "on American industry," in the House of Representatives, March 30 and 31, 1824, said:

Two classes of politicians divide the people of the United States. According to the system of one, the produce of foreign industry should be subject to no other impost than such as may be necessary to provide a public revenue; and the produce of American industry should be left to sustain itself, if it can, with no other than that incidental protection, in its competition, at home as well as abroad, with rival foreign articles. According to the system of the other class, whilst they agree that the imports should be mainly, and may under any modification be safely relied on as a fit and convenient source of public revenue, they would so adjust and arrange the duties on foreign fabrics as to afford a gradual but adequate protection to American industry, and lessen our dependence on foreign nations, by securing a certain and ultimately a cheaper and better supply of our own wants from our own abundant resources. Both classes are equally sincere in their respective opinions, equally honest, equally patriotic, and desirous of advancing the prosperity of the country. In the discussion and consideration of these opposite opinions, for the purpose of ascertaining which has the support of truth and reason, we should, therefore, exercise every indulgence, and the greatest spirit of mutual moderation and forbearance. And, in our deliberations on this great question, we should look fearlessly and truly at the actual condition of the country, retrace the causes which have brought us into it, and snatch, if possible, a view of the future. We should, above all, consult experience—the experience of other nations as well as our own—as our truest and most unerring guide. * * *

Hon. James G. Blaine, the leader of the protectionists in this campaign, in his "Twenty Years in Congress," discusses tariff legislation and policies at length, using the terms "free-traders" and "protectionists," as the two great opposing parties in politics and on pages 207, 208, and 211, says:

In the foregoing summary of legislation upon the tariff the terms "free trade" and "protection" are used in their ordinary acceptation in this country, not as accurately defining the difference in the revenue theories, but as indicating the rival policies which have so long divided political parties. Strictly speaking, there has never been a proposition by any party in the United States for the adoption of free trade. To be entirely free, trade must encounter no obstruction in the way of tax either upon export or import. In that sense, no nation has ever enjoyed free trade. * * *

The essential question which has grown up between political parties in the United States respecting our foreign trade is, whether a duty should be laid upon any import for the direct object of protecting and encouraging the manufacture of the same article at home. The party opposed to this theory does not advocate the admission of the article free, but insists upon such rate of duty as will produce the largest revenue and at the same time afford what is termed "incidental protection." The advocates of actual free trade according to the policy of England, taxing only those articles which are not produced at home, are few in number and are principally confined to doctrinaires.

Hon. WILLIAM MCKINLEY, JR., of Ohio, on May 18, 1888, said:

This brings us face-to face, therefore, with the two opposing systems, that of a revenue as distinguished from a protective tariff, and upon their respective merits they must stand or fall.

Yet Mr. Blaine, Mr. MCKINLEY, and other protectionists, in speeches and campaign literature, declare the proposed bill to be a free-trade measure—to mean the "British policy of free foreign trade"—and declare the Democratic party to be a free-trade party and the advocates of the British policy of free foreign trade, and so use the term "free trade" that their auditors and readers must necessarily think they mean by "free trade" trade without any restrictions, duties, or taxes, and such freedom of trade as England has, and as we have among ourselves. Why is this done? The object must be to deceive, mislead, and array prejudice, and at the same time divert attention from the real issue.

Such a course is neither fair nor creditable to the persons who pursue it, for they know that neither the Democratic party nor any other political party in the United States has ever proposed the adoption of free trade—trade without any restrictions, duties, or taxes—and that no nation has ever enjoyed such free trade.

The Tariff League Bulletin of New York, a special pleader for protection, has published far and wide the charge that President Cleveland has said:

I believe in free trade as I believe in the Protestant religion.

And in the issue of September 7, 1888, states that—

We have received many letters asking for proof that the statement is correct, and we have taken great pains to trace to their origin these words attributed to the President.

And then says:

We have in our possession conclusive evidence that the President used the expression some time ago in a private conversation with an ex-attorney-general of Pennsylvania, who repeated it to Colonel McClure, editor of the Philadelphia Times. Colonel McClure repeated it to a gentleman of prominence and veracity, and finally the President's expression became public. It has never been disputed either by the President or those who repeated it. There is no doubt whatever of its authenticity.

Is the publication of such falsehoods, based upon such pretended hearsays, fair, honorable, or just?

Is the cause of protection in such desperate straits that such cowardly attacks must be made upon the President in the face of his frank, bold, and manly messages upon the tariff?

The following letter of the President shows the utter falsity of the charge:

PHILADELPHIA, *September* 15.

George Whiteley, of 107 Walnut street, in answer to a letter of inquiry sent to President Cleveland as to certain free-trade utterances he was charged with having made, yesterday received the following:

"EXECUTIVE MANSION, *Washington, September* 13, 1888.

"DEAR SIR: Your letter of the 8th instant has just been presented to my attention, and it affords the first intimation I have had that in an article published in the North American Review I am charged with the declaration that 'I believe in free trade as I believe in the Protestant religion.' In answer to your inquiry as to the truth of this allegation I have to say that I never made use of that expression or one anything like it. The statement you quote is pure, unadulterated fabrication. While it would be unfair to attempt to meet or refute every false statement coined or forged to serve the purposes of misrepresentation in the heat of the political canvass, the friendly spirit of your inquiry has led me to make this emphatic denial.

"Yours, very truly,

"GROVER CLEVELAND.

"GEORGE WHITELEY, Esq."

Will the Tariff League Bulletin have the honor and manliness to publish the President's letter? I doubt it.

The true issue is not free trade, but a question of policies in regard to the accumulating surplus in the Treasury and the best method or system for reducing the onerous burdens of unnecessary taxation, and leaving the surplus in the pockets of the tax-payers.

Shall the policy of a high protective tariff or of a revenue tariff with incidental protection prevail?

What is protection? Webster says:

Protection is the establishment of such duties on goods imported as will protect or cherish domestic industry.

And—

A protectionist is one who favors the protection of some branch of industry by legal enactments.

The Industrial League of Pennsylvania, in answer to Mr. Edward Young, in 1872, said:

Protection is simply defense; nothing more, nothing less, and nothing else.

Yes, it is defense. Defense against what? Defense against competition, and consequently a monopoly of the market for the sale of the protected article.

What are the advantages or benefits of a protective tariff as claimed by protectionists?

Could some intelligent being, divinely endowed with a knowledge of the English language, be translated from some other world to the United States and only hear and read the Republican speeches, platform, and literature, he would necessarily be led to believe that the protective-tariff policy was the fountain and source of all blessings and caused the succession of day and night, and of the seasons; regulated sunshine and shower, made the seeds to germinate, the harvests to ripen, agriculture to prosper, commerce to flow, and developed all the industrial interests of the country, enriched the poor by providing them with houses, food, clothing, and high wages, and made the people of the United States the most intelligent, progressive, prosperous, and happy among all the nations of earth.

Mr. President, let us examine the origin, purpose, alleged benefits, and proposed duration of this high protective-tariff policy, and the origin of the term "American system," and why applied thereto.

President Washington in his message to the Second Congress on January 8, 1790, said:

The advancement of agriculture, commerce, and manufactures by all proper means, will not, I trust, need recommendation. But I can not forbear intimating to you the expediency of giving effectual encouragement, as well to the introduction of new and useful inventions from abroad, as to the exertions of skill and genius in producing them at home.

No law had then been enacted for granting any exclusive rights or patents to inventors for their inventions.

On January 15, 1790, the House of Representatives in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union adopted a resolution—

That it is the opinion of this committee that the several matters recommended by the President of the United States in his speech to both Houses of Congress, relating to a provision for the national defense; to the promotion of manufactories for essential, particularly for military, supplies; * * * to the advancement of the agriculture, commerce, and manufactures of the United States; to the encouragement of useful inventions, etc., * * * ought severally to be referred to select committees, etc.

The House thereupon ordered—

That it be referred to the Secretary of the Treasury to prepare and report to this House a proper plan or plans, conformably to the recommendations of the President of the United States in his speech to both Houses of Congress, for the encouragement and promotion of such manufactories as will tend to render the United States independent of other nations for essential, particularly for military, supplies.

In obedience to this order Alexander Hamilton, the Secretary of the Treasury, on December 5, 1791, submitted to the House his celebrated "Report on Manufactures." Mr. Hamilton is justly entitled to the distinction of being the father of the system of protection, and he and Henry Clay were certainly the ablest advocates and expounders of the system, its objects and purposes. When Mr. Hamilton submitted his report Congress had already enacted the tariff laws of July 4, 1789, and August 10, 1790.

Mr. Hamilton in his report said:

The Secretary of the Treasury, in obedience to the order of the House of Representatives, on the 15th day of January, 1790, has applied his attention, at as early a period as his other duties would permit, to the subject of manufactures, and particularly to the means of promoting such as will tend to render the United States independent of foreign nations for military and other necessary supplies; and he thereupon submits the following report.

He then enumerates the principal circumstances which would make manufacturing establishments beneficial to the country, as follows:

1. The division of labor.
2. An extension of the use of machinery.
3. Additional employment to classes of the community not ordinarily engaged in the business.
4. The promoting of emigration from foreign countries.
5. The furnishing greater scope for the diversity of talents and dispositions, which discriminate men from each other.
6. The affording a more ample and various field for enterprise.
7. The creating in some instances a new and securing in all a more certain and steady demand for the surplus produce of the soil.

In discussing the beneficial influence of manufacturing establishments in "the promoting of emigration from foreign countries," he says:

Here is perceived an important resource, not only for extending the population, and with it the useful and productive labor of the country, but likewise for the prosecution of manufactures, without deducting from the number of hands which might otherwise be drawn to tillage; and even for the indemnification of agriculture, for such as might happen to be diverted from it.

In discussing the home market for farm products, the benefits of manufactures in "the creating in some instances a new and securing in all a more certain and steady demand for the surplus produce of the soil," he says:

It is evident that the exertions of the husbandman will be steady or fluctuating, vigorous or feeble, in proportion to the steadiness or fluctuation, adequateness or inadequateness, of the markets on which he must depend for the vent of the surplus which may be produced by his labor; and that such surplus, in the ordinary course of things, will be greater or less in the same proportion.

For the purpose of this vent a domestic market is greatly to be preferred to a foreign one, because it is, in the nature of things, far more to be relied upon.

To secure such a market there is no other expedient than to promote manufacturing establishments. Manufacturers, who constitute the most numerous class, after the cultivators of land, are for that reason the principal consumers of the surplus of their labor.

This idea of an extensive domestic market for the surplus produce of the soil is of the first consequence. It is of all things that which most effectually conduces to a flourishing state of agriculture. If the effect of manufactories should be to detach a portion of the hands which would otherwise be engaged in tillage, it might possibly cause a smaller quantity of lands to be under cultivation; but by their tendency to procure a more certain demand for the surplus produce of the soil, they would, at the same time, cause the lands which were in cultivation to be better improved and more productive.

In discussing the objections and obstacles to the establishment of successful manufactures, he says:

First. If the system of perfect liberty to industry and commerce were the prevailing system of nations, the arguments which dissuade a country in the predicament of the United States from the zealous pursuit of manufactures would doubtless have great force. It will not be affirmed that they might not be permitted, with few exceptions, to serve as a rule of national conduct. In such a state of things each country would have the full benefit of its peculiar advantages to compensate for its deficiencies or disadvantages. If one nation were in a condition to supply manufactured articles on better terms than another, that other might find an abundant indemnification in a superior capacity to furnish the produce of the soil.

And a free exchange, mutually beneficial, of the commodities which each was able to supply on the best terms might be carried on between each, supporting in full vigor the industry of each. And though the circumstances which have been mentioned, and others which will be unfolded hereafter, render it probable that nations merely agricultural would not enjoy the same degree of opulence in proportion to their numbers as those which united manufactures with agriculture, yet the progressive improvement of the lands of the former might in the end atone for an inferior degree of opulence in the mean time; and in a case in which opposite considerations are pretty equally balanced the option ought, perhaps, always to be in favor of leaving industry to its own direction.

But the system which has been mentioned is far from characterizing the general character of nations. The prevalent one has been regulated by an opposite spirit. The consequence of it is that the United States are to a certain extent in the situation of a country precluded from foreign commerce. They can, indeed, without difficulty, obtain from abroad the manufactured supplies of which they are in want, but they experience numerous and very injurious impediments to the emission and vent of their own commodities. Nor is this the case in reference to a single foreign nation only. The regulations of several countries with which we have the most extensive intercourse throw serious obstructions in the way of the principal staples of the United States.

In such a position of things the United States can not exchange with Europe on equal terms; and the want of reciprocity would render them the victim of a

system which should induce them to confine their views to agriculture and refrain from manufactures.

A constant and increasing necessity on their part for the commodities of Europe, and only a partial and occasional demand for their own in return, could not but expose them to a state of impoverishment, compared with the opulence to which their political and natural advantages authorize them to aspire.

Remarks of this kind are not made in the spirit of complaint. It is for the nations, whose regulations are alluded to, to judge for themselves whether, by aiming at too much, they do not lose more than they gain. It is for the United States to consider by what means they can render themselves least dependent on the combinations, right or wrong, of foreign policy. * * *

But the greatest obstacle of all to the successful prosecution of a new branch of industry in a country in which it was before unknown consists, as far as the instances apply, in the bounties, premiums, and other aids which are granted, in a variety of cases, by the nations in which the establishments to be imitated are previously introduced. * * *

The objections to the pursuit of manufactures in the United States, which next present themselves to discussion, represent an impracticability of success arising from three causes—scarcity of hands, dearness of labor, want of capital.

The first two circumstances are to a certain extent real, and within due limits ought to be admitted as obstacles to the success of manufacturing enterprise in the United States. But there are various considerations which lessen their force, and tend to afford an assurance that they are not sufficient to prevent the advantageous prosecution of many very useful and extensive manufactories. * * *

It may be affirmed, therefore, in respect to hands for carrying on manufactures, that we shall, in a great measure, trade upon a foreign stock, reserving our own for the cultivation of our lands and the manning of our ships, as far as character and circumstances shall incline.

As to the dearness of labor, another of the obstacles alleged, this has relation principally to two circumstances: one, that which has just been discussed, or the scarcity of hands; the other, the greatness of profits.

So far as the dearness of labor can be a consequence of the greatness of profits in any branch of business, it is no obstacle to its success. The great undertaker can afford to pay the price.

There are grounds to conclude that undertakers of manufactures in this country can at this time afford to pay higher wages to the workmen they may employ than are paid to similar workmen in Europe. The price of foreign fabrics in the markets of the United States, which will for a long time regulate the prices of the domestic ones, may be considered as compounded of the following ingredients: The first cost of materials, including the taxes, if any, which are paid upon them where they are made; the expense of grounds, buildings, machinery, and tools; the wages of the persons employed in the manufactory; the profits on the capital or stock employed; the commissions of agents to purchase them where they are made; the expense of transportation to the United States, including insurance and other incidental charges; the taxes or duties, if any, and fees of office which are paid on their exportation; the taxes or duties and fees of office which are paid on their importation.

He then says that—

As to the cost of materials, the advantage upon the whole is at present on the side of the United States—

And—

as to the expense of grounds, buildings, machinery, and tools, an equality at least may be assured—

And—

as to the article of wages, the comparison certainly turns against the United States—

And—

as to profits on the capital or stock, it is alike applicable to the foreign and domestic manufacture.

But with respect to all the remaining items, they are alone applicable to the foreign manufacture, and, in the strictest sense, extraordinaries; constituting a sum of extra charge on the foreign fabric which can not be estimated at less than from 15 to 30 per cent. on the cost of it at the manufactory.

This sum of extra charge may confidently be regarded as more than a counterpoise for the real difference in the price of labor; and is a satisfactory proof that manufactures may prosper in defiance of it in the United States. * * *

To all the arguments which are brought to evince the impracticability of success in manufacturing establishments in the United States, it might have been a sufficient answer to have referred to the experience of what has been already done. It is certain that several important branches have grown up and flourished with a rapidity which surprises, affording an encouraging assurance of success in future attempts; of these it may not be improper to enumerate the most considerable.

He then discusses the proper plan for the encouragement and promotion of manufactures, and says:

In order to a better judgment of the means proper to be resorted to by the United States, it will be of use to advert to those which have been employed with success in other countries. The principal of these are:

1. Protecting duties, or duties on those foreign articles which are the rivals of the domestic ones intended to be encouraged.

Duties of this nature evidently amount to a virtual bounty on the domestic fabrics, since by enhancing the charges on foreign articles they enable the national manufacturers to undersell all their foreign competitors. * * * Indeed, all the duties imposed on imported articles, though with an exclusive view to revenue, have the effect in contemplation, and, except where they fall on raw materials, wear a beneficent aspect toward the manufacturers of the country.

* * * * * * * * *

2. Prohibitions of rival articles, or duties equivalent to prohibitions. * * *

Considering a monopoly of the domestic market to its own manufacturers as the reigning policy of manufacturing nations, a similar policy on the part of the United States in every proper instance is dictated, it might almost be said, by the principles of distributive justice, certainly by the duty of endeavoring to secure to their own citizens a reciprocity of advantages.

3. Prohibitions of the exportation of the materials of manufactures. * * *

4. Pecuniary bounties.

This has been found one of the most efficacious means of encouraging manufactures, and it is in some views the best.

He discusses at great length the advantages of "bounties," and among others, says:

It can not escape notice that a duty upon the importation of an article can not otherwise aid the domestic production of it than by giving the latter greater advantages in the home market. * * *

The continuance of bounties on manufactures long established must always be of questionable policy, because a presumption would arise in every such case that there were natural and inherent impediments to success. But in new undertakings they are just as justifiable as they are oftentimes necessary. * * *

There is a degree of prejudice against bounties, from an appearance of giving away the public money without an immediate consideration, and from a supposition that they serve to enrich particular classes at the expense of the community. * * *

As to the second source of objection, it equally lies against other modes of encouragement which are admitted to be eligible. As often as a duty upon a foreign article makes an addition to its price, it causes an extra expense to the community for the benefit of the domestic manufacturer. A bounty does no more. * * *

5. Premiums.

These are of a nature allied to bounties, though distinguishable from them in some important features. * * *

6. The exemption of the materials of manufactures from duty.

The policy of that exemption, as a general rule, particularly in reference to new establishments, is obvious. It can hardly ever be advisable to add the obstructions of fiscal burdens to the difficulties which naturally embarrass a new manufacture; and when it is matured and in a condition to become an object of revenue, it is, generally speaking, better that the fabric than the material should be the subject of taxation. * * *

7. Drawbacks of the duties which are imposed on the materials of manufactures. * * *

8. The encouragement of new inventions and discoveries at home and of the introduction into the United States of such as may have been made in other countries, particularly those which relate to machinery.

This is among the most useful and unexceptional of the aids which can be given to manufactures. The usual means of that encouragement are pecuniary rewards and, for a time, exclusive privileges. The first must be employed according to the occasion and the utility of the invention or discovery. For the last, so far as respects "authors and inventors," provision has been made by law. * * *

9. Judicious regulations for the inspection of manufactured commodities. * * *

10. The facilitating of pecuniary remittances from place to place.

11. The facilitating of the transportation of commodities.

He then discusses the rates of duty necessary for the encouragement and protection of manufactures. As to the first instance, iron, he says:

The only further encouragement of manufactories of this article, the propriety of which may be considered as unquestionable, seems to be an increase of the duties on foreign rival commodities.

And recommends the increase of the duty upon steel from 75 cents to 100 cents per hundredweight, and a duty of 2 cents per pound upon nails and spikes, and says:

To insure the end, it seems equally safe and prudent to extend the duty ad valorem upon all manufactures of iron, or of which iron is the article of chief value, to 10 per cent.

And as to the manufactures of steel, says:

Manufactures of steel generally, or of which steel is the article of chief value, may with advantage be placed in the class of goods rated at 7½ per cent. As manufactures of this kind have not yet made any considerable progress, it is a reason for not rating them as high as those of iron; but as this material is the basis of them, and as their extension is not less practicable than important, it is desirable to promote it by a somewhat higher duty than at present.

A question arises, how far it might be expedient to permit the importation of iron in pigs and bars free of duty. It would certainly be favorable to manufacturers of the article; but the doubt is, whether it might not interfere with its production.

And as to cotton, he says:

The present duty of 3 cents per pound on the foreign raw material is undoubtedly a very serious impediment to the progress of these manufactories. * * *

To secure to the national manufacturers so essential an advantage, a repeal of the present duty on imported cotton is indispensable. One cent per yard, not less than of a given width, on all goods of cotton, or of cotton and linen mixed, which are manufactured in the United States, with the addition of 1 cent per pound weight of the material if made of national cotton, would amount to an aid of considerable importance, both to the production and to the manufacture of that valuable article.

If the duty of 7½ per cent. on certain kinds of cotton goods were extended to all goods of cotton, or of which it is the principal material, it would probably more than counterbalance the effect of the drawback proposed in relation to the fabrication of the article.

I have made these voluminous quotations to show the exact grounds upon which the policy of protection by tariff duties and bounties was presented by Mr. Hamilton at that early day.

In enumerating the supposed benefits of manufacturing establishments he lays great stress upon the promotion of immigration from foreign countries and the creation of a home market for the surplus products of agriculture, but does not intimate the possibility even of higher wages or any protection to American labor against competition with the pauper labor of Europe.

He frankly admitted that the wages of labor were higher here than in any other nation, and that the "scarcity of hands and dearness of labor" were serious obstacles to the success of manufactures; and argues that these obstacles can be overcome by immigration, the importation of foreign laborers, and that our manufacturers could even then afford to pay higher wages than were paid in other countries for similar work, by reason of the disadvantages under which foreign manufacturers labored, and which were extraordinaries, such as commissions, transportation, insurance and other charges, taxes, and duties on importation, and that these were an extra charge on foreign fabrics, amounting to not less than 15 to 30 per cent. on cost at manufactory; and that this sum of extra charge was more than a counterpoise—an equivalent for the difference in price of labor, and was a proof that manufactures may prosper in defiance of the higher wages here.

He claims that the greatest obstacle to success of new manufactures was in the bounties, premiums, and other aids granted in many cases by the nations in which the establishments to be imitated were previously introduced. In other words, infant manufactures could not without aid compete with old-established ones, and therefore infant industries must be protected, not American labor, already then receiving higher wages than in Europe. In discussing the means to be

adopted for encouraging and protecting manufacturers he says nothing of an "American system," does not propose an "American system," but on the contrary, says:

It will be of use to advert to those which have been employed with success in other countries.

He proposes to adopt foreign policies, foreign systems, the British system of protecting duties and bounties, and frankly admits that protecting duties, any duties on foreign articles—the rivals of domestic ones—are a "virtual bounty on the home fabric," for the benefit of the home manufacturer, giving him "the monopoly of the domestic market" and an addition to the price of the domestic fabric, to be paid by the consumer as "an extra expense to the community for the benefit of the domestic manufacturer, and that "a bounty does no more."

He seems to give preference to bounties over duties, and asserts that their effects, so far as the domestic manufacturer is concerned, are practically the same. He admits that—

The continuance of bounties on manufactures—

The same as protective duties—

long established must always be of unquestionable policy, because a presumption would arise in every such case that there were natural and inherent impediments to success. But in new undertakings they are just as justifiable as they are oftentimes necessary.

"New undertakings," "infant industries," need the protecting duties or bounties, not "long-established ones,"

The duties specifically recommended by him as necessary to be imposed for the protection of manufacturers, were very little higher than the then existing duties under the tariff acts of August 10, 1790, and March 2 and 3, 1791, and reduced to an average ad valorem rate were not exceeding 10 per cent., excluding coffee, tea, spirits, and wines as then taxed.

Mr. Clay, in his speech in the House, April 26, 1820, "on the protection of home industry," said:

But, say gentlemen, there are to the manufacturing system some inherent objections, which should induce us to avoid its introduction into this country; and we are warned by the example of England, by her pauperism, by the vices of her population, her wars, etc. * * *

Pauperism is in general the effect of an overflowing population. Manufactures have undoubtedly produced a redundant population; but so may commerce and so may agriculture. * * *

But even France has not that great security against the abuses of the manufacturing system, against the effects of too great a density of population, which we possess in our waste lands. While this resource exists we have nothing to apprehend. Do capitalists give too low wages? Are the laborers too crowded and in danger of starving? The unsettled lands will draw off the redundancy and leave the others better provided for. * * *

I am aware that while the public domain is an acknowledged security against the abuses of the manufacturing or any other system, it constitutes at the same time an impediment, in the opinion of some, to the success of manufacturing industry by its tendency to prevent the reduction of wages of labor. * * *

It is true that we can not remain in the relation of seller only to foreign powers for any length of time; but if, as I have no doubt, our agriculture will continue to supply as far as it can profitably to the extent of the limits of foreign demand, we shall receive not only in return many of the articles on which the tariff operates for our consumption, but they may also form the objects of trade with South America and other powers, and our comforts may be multiplied by the importation of other articles * * *

But, sir, friendly as I am to the existence of domestic manufactures, I would not give to them unreasonable encouragement by protecting duties. Their growth ought to be gradual, but sure. I believe all the circumstances of the present period highly favorable to their success; but they are the youngest and weakest interests of the state. Agriculture wants but little or no protection against the regulations of foreign powers. The advantages of our position, and the cheapness and abundance and fertility of our land, afford to that greatest interest of the state almost all the protection it wants. As it should be, it is strong and flourishing, or if it be not at this moment prosperous, it is not because its produce is not ample, but because, depending, as we do altogether, upon a foreign market for the sale of the surplus of that produce, the foreign market is glutted. Our foreign trade, having almost exclusively engrossed the protective care of the Government, wants no further legislative aid; and whatever depression it may now experience, it is attributable to causes beyond the control of this Government. The abundance of capital, indicated by the avidity with which loans are sought, at the reduced rate of 5 per cent.; the reduction in the wages of labor, and the decline in the price of property of every kind, as well as that of agricultural produce, all concur favorably for domestic manufactures.

The plea is for protecting duties for domestic manufactures, the youngest and weakest interests—"infant industries"—and the plea is urged because of "the reduction in the wages of labor;" not for the protection of labor, not to enable the manufacturers to pay higher wages, and because "agriculture wants but little or no protection," and "our foreign trade * * * wants no further legislative aid."

On March 30 and 31, 1824, when Speaker of the House, Mr. Clay, in his speech on "American industry," said:

The greatest want of civilized society is a market for the sale and exchange of the surplus of produce of the labor of its members. This market may exist at home or abroad, or both; but it must exist somewhere if society prospers, and whenever it does exist it should be competent to the absorption of the entire surplus of production. It is most desirable that there should be both a home and a foreign market. But with respect to their relative superiority I can not entertain a doubt. The home market is first in order and paramount in importance. The object of the bill under consideration is to create this home market and to lay the foundations of a genuine American policy. It is opposed; and it is incumbent upon the partisans of the foreign policy (terms which I shall use without any invidious intent) to demonstrate that the foreign market is an adequate vent for the surplus produce of our labor. But is it so? First, foreign nations can not, if they would, take our surplus produce. If the source of supply, no matter of what, increase in a greater ratio than the demand for that supply a glut of the market is inevitable, even if we suppose both to remain perfectly unobstructed. * * * But secondly, if they could they will not. The policy of all Europe is averse to the reception of our agricultural produce so far as it comes into collision with its own, and under that limitation we are absolutely forbid to enter their ports, except under circumstances which deprived them of all value as a steady market. The policy of all Europe rejects those great staples of our country which consist of objects of human subsistence. The policy of all Europe refuses to receive from us anything but those raw materials of smaller value essential to their manufactures to which they can give a higher value, with the exception of tobacco and rice, which they can not produce.

Our agricultural is our greatest interest. It ought ever to be predominant. All others should bend to it; and, in considering what is for its advantage, we should contemplate it in all its varieties of planting, farming, and grazing. Can we do nothing to invigorate it; nothing to correct the errors of the past and to brighten the still more unpromising prospects which lie before us? We have seen, I think, the causes of the distress of the country. We have seen that an exclusive dependence upon the foreign market must lead to still severer distress, to impoverishment, to ruin. We must then change somewhat our course. We must give a new direction to some portion of our industry. We must speedily adopt a genuine American policy. Still cherishing the foreign market, let us create also a home market, to give further scope to the consumption of the produce of American industry. Let us counteract the policy of foreigners and withdraw the support which we now give to their industry and stimulate that of our own country. It should be a prominent object with wise legislators to multiply the vocations and extend the business of society, as far as it can be done, by the protection of our interests at home against the injurious effects of foreign legislation. * * *

The creation of a home market is not only necessary to procure for our agriculture a just reward of its labors, but it is indispensable to obtain a supply of our necessary wants. If we can not sell we can not buy. That portion of our population (and we have seen that it is not less than four-fifths) which makes comparatively nothing that foreigners will buy, has nothing to make purchases with from foreigners. * * *

At that time and for many ages before and afterward to 1846 the English corn laws, imposing high tariff duties on all imports of corn, wheat, and breadstuffs from foreign countries into England were in force and our exports of the same heavily burdened.

Mr. Clay further said:

But it is said that wherever there is a concurrence of favorable circumstances, manufactures will arise of themselves, without protection; and that we should not disturb the natural progress of industry, but leave things to themselves. If all nations would modify their policy on this axiom, perhaps it would be better for the common good of the whole. Even then, in consequence of natural advantages and a greater advance in civilization and in the arts, some nations would enjoy a state of much higher prosperity than others.

The object of protection is the establishment and protection of the arts. * * *

The adoption of the restrictive system on the part of the United States, by excluding the produce of foreign labor, would extend the consumption of American produce, unable in the infancy and unprotected state of the arts, to sustain a competition with foreign fabrics. Let our arts breathe under the shade of protection; let them be perfected as they are in England, and we shall then be ready, as England now is said to be, to put aside protection and to enter upon the freest exchanges. * * *

"On the reduction of duties on imports," in the Senate of the United States, January 11, 1832, Mr. Clay said:

Whoever may be entitled to the credit of the payment of the public debt, I congratulate you, sir, and the country most cordially, that it is so near at hand. It is so nearly being totally extinguished that we may now safely inquire whether, without prejudice to any established policy, we may not relieve the consumption of the country by the repeal or reduction of duties and curtail considerably the public revenue. In making this inquiry, the first question that presents itself is whether it is expedient to preserve the existing duties in order to accumulate a surplus in the Treasury for the purpose of subsequent distribution among the several States. I think not. * * *

The public revenue, then, should be regulated and adapted to the proper service of the General Government. It should be ample; for a deficit in the income, always to be deprecated, is sometimes attended, as we know well from history and from what has happened in our own time, with fatal consequences.

We may safely assume that the revenue may now be reduced, and considerably reduced. This reduction may be effected in various ways and on different principles. Only three modes shall now be noticed.

First. To reduce duties on all articles in the same ratio without regard to the principle of protection;

Second. To retain them on the unprotected articles and augment them on the protected articles; and

Third. To abolish and reduce the duties on unprotected articles, retaining and enforcing the faithful collection of those on the protected articles.

To the first mode there are insuperable objections. * * *

The second would be still more objectionable to the foes of the tariff than either of the others. * * *

The third mode is the most equitable and reasonable, and it presents an undebatable ground, on which I had hoped we could safely tread without difficulty. It exacts no sacrifice of principle from the opponent of the American system; it comprehends none on the part of its friends. The measure before you embraces this mode. It is simple and free from all complexity. It divides the whole subject of imports according to its nature. It settles at once what ought not to be disputed, and leaves to be settled hereafter, if necessary, what may be controverted. * * *

It assumes the right of the Government in the assessment of duties to discriminate between those articles which sound policy requires it to foster and those which it need not encourage. This has been the invariable principle on which the Government has proceeded from the act of Congress of the 4th of July, 1789, down to the present time. And has it not been admitted by almost every prominent Southern politician? Has it not even been acknowledged by the fathers of the free-trade church in their late address promulgated from Philadelphia to the people of the United States? If we never had a system of foreign imports, and were now called upon for the first time to originate one, should we not discriminate between the objects of our own industry and those produced by foreigners? And is there any difference in its application between the modification of an existing system and the origination of a new one?

Mr. Clay in his speech in the Senate on February 2, 3, and 6, 1832, in defense of his so-called American system, said:

I pass with pleasure from this disagreeable topic to two general propositions which cover the entire ground of debate.

The first is that under the operation of the American system the objects which it protects and fosters are brought to the consumer at cheaper prices than they commanded prior to its introduction or than they would command if it did not exist; and, second, that the tendency of the system is to sustain, and that it has upheld the prices of all our agricultural and other produce, including cotton. * * *

This brings me to consider what I apprehend to have been the most efficient of all the causes in the reduction of the prices of manufactured articles, and that is competition. By competition the total amount of the supply is increased, and by increase of the supply a competition in the sale ensues, and this enables the

consumer to buy at lower rates. * * * The great law of price is determined by supply and demand. Whatever affects either affects the price. If the supply is increased, the demand remaining the same, the price declines. If the demand is increased, the supply remaining the same, the price advances. If both supply and demand are undiminished, the price is stationary, and the price is influenced exactly in proportion to the degree of disturbance to the demand or supply. * * *

And now, sir, I would address a few words to the friends of the American system in the Senate. The revenue must, ought to be reduced. The country will not after, by the payment of the public debt, ten or twelve millions of dollars become unnecessary, bear such an annual surplus. Its distribution would form a subject of perpetual contention.

Mr. Clay on February 25, 1837, in discussing the bill to reduce the tariff, said:

But the best friends of the protective policy never intended that that policy should be perpetual, though the acts establishing it were unlimited in point of time. All who advocated the system went upon the ground that after a certain time (the precise period they did not attempt to fix) our domestic manufactures would become so thoroughly fixed and permanently established that they would bear the competition of rival products from abroad. * * *

The great question so long agitated between different portions of the Union has not been whether in laying a bill for revenue the Government may not levy a duty which gives incidental protection to the industry of our own citizens, for this none will deny, but whether such protection is in itself a proper and legitimate object for which taxes may be laid. The friends of the protective policy have always maintained the latter proposition.

And in speaking of the compromise act of 1833, he says:

At the time of its conception he was not in the city, but in Philadelphia, whither he had retired for three weeks. While there he was called upon by a committee of manufacturers, who disclosed to him their apprehensions of the imminent danger to which the tariff system was exposed, and who asked with anxiety what was to be done, whether no measure could be devised to save the manufacturing interests from the ruin with which they were threatened. It was to these individuals, and not to his friends in Congress, that he first applied to know whether in their apprehension a long lease of the protective policy, even though on a lower scale, would not be better than the uncertain state with regard to it in which they then were. To this question not a single man (and he put it to the most intelligent individuals) hesitated for a moment to reply in the affirmative. He afterwards conferred with other manufacturers and found that they concurred in the same view. * * *

The bill then provided a biennial reduction at the rate of 10 per cent. on all duties over 20 per cent., till the 1st of December, 1841; in June following, one-half of the remaining excess of duties over 20 per cent., and soon after the residue. To this bill it was objected that the manufacturing interest could never live under it. But what has been the fact? The law has now been in operation for four years, and have you heard any complaints from that interest? Can any period of four years be pointed out in which it has enjoyed greater prosperity? But it was urged that, although the manufacturers might get along till 1842, yet when that time should arrive they could no longer exist under the remnant of protection which would then be left them; that is, with a duty of 20 per cent., the home valuation, and the cash payment. In reply to this I said then, and I say now, that no man can tell beforehand whether this protection will be found sufficient or no. For myself, I do believe that the leading manufacturing interests of the country can subsist under it.

Mr. Clay, on March 10, 1838, in reply to Mr. Calhoun in their memorable discussion, in defending his compromise tariff of 1833 (this reply of Clay is found in the Daily National Intelligencer of March 19, 1838), said:

There is protection from one end to the other in the compromise act; modified and limited, it is true, but protection nevertheless. There is protection, adequate and abundant protection, until the year 1842; and protection indefinitely beyond it. Until that year the biennial reduction of duties is slow and moderate, such as was perfectly satisfactory to the manufacturers. Now, if the system were altogether unconstitutional, as had been contended, how could the Senator vote for a bill which continued it for nine years? Then, beyond that period, there is the provision for cash duties, home valuations, a long and liberal list of free articles carefully made out by my friend from Rhode Island, Mr. Knight, expressly for the benefit of the manufacturers, and the power of discrimination, reserved also for their benefit, within the maximum rate of duty fixed in the act. * * *

No one, Mr. President, in the commencement of the protective policy, ever supposed that it was to be perpetual. We hoped and believed that temporary protection extended to our infant manufactures would bring them up and enable them to withstand competition with those of Europe. We thought, as the wise French minister did, who, when urged by a British minister to consent to the equal introduction into the two countries of their respective productions, replied that free trade might be very well for a country whose manufactures had reached perfection, but was not entirely adapted to a country which wished to build up its manufactures. If the protective policy were entirely to cease in 1842, it would have existed twenty-six years from 1816, or eighteen from 1824; quite as long as, at either of those periods, its friends supposed might be necessary. But it does not cease then, and I sincerely hope that the provisions contained in the compromise act for its benefit beyond that period will be found sufficient for the preservation of all our interesting manufactures. For one, I am willing to adhere to and abide by the compromise in all its provisions, present and prospective, if its fair operation is undisturbed.

Mr. Clay, in his letter of September 13, 1843, to Dr. F. S. Bronson, of Lagrange, Ga., published in Niles's National Register of October 21, 1843, said:

The sum and substance of what I conceive to be the true policy of the United States in respect to a tariff may be briefly stated. In conformity with the principle announced in the compromise act, I think that whatever revenue is necessary to an economical and honest administration of the General Government ought to be derived from duties imposed on foreign imports. And I believe that in establishing a tariff of those duties such a discrimination ought to be made as will incidentally afford reasonable protection to our national interests.

I think there is no danger of a high tariff being ever established; that of 1828 was eminently deserving that denomination. I was not in Congress when it passed, and did not vote for it, but with its history, and with the circumstances which gave birth to it, I am well acquainted. They were highly discreditable to American legislation, and I hope for its honor will never be again repeated.

After my return to Congress in 1831 my efforts were directed to the modification and reduction of the rates of duty contained in the act of 1828.

The act of 1832 greatly reduced and modified them, and the act of 1833, commonly called the compromise act, still further reduced and modified them. The act which passed at the extra session of 1841, which I supported, was confined to the free articles. I had resigned my seat in the Senate when the act of 1842 passed. Generally, the duties which it imposes are lower than those in the act of 1832. And, without intending to express any opinion upon every item of this last tariff, I would say that I think the provisions, in the main, are wise and proper. If there be any excesses or defects in it (of which I have not the means here of judging) they ought to be corrected.

My opinion that there is no danger hereafter of a high tariff is founded on the gratifying fact that our manufactures have now taken a deep root. In their infancy they needed a greater measure of protection, but as they grow and advance they acquire strength and stability, and consequently will require less protection. Even now some branches of them are able to maintain in distant markets successful competition with rival foreign manufactures.

I have thus quoted very fully from Mr. Clay, beginning in 1820 and ending in 1843, that we may clearly see the exact grounds upon which he sustained the protective system.

THE AMERICAN SYSTEM SO CALLED.

In his speech in March, 1824, for the first time in tariff discussions, Mr. Clay designated the policy of protection, the "American policy," the "American system," and ever since that speech protectionists have rolled this phrase "American system" as a sweet morsel under their tongues and have hurled at all persons who differed with them the charge of favoring a British system of free foreign trade—a foreign system.

Daniel Webster, then a Representative in the House from Massachusetts, on April 1 and 2, 1824, in reply to Mr. Clay, then Speaker of the House, said:

And allow me, sir, in the first place to state my regret, if indeed I ought not to express a warmer sentiment, at the names or designations which Mr. Speaker has seen fit to adopt for the purpose of describing the advocates and the opposers of the present bill. It is a question, he says, between the friends of an "American policy" and those of a "foreign policy." This, sir, is an assumption which I take the liberty most directly to deny. Mr. Speaker certainly intended nothing invidious or derogatory to any part of the House by this mode of denominating friends and enemies. But there is power in names, and this manner of distinguishing those who favor and those who oppose particular measures may lead to inferences to which no member of the House can submit. It may imply that there is a more exclusive and peculiar regard to American interests in one class of opinions than in another. Such an implication is to be resisted and repelled. * * *

Indeed, sir, it is a little astonishing, if it seemed convenient to Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of distinction, to make use of the terms "American policy" and "foreign policy," that he should not have applied them in a manner precisely the reverse of that in which he has in fact used them. If names are thought necessary, it would be well enough, one would think, that the name should be in some measure descriptive of the thing; and since Mr. Speaker denominates the policy which he recommends "a new policy in this country;" since he speaks of the present measure as a new era in our legislation; since he professes to invite us to depart from our accustomed course, to instruct ourselves by the wisdom of others, and to adopt the policy of the most distinguished foreign states, one is a little curious to know with what propriety of speech this imitation of the other nations is denominated an "American policy," while, on the contrary, a preference for our own established system, as it now actually exists, is called a "foreign policy." This favorite American policy is what America has never tried; and this odious foreign policy is what, as we are told, foreign states have never pursued. Sir, that is the truest American policy which shall most usefully employ American capital and American labor and best sustain the whole population. With me it is a fundamental axiom, it is interwoven with my opinions, that the greatest interests of the country are united and inseparable; that agriculture, commerce, and manufactures will prosper together or languish together; and that all legislation is dangerous which proposes to benefit one of these without looking to consequences which may fall on the others.

It would seem that the reply of Mr. Webster would have silenced the further demagogical use of the term "American system," but it did not, and to-day we hear the same use of the term from ocean to ocean.

Why did Mr. Clay use this term of "American system" to designate his protective-tariff system?

Mr. Hamilton in his celebrated report, as before quoted, based his whole system of protective duties and bounties upon the like systems or policies "which have been employed with success in other countries," and reasoned, from their successful adoption and employment by foreign nations, the probability of their success in our country, and thus boldly proposed to introduce these exotic, foreign systems into our country. In the tariff discussion in 1820 Mr. Clay had been warned of the effects of the adoption of this foreign system of protective duties, and especially of the dire results of the system in England, for he said:

And we are warned by the example of England, by her pauperism, by the vices of her population, her wars, and so forth.

And in reply to the warning said:

Pauperism is in general the effect of an overflowing population. Manufactures have undoubtedly produced a redundant population, but so may commerce and so may agriculture.

He was warned of our higher wages for labor in this country than in foreign countries, and of the effect of the protective policies in foreign countries in reduced wages, pauperism, and vices, and that the same foreign policies adopted here would produce like results.

To break the force of these facts, that the policy of protective, discriminating, restrictive duties was the policy then of England and other foreign countries, and the results of such policy there were a redundant, overflowing population, low wages, and pauperism, and that his protective policy was only an imitation of such foreign policy, he introduced and coined the term "American system."

The protective, restrictive policy is not an American system. On the contrary, it is the excluding, restrictive, prohibitive system practiced by the "Celestial Empire," China, for thousands of years, which built by pauper labor the Chinese wall. It is the system to-day of Italy, Spain, France, Germany, Austria, Hungary, and Russia. It was the system of England, and rigidly maintained in the days of Hamilton

and Clay, and until her labor was degraded and wages reduced to starvation point. Such is the historical origin of this real foreign Chinese-British-Italian policy of restrictive, prohibitive duties adopted by protectionists in this country and proclaimed by the Chicago platform as the American system of protection.

Not a word did Mr. Clay utter in behalf of increasing the wages of American labor; not a word for the protection of American labor against the pauper labor of Europe; on the contrary, as with Hamilton so it was with Clay—protection to American manufacturers and contention by both that our wages, compared with the so-called pauper labor of England and Europe, were not as much higher as represented. How long was this protection to continue? Mr. Hamilton claimed that protective duties were necessary and justifiable for "new undertakings," "new manufactures," and that—

The continuance of bounties on manufactures long established must always be of questionable policy—

But fixed no date. Mr. Clay claimed, in 1820, that—

Manufactures were the youngest and weakest interests of the State. Agriculture wants but little or no protection—

And—

our foreign trade wants no further legislative aid.

And, in 1824, that—

The unprotected manufactures of a country are exposed to the danger of being crushed in their infancy.

And—

Let our arts breathe under the shade of protection; let them be perfected as they are in England, and we shall then be ready, as England now is said to be, to put aside protection and to enter upon the freest exchanges.

Mr. Clay called them infant industries in 1820 and 1824, but in 1837 said:

The best friends of the protective policy never intended that that policy should be perpetual.

And that—

All who advocated the system went upon the ground that after a certain time (the precise period they did not attempt to fix) our domestic manufactures would become so thoroughly fixed and permanently established that they would bear the competition of rival products from abroad.

And in speaking of "the remnant of protection" left under compromise tariff of 1833, which was a duty of 20 per cent., said:

For myself, I do believe that the leading manufacturing interests of the country can subsist under it.

In 1838 Mr. Clay said:

No one, Mr. President, in the commencement of the protective policy ever supposed that it was to be perpetual. We hoped and believed that temporary protection extended to our infant manufactures would bring them up and enable them to withstand competition with Europe. * * * If the protective policy were entirely to cease in 1842 it would have existed twenty-six years from 1816 or eighteen from 1824, quite as long as at either of those periods its friends supposed might be necessary.

In his letter to Dr. Bronson in September, 1843, Mr. Clay said:

My opinion that there is no danger hereafter of a high tariff is founded on the gratifying fact that our manufactures have now taken a deep root. In their infancy they needed a greater measure of protection, but as they grow and advance they acquire strength and stability, and consequently will require less protection. Even now some branches of them are able to maintain in distant markets successful competition with rival foreign markets.

And now, after nearly a century of duties under the various tariff laws protective of our manufactures against competition with like manufactured products from foreign countries to the amount of 10 to 25 per cent. from 1789 to 1824, and of 30 to 48 per cent. from 1824 to 1846, and of 25 per cent. from 1846 to 1857, and of 20 per cent. from 1857 to 1861, and of 40 to 50 per cent. from 1861 to this date, and after the lapse of forty-five years from the date of Mr. Clay's letter to Dr. Bronson, we hear the same cry for protective duties to our infant industries.

When will they attain the age of majority—of maturity?

When this British system of protective duties was transplanted in this country by Mr. Hamilton we were then an infant nation in population and time of separate existence, under a republican-democratic government, antagonistic to the other governmental systems of the world, burdened with an onerous debt, without financial credit in the money centers of the world, with limited sources of revenue, with a vast area, with sparse population, and without the essential and necessary supplies, military or otherwise, to render us independent of other nations. We were without railroads, canals, steam-boats, and necessary transportation facilities for the exchange and the internal commerce among our own people. Our products of agriculture and manufacture were largely confined to restricted local markets at home, and when exported were burdened with heavy duties by the restrictive and discriminating policies of foreign nations, and especially our surplus agricultural products, not large in quantity, were, when exported to England, heavily taxed by an almost prohibitive duty; and we had but few products we could sell to or exchange with foreign countries upon equal or fair terms, and were to a large extent dependent on foreign nations for many supplies essential to our existence and success in event of wars. Europe was in a state of almost continual wars, and our new nation was liable at any time and upon easy provocation to be drawn into a war.

Thus situated, the system of protective duties was urged by Hamilton as well as by Clay, to counteract the foreign protective systems, to render us independent as a nation on foreign nations for essential, especially military, supplies, and to induce capital to be invested in new manufactories of such supplies, and to protect the manufacturers in the infancy of such establishments against the competition of old, long-established manufactories in foreign countries; and to insure to such manufacturers a sure return of profits on their investments, and without any purpose of making the system perpetual; and to induce foreign immigration in order to increase the numbers of the laborers in this country, and to enable the manufacturers to trade on a foreign stock, imported laborers, and thus, by increasing the numbers engaged in manufactures, increase the demand for our surplus agricultural products, and furnish in the various localities where manufactories might be established the home market for farm products, then absolutely excluded from the foreign markets by the restrictions and prohibitory laws of England and other countries.

The conditions and surroundings have entirely changed. The grounds upon which the system was advocated by Hamilton and Clay no longer exist.

In 1790 we were a nation of 3,929,214 people. Now we number over 60,000,000.

Then we were in our national infancy—babyhood. Now we are a mature nation one century old.

Then our governmental system was an experiment, dissimilar to any previously existing system, and the envy of all others. Now our system is established beyond doubt, and has carried us safely and victoriously through the war with Great Britain, then the most powerful nation on land and sea, and through the war with our now esteemed and friendly neighbor, Mexico, and through our own late civil war, the severest ordeal to which our system could possibly be subjected.

Then we were poor, burdened with debt, without financial credit and standing among nations, and with limited sources of revenues. Now we are rich in all the elements of true wealth, with financial credit at home and abroad second to no nation on earth, without a dollar of debt we can now redeem or pay without a heavy premium, and with an overflowing Treasury and sources of revenue we are trying to decrease, and with territorial boundaries extending from ocean to ocean and from Canada to Mexico, inhabited by an intelligent, progressive, enterprising, self-reliant, patriotic people.

Then we were dependent on foreign nations for many essential supplies necessary to our national existence, even military supplies, and without transportation facilities for our surplus products. Now, in 1880, we had 253,852 manufacturing establishments with a capital of $2,790,272,606, consuming materials of the value of $3,396,823,549, and yielding an aggregate product of the value of $5,369,579,191; and with steam and water power in 1880 equal to the muscular power of 21,000,000 of men, representing a population of 105,000,000 of people, and capable of manufacturing all the supplies of our consumption at home, if continuously working on full time, in six months, and making us wholly independent of any foreign nation for essential supplies, military or otherwise. And in 1887 we had 148,987 miles of railroad in operation, binding together the oceans that wash our shores, and extending into the territories of our bordering nations, and running into and through every State and Territory except Alaska; and bringing together, excluding Alaska, the farthest parts of our country, in point of time, within one week, and affording boundless facilities of travel and transportation for our surplus products from State to State.

Then the only markets for our surplus products were the home local markets. Now our markets are simply the powers of consumption of our people in every locality in our own country and in all foreign countries, and are quickly and easily accessible to our surplus wherever produced.

Then we had no foreign markets for our surplus agricultural products, because of the restrictive policies of foreign nations. Now the markets of the world are open to the competition of our products on terms equally as advantageous and liberal as we offer them.

And yet we are called upon by our Republican friends to increase the protective duties upon the manufactured products of our century old but still infant industries, and to perpetuate their British-Chinese policy of restriction, to the exclusion of any healthful competition of foreign products in our home markets, and secure to our manufacturers a monopoly of this home market, and thus strengthen the powers of their trusts, which Mr. Blaine calls "private affairs with which the consumers have nothing to do."

THE SO-CALLED HOME MARKET.

This leads us now to consider this "home market for farm products."

This is another pet phrase of protectionists. Why are they continually pleading for a home market, just as they do for their so-called American but real foreign system?

There is an object in view—an end to be secured.

The majority of the Senate committee in their report say—

No class of people in the United States have an equal interest with the farmer in the diversification of our industries and in the development of manufactures, for proximity to profitable markets gives increased value to labor and to land and its products.

And that—

An addition of 5 cents per day to the wages of the workingmen of the country would furnish a market within our own territory equal in extent to the value of the surplus agricultural products now annually exported.

Protectionists point to the tariff duties imposed on corn, 2 cents per bushel, corn-meal same, on wheat 20 cents per bushel, on flour 20 per cent. ad valorem, on beef and pork 1 cent per pound, on hams and bacon 2 cents per pound, and on cheese and butter 4 cents per pound, and on other farm products when imported, to make them believe they, too, are protected against the products of pauper labor in foreign countries.

Our Republican friends say that lands are higher and farm products bring a higher price in the vicinity of manufacturing establishments than elsewhere. To some extent and in regard to some products this is true, but is not caused by protection. Lands are always higher in the vicinity of any locality where any considerable numbers of people are aggregated, and not engaged in farming, are consumers. As in the vicinity of towns and cities and in densely settled districts, regardless of whether such persons are engaged in manufacturing or commercial or other pursuits, and regardless of whether their employments are the beneficiaries of protection.

There are many towns, cities, and communities where lands are higher and farm products bring a higher price than in the more distant surrounding country, and yet where there are no protected industries and no employed consumers in such industries.

There are many industries in this country, wherein are employed thousands of laborers, which do not enjoy any protection and in whose vicinity lands are higher and farm products of certain kinds command a higher price than elsewhere. Therefore protection can not be the cause of such higher prices of lands and for such farm products.

The whole extent of the so-called home market for farm products is the consumption of farm products by those engaged in the protected industries, for whilst so engaged they are consumers and not producers of farm products. Now, to what extent does protection benefit the farmers in the prices of their surplus products to these employés in the protected industries? Our Republican friends say to the full extent such employés consume such products. I deny the assertion, for it is merely an assertion. Bear in mind that in this great country, among all our people, in all our States and Territories, absolute free trade, without any restrictions, burdens, or taxes, is the constitutional system and the law of the land, and all our products of the soil which will bear transportation are carried upon our railroads and navigable waters from ocean to ocean and from Canada to Mexico, and the prices are regulated and controlled, not by any local neighborhood, town, or city market, but by the prices in our great commercial centers and ports of export to foreign markets. And the foreign markets of the world absolutely regulate, fix, and determine the prices of all such transportable products, not only in such markets, but also throughout the length and breadth of our whole country, subject only to the cost of such transportation.

Consequently our farmers derive no benefit whatever in the prices of their surplus products susceptible of transportation, in these local markets where employés are aggregated in protected industries and only receive the price of such articles in such localities as regulated and fixed by the foreign markets of the whole world.

Now, as to farm products, which will not bear, or are not susceptible of transportation—quickly perishable vegetables and products—the local market everywhere—the number of consumers of such articles in each locality, determines the price regardless of whether such consumers are engaged in protected or unprotected industries, or commercial or other pursuits, or mere pleasure seekers at resorts, or students in institutions of learning, or Government officials and employés.

Protection is therefore of no benefit to such producers of perishable products in the prices they receive.

Protection therefore does not and can not affect or increase the prices of the surplus products of the farmers; and the so-called home market for farm products is a myth, a delusion, and a snare to entrap farmers into voting for the Republican party.

Now, as to the extent of the increase of consumers of surplus farm products by protection, I say emphatically that a high protective tariff as distinguished or opposed to a revenue tariff has never caused, does not now and can not in future cause, any increase in the numbers of consumers engaged in manufacturing industries over or above the numbers who have been or will be employed in such industries under a revenue tariff.

But admitting for the sake of argument that all the persons engaged in protected manufactures are so engaged because of the high protective tariff, and to the extent of their numbers are consumers of surplus farm products, are they consumers in such numbers and of such quantities as to seriously affect the prices of the surplus farm products? Let the facts and figures show. The total population of the United States of all ages, sexes, and races in 1880 was 50,155,873, and the total number of all persons engaged in both manufacturing and mining industries was 3,837,112. Deduct from this number those engaged in the unprotected industries of the country, such as carpenters, blacksmiths, butchers, bakers, etc., and we have not exceeding 2,623,089 persons, including all ages, sexes, and races engaged in protected industries. As to the whole population they are as 1 in 19, or about 5.23 per cent.

In 1880 the total exports of all kinds of products from the United States amounted to $823,946,353. Of this sum the agricultural products were $685,867,737, being 83.24 per cent. of all exports. After having exhausted the home market this vast sum of surplus agricultural products was exported and sold in the foreign markets of the world—in competition with the pauper labor of India, Russia, and all other parts of the world—and the prices in the markets of the world regulated and fixed the price not only in such markets, but also in the home market.

Our Republican friends, in their Senate report, as quoted before, say that an addition of 5 cents per day to the wages of the workingmen of the country would furnish a market for all this surplus of farm products so exported. Do they mean to leave the impression that an addition of 5 cents per day to the wages of those engaged in protected industries would equal in amount the value of all such exported farm products? If they did not mean this, why make such a statement? Perhaps they meant that our workingmen do not have sufficient food under a high tariff, and if their wages were increased 5 cents per day they could eat that much more.

I admire their arithmetic. Five cents per day—working days, three hundred—would be $15, and, counting 2,623,089 as the employés or consumers in protected industries, would amount to $39,346,335—to equal the exports of surplus farm products of $685,867,737 in value.

Suppose, however, that each of the men, women, and children engaged in protected industries consumed during the year $40 worth of the kind of articles so exported, and this estimate is too high, they would only have consumed $104,923,560 worth, or less than one-sixth of the value of such exported articles, and such consumption would have but little effect. Our Republican friends claim they are protecting farm products.

The following statement will show some of the surplus farm products exported in 1880, and the imports, duties, etc.:

Articles.	Exports.	Imports.	Duties.
Cotton, raw	$211,535,905	$591,120	Free.
Corn	54,279,608	65,364	10 cents per bushel.
Wheat	190,546,305	534,475	20 cents per bushel.
Flour	35,333,197	28,532	20 per cent. ad valorem.
Meat products	132,488,201	1,239,292	1 cent per pound on beef and pork, 2 cents per pound on hams and bacon, and 4 cents per pound on butter and cheese.
Butter and cheese	18,862,407		
Total value	643,045,623		

This shows clearly the farce of the so-called home market and the protective duties on such products. Farm products have no competition worthy the name in the home market with like foreign products.

But farmers compete with the products of the lowest and most degraded pauper labor of the world in the markets of the world, and receive for their surplus products both in the home and foreign markets the prices established and regulated by such foreign market with such competition, and are neither directly nor indirectly the beneficiaries of any tariff duties at home, and in some foreign markets even have to submit to protective duties imposed on their surplus products exported thereto. Farmers can not be benefited by high-tariff taxes.

To establish these facts beyond the power even of Republican protectionists to dispute them, I will present the deliberate statements of two distinguished Republican leaders, Senators on this floor, representing great agricultural farming constituencies.

Senator W. B. ALLISON, of Iowa, said in the House on March 24, 1870:

The agricultural interest, it will be seen, is much the largest interest in its aggregate product, as well as in the number of persons employed. I believe no one will claim that this large interest is directly protected. It is true that under customs laws there is a small duty upon wheat, barley, oats, and other agricultural products, but it does not afford any protection to the great wheat and grain-producing regions of the country. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Wilson], in discussing this question, stated that the cost of wheat in New England is about $1.70 per bushel, while in Illinois, Iowa, and Wisconsin the price is about 65 cents per bushel. The Canadian wheat is the only wheat that comes in competition with our own. Canada being nearer New England than the wheat-growing States more than makes up the duty in the reduced cost of transportation.

What is true of wheat is equally true of other grains. Therefore the farmer has practically no protection at all, and whatever benefit he derives is from what the home market furnishes for home products. Unfortunately for the farmer the market price of wheat is fixed by the price which the surplus will bring abroad, or the price of wheat in London or Liverpool. At that market, where the surplus is sold, and which fixes the value of the whole crop, he comes in competition with the grain produced in the Crimea, in Hungary, and in the region of the Baltic, from fields cultivated by what is known, in comparison with our own, as pauper labor.

But I am told we must so legislate as to furnish a home market for all our agricultural products, and this can only be done by high tariff. Any one examining the subject will see that our agricultural products increase more rapidly than our population, so that if we do not export these products in their natural condition we must do so by converting them into manufactured articles and export these articles. But this can not be done under a high tariff, for all nations will buy manufactured products where they are the cheapest, and the nation selling the cheapest will control the market. This rule excludes our

highly-taxed manufactures made from highly-taxed materials from the markets of the world, although we have natural advantages possessed by no other nation.

Senator P. B. PLUMB, of Kansas, January 17, 1883, said in this Chamber:

I do not ask that any duty shall be increased. No one raising anything within the State of Kansas, and no manufacturer in that State asks for an increase of duty on anything. We do ask that a ring—if I may use that expression without offense—a collection and combination of interests located upon the eastern frontier of this country, near the seat and source of power, easily accessible to tariff commissions and easy to get their ears, shall not have their own way about everything of this kind, entirely irrespective of the sections of this country remote from the seat and sources of power.

Mr. President, some of us have got to be consulted before this bill finally passes, and some of us will be consulted after the bill has passed in regard to the reasons for the action or non-action taken. I say now to the persons who have the run of this thing, to those who have had control and are better posted, and have been able by arts and various processes to do those things which were not thoroughly understood—I beg of them to consider that the people are watching this proceeding, and that they want no higher taxes, but lower taxes, and that in giving the protection for American industry they want to give a decent chance to a class of people who by reason of their calling can not be protected at all, but who have got to take their chances in the market of the world for their products, hard products to raise, expensive products to get to market, and in the production of which there is the smallest margin of profit.

I was talking with a farmer from Massachusetts to-day about this thing. He said he had as good a farm as there was in the old Bay State, and yet he said that he could barely make both ends meet, and he complained to me that one of the reasons why he could not do so was because everything else that surrounded him was so much protected that it simply took the difference between profit and loss in his calling, and left him a very slim chance indeed, from year to year.

I will present the testimony of that distinguished soldier and statesman, whose presence in this Chamber we all so much miss, and whose death we mourn.

General John A. Logan said in the House on April 18, 1870:

Now, when the gentleman, who seems to be the protector to an especial manner of the great labor interests of the country, speaks of this protection being the protection of the labor of this country, I ask him: Does not every farmer and mechanic in this broad land make use of iron in all kinds of labor? The 4,000,000 men that have been freed recently are laborers, are producers, not manufacturers. They are not men of skilled labor; they evidently are not the men who are protected. And then there are the men in the Northwest who produce corn, wheat, oats, pork, and beans, etc.; they are producers and consumers, and are not protected; and it is they who pay this large amount of money into the pockets of the manufacturers of this article. And when a gentleman stands upon this floor and tells me that this high, this extraordinary high tariff is for the protection of the laboring men of this country who are not skilled laborers, I tell him I do not understand how he can possibly substantiate such a theory.

If we will not buy of foreign nations, they will not buy of us. If we sell to them, we must buy of them.

Close the markets of the world to the exports of our surplus farm products and the ruin and bankruptcy of our farmers follow unavoidably, and all other industries suffer.

There is, however, a home market—a prolific, enriching home market—for the protected manufactured products, but none for surplus farm products.

Let census and record figures show the enchanting beauties of this home market for manufactured products.

By the Tenth Census the value of manufacturing products was $5,369,579,196. Deduct from this the value of materials, $3,396,823,549, and we have the value of net product, $1,972,755,642. This is an enormous sum of products to be sold in some market. Where was it sold, and in competition with what other like products? In 1880 the total imports into the United States were $667,954,746, of which $208,301,863 were free of duty, and $459,652,883 were dutiable, and upon which duties or taxes to the amount of $186,522,065 were paid into our Treasury by the consumers of such imports. In the same year the total exports, $823,946,353, of which $685,867,737 were exported agricultural products, leaving only $138,078,616 as the value of all other exports, and at the highest estimate not over $90,000,000 were protected manufactured products.

The following statement shows some of the manufactured products so exported and imported:

Manufactured products.	Exported.	Imported.
Cotton manufactures	$9,981,418	$29,929,366
Iron and steel manufactures	14,716,524	53,714,008
Wood and manufactures	16,237,376	6,650,598
Woolens	216,576	33,911,093
Earthen, stone, and china ware	196,724	5,760,163

Deduct the $90,000,000 worth of manufactured products enjoying home protection from net product $1,972,755,642, we have $1,882,755,642 of manufactured products sold in our home market, with the advantage and benefit of high protective duties imposed on all like foreign products imported. In this net product of manufacturing products sold in the home market there are doubtless many products not enjoying the benefit of protective duties, or in fact any duties. For these make a liberal allowance of $350,000,000, and we still have $1,532,755,642 as the value of the manufactured products enjoying the home market and hedged around with high protective duties on like imports.

It is no wonder that manufacturers enjoying this hedged-in home market organize into "home-market clubs," and publish tariff-league bulletins, and sundry other publications, circulars, and leaflets, and send them broadcast throughout the land, through the mails and Republican campaign committees and clubs, and hire Jarrett and other pretended laboring men to proclaim the benefits of this home market, of which they have the exclusive monopoly for their millions of products, up to the limit of the high tariff duties on like imported products. Having this monopoly, they try to make farmers believe that the home market is for them. In 1880 the $459,652,883 worth of foreign products imported and taxed by the tariff laws $186,522,065 was the only competition they had with products of the world, and against this they had the shield and protection of the tariff duties as stated.

What is the origin of this home market for farm products? It originated with Hamilton and Clay, as shown in my quotations from them.

Why did they plead for a home market for farm products? Because there was then no foreign market for such products, on account of the restrictive, prohibitive corn laws of England and restrictive laws of other foreign countries. And such products were practically denied admission into foreign countries.

Mr. Hamilton said:

The United States are to a certain extent in the situation of a country precluded from foreign commerce. The regulations of several countries with which we have the most extensive intercourse throw serious obstructions in the way of the principal staples of the United States.

Mr. Clay said:

The policy of all Europe is averse to the reception of our agricultural produce, so far as it comes into collision with its own, and under that limitation we are absolutely forbid to enter their ports, except under circumstances which deprive them of all value as a steady market.

Since those days the conditions have entirely changed. England in 1846 to 1848 repealed her obnoxious corn laws and other nations removed their restrictions, and now our agricultural products of cotton, wheat, meats, etc., are admitted free of duty in almost every country and our surplus agricultural products are left free to compete in the foreign markets with all the laborers of all countries, and their prices there regulate and fix the prices there and here, and they therefore have no advantages in the home market over the foreign, but are absolutely controlled by the foreign.

Yet we hear the same old song of home market, delicious and enriching to the manufacturers, who enjoy its exclusive monopoly; pernicious and impoverishing to the farmers, who enjoy no advantages in it over the foreign markets.

The grounds upon which it was advocated by Hamilton and Clay have passed away and no longer exist, and yet our Republican friends persist in proclaiming it the panacea for the farmers, merely to catch their votes.

WHO PAYS THE TARIFF DUTIES IMPOSED BY OUR LAWS UPON DUTIABLE IMPORTED ARTICLES?

Any person, firm, or corporation, either at home here, or in any foreign country, desiring to sell in our markets such dutiable article ascertains the cost at foreign factory, the transportation and insurance charges, and the tariff duties, and by adding all these items together determines the total cost of the articles to him when ready for sale here, and then ascertains the selling price in our markets, and determines by comparing the relative total cost and the selling price the margin, if any, for profit on the investment.

The tariff duty is just as much a part of the total cost here as the cost at factory or the transportation and insurance charges, and is essentially an inseparable part of the total cost of such article when ready for sale in our markets, and the profit expected to be realized in its sale is computed upon the tariff duty so paid as fully as upon the factory cost or transportation and other expenses. And the consumer of such article must and does necessarily and unavoidably pay, in the price paid for such article, the amount of such duty with percentage of profit added thereto.

For illustration: An American citizen desiring to purchase either for his own consumption or for sale in our home market an article of foreign manufacture, costing at the factory $1,000, and the transportation and other expenses being $20 and the tariff duty 60 per cent. ad valorem, or $600, can make his purchase in different ways as may best suit his convenience. He may purchase directly from the foreign manufacturer, and in such case pays the $1,000 factory cost, the $20 expenses, and upon the delivery of the article in our Government warehouse does and must pay the $600 tariff duty before the article can be delivered to him or transferred to his house. The total cost to him is $1,620, and if he consumes the article the tariff duty of $600 is an integral part of the $1,620 cost to him. If he sells the article he computes his profit as much upon the $600 paid for tariff duty as upon the $1,000 paid at factory. And the final consumer, whoever he may be, pays in the total price paid for such article the amount of such duty, with profit thereon added.

He may, to suit his convenience, purchase such article of the foreign manufacturer, or of his resident agent, partner or branch house in this country, to be delivered at his own business house or home. And in this case the seller, either foreign manufacturer, his resident agent, partner or branch house, pays the $20 transportation charges, and, upon

the delivery of the article from the ship or railroad in our Government warehouse, must and does pay the $600 tariff duty before the article can be removed, and then delivers such article to such purchaser and receives from him the total amount, $1,620, being the factory cost, transportation expenses, and duty, and our American citizen purchasing in this way pays the tariff duty of $600 as fully as if he himself had imported the article and had paid the said three items—$1,000 factory cost, $20 expenses, and $600 duty—to the three different persons, manufacturer, carrier, and collector of customs.

Suppose, however, that after he has bought this article at a cost of $1,620 the selling price in the market falls, or fashions or styles change, or financial depression ensue, or he becomes financially embarrassed, or for any other cause he is compelled to sell the article at cost, the consumer still pays the duties. He may be compelled to sell the article even at a loss of 10, 20, 30, or 50, or any other per cent., then he is the sufferer and the consumer the gainer. He does not deduct the loss from the item of $600 tariff duty any more than from the item of $1,000 factory cost.

He simply charges his loss to account of loss. This is an incident to all transactions of buying and selling all kinds of products, domestic and foreign, dutiable and free, and is an exception to the general rule of business; and in all such cases of loss the consumer gets the benefit of such reduced price. Certainly no one buys to sell again without the hope of gain or profit. If mistaken, he must bear the loss.

The duty is imposed by law upon the specific article when imported, not upon the foreign manufacturer, not upon the common carrier of such articles, not upon the importer, nor yet upon the seller or the buyer. It is imposed by law upon such dutiable imported articles, regardless of the persons producing or handling, buying or selling such article for the express and avowed purpose of making such article cost more; of increasing the cost of such article in our markets by the amount of the tariff duty; for the especial benefit and protection, not of the consumer, nor of the importer, whoever he may be, but of the home manufacturer, and for the further express purpose of making the consumer of such foreign article pay this increased additional cost of the tariff duty if he will purchase such foreign article in preference to the like article manufactured here. If this be not the object and purpose of imposing tariff duties upon imported articles, then protection and high tariff laws are a humbug, a fraud, a delusion, a will-o'-the-wisp.

The fact that the consumer of any imported product pays the tariff duties thereon in the increased price paid for such article seems so plain, so patent, that no one would dispute it. Yet we find the protectionist leaders and publications claiming that the foreign manufacturer pays the tariff duties, not the consumer. If this be true, the consumer is benefited to the amount of the tariff duties. This conclusion must necessarily and logically follow if the claim be true that the foreign manufacturer pays the tariff. Practically this claim is that the protectionists have devised a mysterious system imposing high tariff duties upon imported articles, whereby the foreign manufacturers and exporters to this country have to pay such duties and then sell such articles to our consumers without adding such duties as a part of the price.

There is no mystery about taxes imposed on an imported article. The consumer of such article pays it. No arithmetical legerdemain can relieve him from its payment.

Senator EDMUNDS, in his tariff article in Harper's Magazine for February, 1888, in reply to Mr. Watterson, refers to the policy of England in advocating partial free trade, and what she knew, and said, meaning England:

> Well understanding the error of the idea that seems to be advanced in Mr. Watterson's article, that it is the consumer who bears the whole burden of impost duties, and well understanding the fact that at least a very heavy proportion of such imposts is borne by the foreign producer or manufacturer, this last-named fact appears to be entirely overlooked by those who advocate great reductions of customs duties as a benefit to the consumer and as a relief of the consumer from taxation. If the profits of the foreign manufacturer or producer are essentially diminished by customs duties, and are essentially increased by the diminution or abolition thereof, then so far the money obtained from them is not by taxation of our own people, but by taxation of the foreigner; and if the surplus revenues are to be reduced by the abolition or reduction of the customs duties, so far they are reduced not for the benefit of our own people but to the benefit of people of other countries who are the exporters of goods to our markets.

He attempts to sustain his position by referring to the removal of the duties on coffee and tea, and says no decrease in selling price here resulted, and makes comparisons of prices.

The fallacy of his statement is clearly shown by his illustration of the effects of removing duties from coffee and tea, articles not produced in this country and not benefited in production here by duties.

The question is not what effect the removal of duties from an article not manufactured or produced in this country may have upon its selling price here.

Protectionists advocate protective duties on articles manufactured here, to defend, to protect the home manufacturers against competition or too close competition with like articles manufactured abroad, and the effects of an increase or reduction of tariff duties must and can only be ascertained by confining comparisons to protected articles produced here with like articles produced abroad.

Senator EDMUNDS says—

> "If" the profits of the foreign manufacturer or producer are essentially diminished by customs duties and are essentially increased by the diminution or abolition thereof, then so far the money obtained from them is not by taxation of our own people but by taxation of the foreigner.

He uses his famous "if," and does not assert his proposition to be true.

His "if" is based upon the supposition that the demand and supply, and consequently the market price paid by the consumer, remain unchanged, and disregards competition.

Take as an example an article of cotton cloth manufactured here and in England, the cost of which in England is $950 and here $1,000, and the market price—selling price to consumer—is $1,200. There being no duty, the English manufacturer receives $250 profit and the home manufacturer $200 profit, and the consumer pays $1,200.

Now, impose a tariff duty of 10 per cent. ad valorem on the imported article, and you reduce the profit of the foreigner to $155 and leave the profit of the American at $200, and consumer pays $1,200 for the article and is not benefited; but the home manufacturer realizes a relatively higher profit.

Now, impose a tariff duty of 20 per cent. ad valorem, or an equivalent specific duty on the imported article, and you reduce the profit of the foreigner to $60 and relatively increase the profit of the American manufacturer, and the consumer still pays $1,200 and is not benefited.

Now, impose 30 per cent. ad valorem duty, and the foreigner suffers a loss of $35 and the American receives his same $200 profit and has a monopoly of the American home market, and the consumer still pays the same $1,200, derives no benefit, and is liable to have the $1,200 market price slightly increased.

Now, increase the duty to 40 per cent. ad valorem, and the foreigner would lose $130, if he still sold at $1,200, and the home manufacturer would have an exclusive monopoly of the home market; and even at the same price of $1,200 the consumer would still pay the tariff tax and would certainly have the market price increased to $1,250 or $1,300.

Now, reverse the transaction. There is a 40 per cent. duty on the foreign article and the home manufacturer has a monopoly, no competition from abroad, and holds the article at $1,200, or even an increase, and no duty goes to the Government. Reduce the duty to 30 per cent. and he still has a monopoly. Reduce it to 20 per cent. and the foreign producer can make a profit of $60 on his product, worth at home $950, and begins to export the product to this country, and as long as the demand, the consumption, will take all the home product and foreign at the $1,200, the home manufacturer keeps on his $200 profit, but if the market becomes dull and demand light he reduces the price in the home market to $1,140, or his profit to 14 per cent., and then the foreigner can make no profit and must retire. And in all cases of reduction of duties the consumer receives the benefit, either in reduced price of foreign product or reduced price of home product, or both.

The consumer at home, and never the foreigner, pays all tariff duties on imported articles, and not only this, but he pays to the home manufacturer for his product profits increased by the amount of the tariff duties imposed on like competing imported article, subject only to the competition in this country among and between the protected manufacturers.

When the duty is so high that there is no margin of profit to the manufacturer in foreign countries on his products exported to this country, you close our ports to the entry of his products, and the duty becomes prohibitory and gives the home manufacturers a monopoly and the liberty, power, and temptation to form trusts and combinations, to reduce any competition among themselves, limit the products of their factories to the consumptive demand at their own prices, and to shut down their factories whenever production exceeds consumption, and thus begin a reduction of consumption, which leads to industrial depression and to lock-outs of laborers and to want, misery, and suffering.

But to establish still more clearly that the consumer pays in the price paid for a dutiable imported article the amount of the tariff duty thereon with the per cent. of profit generally added, I will quote from protectionists whose loyalty to the system can not be doubted. Mr. Clay said, in 1832, in speaking of the public debt:

> It is so nearly being totally extinguished that we may now safely inquire whether, without prejudice to any established policy, we may not relieve the consumption of the country by the repeal or reduction of duties.

If the consumers of the country did not pay the tariff duties, how could their repeal or reduction relieve them?

Ex-President John Quincy Adams, when a Representative in the House from Massachusetts, on May 23, 1832, submitted to the House from the Committee on Manufactures his celebrated report, No. 481, in which he discusses fully who pays the tariff duties, and says:

> But the duty upon the article imported from abroad enabled the domestic producer to enter into competition with the importer from abroad. So long as this competition continues the duty operates as a bounty or premium to the domestic manufacturer. But by whom is it paid? Certainly by the purchaser of the article, whether of foreign or of domestic manufacture. The duty constitutes a part of the price of the whole mass of the article in the market. It is substantially paid upon the article of domestic manufacture as well as upon

that of foreign production. Upon one it is a bounty, upon the other a burden, and the repeal of the tax must operate as an equivalent reduction of the price of the article, whether foreign or domestic. * * *

The incidental effect of competition in the market, excited on the part of the domestic manufacturer by the aggravation of duty upon the corresponding article imported from abroad to reduce the price of the article, must be transient and momentary. The general and permanent effect must be to increase the price of the article to the extent of the additional duty, and it is then paid by the consumer. If it were not so, if the general effect of adding to a duty were to make the price of the article upon which it is levied less, the converse of the proposition would also be true, and the operation for increasing the price of the domestic article would be to repeal the duty upon the same article imported—an experiment which the friends of our internal industry will not be desirous of making. We can not subscribe, therefore, to the doctrine that the duties of impost protective of our own manufactures are paid by the foreign merchant or manufacturer.

This should be absolutely conclusive.

PROTECTION TO AMERICAN LABOR.

The burden of the song of protectionists to-day is the alleged protection of our laboring people against foreign pauper labor.

Our Republican friends assert that a high protection tariff gives higher and better wages to laborers engaged in our manufactures—than they would receive under a revenue tariff—which necessarily affords protection to the extent and amount of the duties or tariff taxes imposed under it.

The Democratic party denies it.

The issue is squarely and fairly made.

The Republican protectionists hold the affirmative, and the Democratic party the negative.

We demand affirmative proof, facts and figures, of protectionists to maintain their position.

What do they offer in the way of proof, facts and figures?

Mr. Blaine points to the low wages, deprivations, sufferings, almost starvation, of laborers in England and Europe, and then points to the happy, prosperous, joyous, and contented condition and high wages of American laborers, and warns the American laborers that the proposed House bill, reducing the average ad valorem rates of duties from 50.60 per cent. to 42.77 per cent., a reduction of 7.83 per cent., will reduce their wages and lower them to a level with foreign laborers and reduce them to a like condition.

In this he only follows in the footsteps of his distinguished successor in the Senate, Senator FRYE, who previously made a tour of Europe, and has ever since been depicting to American laborers the fearful condition of the pauper laborers of Europe, and appealing to them to vote for a high protective tariff to prevent being reduced to a similar condition.

They say that this proposed reduction of the tariff duties will cause many American manufacturers to close, and thus throw out of employment their laborers, or will force these manufacturers to reduce the wages of labor in order to maintain competition with rival establishments in foreign countries employing so-called pauper labor. In support of their first point, that wages are higher in this country than in England, Europe, or any other country, they present many tables of figures, comparing the daily, weekly, monthly, and yearly wages in this country with the wages for like employment in England, Europe, and other foreign countries, and showing higher wages here than in those countries. In reply we say with the greatest pleasure and pride, yes, wages in dollars and cents in this country as compared with wages in foreign countries by the day, week, month, or year are higher, and we intend they shall remain so, if our wise and just policy shall prevail.

But our Republican friends say the high tariff, the high taxes they have imposed upon foreign products, causes and produces these higher wages in this country, and must be maintained to keep the wages up to their present rate. This we most emphatically deny, and demand the proofs that high tariff taxes have either caused or will maintain higher wages here than in foreign countries. Now, what proof do they offer? They fall back upon the one only simple fact, which we gladly admit, that wages are higher here than in foreign countries. The fact of higher wages here we admit. The assumption, the assertion, that protection causes these higher wages we deny *in toto*. In order to expose the glaring fallacy of this mere assertion, let us apply to this one fact and one false assertion the principles of logic.

Before doing this let me state unquestioned facts, which every intelligent American voter must know, that England is called a free-trade country, and that Russia, Germany, France, Italy, Austria-Hungary, Spain, and other European countries have high protective tariff duties on products imported, just as this country has to-day, and that wages, by the day, week, month, or year, compared in dollars and cents, are higher in England than in any other country except the United States, and are higher in France than in any other continental country, and are higher in Germany than in Austria, Spain, or Italy, and that these countries, Spain, France, Italy, Germany, and Austria, are adjoining and contiguous countries, with lines of division and separation such as mark the boundaries of our respective States, with railroads and transportation routes connecting and running into and through them respectively as in our adjoining States. They are, however, separate and independent nations with different languages.

Now, our Republican friends reason thus: Wages are higher in the United States than in any other country. The United States have a high protective tariff, therefore the high protective tariff causes higher wages and must be maintained. The major premise we admit, the minor premise we admit, but the conclusion is false.

Now, apply the same logic to other countries. Wages are lower in Italy than any other European country. Italy has a high protective tariff, therefore a high protective tariff causes lower wages in Italy and must be maintained to keep them lower.

Again, wages are lower in Germany than in England. Germany has a high protective tariff, therefore a high protective tariff causes such lower wages.

Again, wages are higher in France than in Germany. France has a high tariff, therefore the high tariff causes the higher wages. Wages are lower in Germany than in France. Germany has a high protective tariff, therefore this high tariff causes the lower wages. Wages are higher in the United States than in Germany, France, and Italy, and all four countries have high tariffs; therefore, if the high tariff in this country causes the higher wages here, then the same high tariff in each of those countries must cause the lower wages there.

Wages are higher in England than in Europe. England has free trade; therefore free trade causes the higher wages.

If because wages are higher in this country than in England, the high tariff here causes such higher wages; then, because wages are higher in England than Europe, free trade there must cause the higher wages.

Canada and Mexico, our adjoining countries, each have high tariffs and lower wages than in this country. If the high tariff here cause the higher wages, then the high tariff in Canada and Mexico must cause the lower wages there.

In all these cases the major and minor premises are true, but in each the conclusion must be false. The same substantial cause in such adjoining countries can not possibly produce such diametrically opposite effects.

The conclusion is irresistible that a high tariff, high protective duties, can not and do not in this or any other country increase the rate of wages.

But to further expose the fallacy, the falsity of this assumption—mere assertion—that protection, high tariff taxes, increase wages, compare the rates of wages in this country in the different States, and even in different localities in the same State.

Hon. Carroll D. Wright, Commissioner of Labor, in his first annual report, for 1886, shows by numerous tables "the variation in the rates of wages" in the different States and different localities of the same State, and says:

A casual examination of these summaries will show that any attempt to prove an American rate of wages must necessarily result in failure. There is no such thing as an American rate of wages.

The following are examples of the variation in the rates of wages in same kind of work in manufactures in different States and in different localities in same State:

In agricultural implements the average rates of daily wages for males were for "molders," in Illinois, $3.13; in Indiana, $1.65; in Pennsylvania, $1.80; and in Ohio, $2.51. For painters, $2.09 in Illinois, $1.72 in Indiana, $1.50 in Maine, and $2.50 in Pennsylvania.

In cotton goods, for "carders," 85 cents in Delaware, 71 cents in Maryland, $1.26 in Massachusetts, 96 cents in New Hampshire, and $1.20 in New York; for "engineers," $2.50 in Connecticut, $1.50 in Georgia, $2.04 in Massachusetts, $2 in New Jersey, $2.43 in Pennsylvania, and $4.33 in Vermont; for "machinists," $1.50 in Connecticut, $1.83 in Maine, $2.13 in Maryland, $1.47 in Massachusetts, $2.35 in New Jersey, $1.94 in New York, and $2 in North Carolina; and for "overseers," in Connecticut $2.57, in Georgia $3.43, in Massachusetts $2.85, in New Hampshire $4.15, and in New York $2.56.

In "metals and metallic goods," for "puddlers," in Delaware $2.50, in Illinois $4, in New York $2.84, in Pennsylvania $3.47, and in West Virginia $2.75.

In "print works," for "engravers," in New Hampshire $4.28, in New Jersey $2, and in Pennsylvania $3.33.

In "woolen goods," for "carders," in California $1.75, in Vermont $1, in Pennsylvania $2.65, and in New York $1.08; for "dyers," in California $1.87, in Delaware $3, in Maine $1.44, in Massachusetts $1.12, in New Jersey $1, and in Vermont $1.02; for "finishers," in Connecticut 98 cents, in Massachusetts 99 cents, in New Jersey 75 cents, in New York $1.25, and in Missouri $2; for "weavers," in Delaware $1.71, in New Jersey $1, in New York $1.08, in New Hampshire $1.50, and in Massachusetts $1.28.

In different localities in some States—in Ohio in agricultural implements, "plows," for blacksmiths, in one establishment $2.50, in another $2, and in another, $1.75; and such like variations exist in other States. These variations in the prices for the same kind of work exist in foreign countries and in different localities in the same country in about the same degree as in the different States in this country and in different localities in the same State, and they also exist in all the industries, protected and unprotected, here and elsewhere, and the rates of wages here in the unprotected industries are relatively as much higher than in foreign countries as the rates in the protected industries are. Therefore protection can not regulate or increase wages. How

can these facts of the differences in wages in different States and different localities in the same State exist if the tariff duties regulate or increase wages?

Absolute free trade, without restrictions, taxes, or burdens of any kind between all the States and Territories of our great country and among all our 60,000,000 of people is the constitutional policy, and exists while the same tariff duties are uniform in every State. Can the same cause operating uniformly everywhere in this country produce such widely different effects or results? It is absolutely impossible.

This assertion—mere assumption—that protection is specially for the benefit of the laborers, wage-workers, of this country, and not for the benefit and enrichment of manufacturers, is now the main reliance of protectionists, our Republican friends, to maintain the high tariff duties. Hence the frantic efforts to make the voters, the toiling laborers, believe and assent to this assertion. This is comparatively a new subterfuge, a *dernier ressort* of those who advocate high protective duties.

The protective system, high tariff duties, this exotic system, formed and fashioned in imitation of the restrictive, prohibitory systems of foreign nations, practiced by the Celestial Empire and by Great Britain before our nation was born, when civilization and humane efforts for the amelioration of the masses were struggling with barbarism and feudalism, and it was thought to be necessary to shelter and hedge around every industry with the strictest laws, was not transplanted and established and maintained here to regulate or increase the wages of the employés engaged therein, and had no such object in view. On the contrary, it was established for the express purpose of encouraging and protecting manufactures, such manufactories as would tend to render us independent of foreign nations for essential, particularly military, supplies, and of insuring to manufacturers remunerative profits for their investments of capital, and was never intended to be perpetual, but only temporary, as I have already shown, and the fact was admitted and recognized that the tendency would be the reduction of the then existing higher wages in this country to the standard rates in foreign countries.

What are the proofs of these statements? In the tariff law of July 4, 1789, to which protectionists so often refer, the preamble recited:

Whereas it is necessary for the support of the Government, for the discharge of the debts of the United States, and the encouragement and protection of manufactures that duties be laid on goods, wares, and merchandises imported.

And not a word or syllable can be found in that law looking to the protection of American labor or increasing wages.

On January 15, 1790, the House of Representatives, in the Second Congress, ordered the Secretary of the Treasury, Alexander Hamilton—

to prepare and report a proper plan or plans for the encouragement and promotion of such manufactories as will tend to make the United States independent of other nations for essential, particularly for military, supplies.

Not a word or syllable can be found in this order about any plan for protecting American labor or increasing wages. The Secretary, Mr. Hamilton, submitted his report on manufactures, from which I have quoted so largely, and said not a word about protecting American labor against the cheaper or pauper labor of all foreign countries, or increasing the wages of American laborers; but, on the contrary, expressly enumerated as the fourth principal reason, which would make manufacturing establishments beneficial to the country, "the promoting of emigration from foreign countries," which was to be the panacea for the "scarcity of hands and the dearness of labor."

He admitted the fact, then and ever since existing, that wages were higher in this country than in any other, and affirmed that—

in respect to hands for carrying on manufactures we shall in a great measure trade upon a foreign stock.

Import our manufacturing laborers or employés, reserve our own laborers for other pursuits, and thus, by increasing the numbers of those seeking employment, lessen the scarcity of hands and necessarily reduce the wages.

He admitted that protecting duties—

evidently amount to a virtual bounty on the domestic fabrics;

And—

by enhancing the charges on foreign articles they enable the national manufacturers to undersell all their foreign competitors;

And—

wear a beneficent aspect toward the manufacturers of the country;

And that—

as often as a duty upon a foreign article makes an addition to its price, it causes an extra expense to the community for the benefit of the domestic manufacturer.

It is thus clear that the acknowledged father of this British-Chinese protective system urged its establishment and maintenance, not for the purpose of protecting American labor or increasing wages, then, as now, higher in this country than any other, but for the encouragement and protection of the manufacturers and to insure to them remunerative profits.

Mr. Clay, the successor of Mr. Hamilton, in defending and maintaining this protective anti-American system, never urged it for the purpose of protecting American labor or increasing wages. On the contrary, when warned of the results of the high protective system of Great Britain in producing lower wages, pauperism, and vice, and that the same results might follow the transplanting and maintaining of this British system in America, he replied that—

Pauperism is in general the effect of an overflowing population. Manufactures have undoubtedly produced a redundant population.

And that while our waste lands existed they were a security against the abuses of the manufacturing system and the effects of too great a density of population, and would draw off the redundancy, but were—

An impediment in the opinion of some to the success of manufacturing industry by its tendency to prevent the reduction of the wages of labor.

He urged that—

The abundance of capital, * * * the reduction of the wages of labor, and the decline in the price of property of every kind, as well as that of agricultural produce, all concur favorably for domestic manufactures.

He contended that relatively wages were not so much higher here than in England, as was claimed.

The facts, therefore, are that wages were higher in this country before any tariff law was enacted than in any other country, and have ever since remained so, and that this British system of high protective duties was advocated for the benefit of manufacturers, and to promote emigration from foreign countries to compete here with our American labor, to increase the numbers seeking employment, increase the competition, and reduce the wages.

This has ever since been the policy of protectionists—to import the hands to carry on manufactures, to trade upon a foreign stock.

The conclusive evidence of this is found in the enactment of the law of July 4, 1864, entitled "An act to encourage immigration" (volume 13, United States Statutes at Large, pages 385, 386, 387).

This law appropriated $25,000 to carry its provisions into effect and authorized the appointment by the President of a Commissioner of Immigration with $2,500 salary, and section 2 provided:

That all contracts that shall be made by emigrants to the United States in foreign countries, in conformity to regulations that may be established by the said commissioner, whereby emigrants shall pledge the wages of their labor for a term not exceeding twelve months, to pay the expenses of their emigration, shall be held to be valid in law, and may be enforced in the courts of the United States or of the several States and Territories, and such advances, if so stipulated in the contract and the contract be recorded in the recorder's office in the county where the emigrant shall settle, shall operate as a lien upon any land thereafter acquired by the emigrant, whether under the homestead law when the title is consummated or on property otherwise acquired until liquidated by the emigrant.

It was provided in section 3, as follows:

That no person shall be qualified to fill any office under this act who shall be directly or indirectly interested in any corporation having lands for sale to immigrants, or in the carrying or transportation of immigrants either from foreign countries to the United States and its Territories or to any part thereof.

This clearly shows that these contract laborers to be imported were not intended to develop the West or for the agricultural interest, but for the manufacturing interests. This law was not for the protection of American laborers or the increase of their wages, but was in strict accord with the policy of protectionists from the days of Hamilton.

To establish my position still more conclusively, I quote from the speech of Hon. John F. Miller, now deceased, and late United States Senator from California, in the Senate on the 28th day of February, 1882:

The average American manufacturer is interested generally in two things, namely, the highest protective tariff and the cheapest labor. * * * It is not difficult to perceive the origin of that political economy which suggests high protective tariff and at the same time advocates the admission of servile laborers into this country without limit. It means high prices for the products of manufacture and low prices for the labor which produces them; the aggrandizement of capital and the debasement of labor; greater wealth to the wealthy and greater poverty to the poor.

I also quote from speech of Senator JOHN P. JONES, of Nevada, now a member of Senate Finance Committee, made on the 9th day of March, 1882, in the Senate:

I have noticed, Mr. President, that most of those who are in favor of the largest liberty being extended to the Chinese immigrant to this country are also in favor of a tariff—a tariff which has been urged as necessary to protect the American laborer from the degradation of competition with the pauper labor of Europe, as it is usually termed. In reality, if we may judge of their motives by the action of the men who are now advocating a tariff, it was not the American laborer they wished to protect against the pauper labor of Europe, but it was the American capitalist, the lordly manufacturer, that they wished to protect against the free competition of the capitalist of Europe. Our capitalist manufacturer wanted a larger interest on his money than the capitalist of Europe was willing to accept, and he was given the benefit of a tariff.

Let us see how that tariff works. It works in this wise, that everything that the capitalist manufacturer has to sell he sells in a protected market, he sells in a market in which foreign capitalists can not compete with him.

How is it with what he has to buy? For the principal article he has to buy—to wit, the labor of men—he demands free trade in the broadest sense, not only free trade in bringing in laborers of our own race who can soon accommodate themselves to our conditions of life, but the bringing in a class of laborers who have been inured to poverty by thousands of years of training. The capitalist asks the broadest free trade for that, his own market in any event being protected.

Now, how is it with the laborer? Everything he wants to buy he has to buy from his capitalist master in a protected market; everything he has to sell, to wit, his labor (and, unlike the capitalist, he can not hold it away from sale; unlike the capitalist, he can not wait for better times, or travel here and there where he pleases to sell it, but he must sell it every day), he must sell in the openest market in the world. This is the theory in favor of the laborer that the gentleman [Mr. DAWES, of Massachusetts] propounds to us. We reject it, and by this bill propose to bar out this degrading, this shocking competition with our own people. And yet he tells us we are striking a blow at labor, that we are proposing to inflict injury on the laborers of our country.

Ah! sir, when the artisans and laborers of this country shall be made to understand that they are subjected to free trade in labor they will demand as one

of the conditions of their existence that they shall have an open market in which to buy that which they want if it is an open market in which they must sell their labor, the only thing they have to sell. They will never consent to a tariff on bales and boxes and hampers of goods coupled with free trade in human brain and muscle.

The Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. DAWES] told us that he wanted the American people to know that this bill was a blow struck at labor. Yes, sir, it is a blow struck at degraded, underpaid, underclothed, underfed labor, and it is a blow in favor of that fair remuneration which the forces of our civilization up to this hour have decreed that the laborer should get.

Have those who have been the beneficiaries of the protective duties and bounties of the Government carried out in practice this policy of "promoting emigration from foreign countries" and "traded on a foreign stock" of imported laborers? Let the facts and figures answer.

From January 1, 1865, to December 31, 1887, 8,582,077 foreigners, not including any from Canada and Mexico since July 1, 1885, came to our hospitable shores, and from nearly every civilized nation on earth.

The tenth census shows that 2,732,595 hands of both sexes, all ages and nativities, were employed in manufacturing industries, and 3,837,112 of both sexes, all ages and nationalities, were employed in both manufactures and mechanical and mining industries, and of this number 2,611,325 were natives of this country, and 1,225,787 of foreign birth; 284,175 from Ireland, 368,110 from Germany, 225,730 from Great Britain, 44,615 from Scandinavia, 153,935 from British America, and 149,222 from other countries. The percentage of persons, native and foreign, engaged in all and in separate occupations in 1880 are as follows:

Occupations.	Natives.	Foreigners.
	Per cent.	*Per cent.*
All occupations	79.91	20.09
Agriculture	89.40	10.60
Professional and personal services	75.52	24.48
Trade and transportation	74.67	25.33
Manufacturing, mechanical and mining	68.05	31.95

Hon. Carroll D. Wright, in his first annual report as United States Commissioner of Labor, page 245, in commenting on this ratio or percentage of foreigners in manufacturing industries, says:

It will be seen at once that the tendency of immigrants is to assimilate with our mechanical industries. This increases the supply of labor in comparison to the demand, lowers wages, contributes to whatever overproduction exists, and cripples temporarily the consuming power of the whole.

The eighteenth annual report of Hon. Carroll D. Wright, chief of the bureau of statistics of labor for Massachusetts, submitted December 31, 1887, dealing with the unemployed in that State in 1885, shows 816,470 persons of both sexes, all ages and nationalities, engaged in gainful occupations, and of this number 574,881 employed and 241,589 unemployed, the percentage of employed being 70.41 and of unemployed 29.59.

In his analysis, Mr. Wright says:

In other words, a little less than one-third of the persons returned as being engaged in remunerative labor were unemployed for about one-third of their working time; while on the other hand, the working population of the State, considered in their entirety, were employed at their principal occupation for a trifle less than eleven months during the census year.

Of the 241,589 unemployed, 144,553, or 57.37 per cent., were natives of the United States, and 97,036, or 42.63 per cent., were foreign born; the foreign born from Ireland, 46,872; from Canada, English, 2,297; from Canada, French, 15,535; from England, 11,399; Scotland, 2,314; Nova Scotia, 6,091; New Brunswick, 2,407; Germany, 2,592, and from other foreign countries in less numbers, there being some from each of the following countries: Prince Edward Island, Sweden, Portugal, Asia, Africa, Austria, Belgium, British America, China, Cuba and West Indies, Denmark, France, Greece, Holland, Italy, Japan, Mexico, Newfoundland, Norway, Poland, Russia, Sandwich Islands, South America, Spain, Switzerland, Turkey, Wales, and 388 persons from countries not specified.

When the United States granted to the Central Pacific Railroad of California millions of acres of the public doman and $25,885,120 in bonds to aid in the construction of that road, the managers or contractors, by contract with the Chinese companies in California, imported Chinese laborers by the thousand (estimated at ten thousand) to do the work, to displace American labor, and reduce wages.

These facts speak for themselves and show how faithfully the protectionists have carried out the policy of their so-called protection to American labor by the "promoting of emigration from foreign countries" and the importation of laborers from almost every race on earth, civilized and uncivilized, and placing them in their manufactories to compete with American laborers and reduce their wages.

One thing alone—our immense area of unsettled public domain—has thus far saved us from an overflowing population in our manufacturing centers and the inevitable results, reduction of wages, pauperism, and vice. The proof of this statement is found in the report of cotton manufactures by Edward Atkinson in the Tenth Census, wherein he says:

During the last thirty years the factory population of New England has passed through three phases. First came the sons and daughters of the New England farmer; but as the sewing-machine and other inventions opened new demands for women's work, women of American birth passed out to easier or better paid employments, while the men took up other branches requiring more individual skill. These places were taken mainly by Irish, with a few Germans and English. But as the Irish saved their earnings and as the New England yeomen emigrated to the richer lands of the great West, they passed out of the mills to buy up the deserted farms of the poorer Northeastern States, where by their persistent industry and manual labor they achieved success and gained a position which satisfied them, but with which the native New Englander is no longer contented. Their places in the mills are now being more and more taken by the French Canadians, who in their new conditions and surroundings show little of the stolid and unprogressive character which has kept them so long contented on their little strips of land on the St. Lawrence River.

Thus, while our manufacturers have been protected by high duties on all foreign products competing with theirs in our markets, and have practically enjoyed, and now enjoy, a monopoly of the home market, they have been and are practical free-traders in foreign labor and in wages, and have been the importers of foreign laborers from every race and tongue on earth, and have enacted laws to legalize their grinding contracts made in foreign countries with foreign laborers, even making such contracts a lien upon the homesteads of such laborers and all other property, and made the United States to pay the expenses of administering such laws; and have freely and without restrictions—until the law of February 26, 1885, was enacted "to prohibit the importation and immigration of foreigners and aliens under contract or agreement to perform labor in the United States, its Territories, and the District of Columbia"—imported such foreign laborers and placed them in factories and mines to take the place of their former employés at reduced wages.

These facts are known to all, and can not be denied.

Our American laborers, instead of enjoying any increase of wages in protected industries, have all the time been in free, unrestricted competition with the laborers of all foreign nations. Even since the passage of the law prohibiting imported contract laborers the manufacturing and mining bosses have been evading the law and still importing foreign laborers through others.

Their motto is protection against competition in the sale of the products of labor in their monopolized home market and free trade in laborers and their rates of wages.

If the laborers are benefited by protection and their rates of wages either maintained or increased, why do the laborers, who are members of the organized labor associations, such as Knights of Labor and others, receive higher wages as a rule than other laborers not such members? Why does organized labor receive better wages than unorganized? Why strikes of laborers in protected industries to prevent reduction of wages?

Who receive the prices of the sales of the products of protected industries, the laborers or the manufacturers? Who receive the additional or increased prices for which the protected products are sold, the laborers or the protected manufacturers? The manufacturers always receive the prices for which the protected products are sold in the first instance.

By claiming that protective duties are necessary to enable them to pay the present rate of wages they admit they are the beneficiaries of the protection. If they do not, why do they clamor for protection? They receive all the proceeds of the sales of all the products of all their employés.

Unless protection secures to them higher prices for their products it can be to them no benefit, gain, or profit, and is a delusion. If the laborers are intended to be the sole beneficiaries of protection, or even in part, why not so word the tariff laws as to secure the payment direct to the laborers of the whole or some particular part of the increased prices secured by protection?

The protected manufacturers are intelligent, progressive, and aggressive business men. They have large sums of money invested in protected industries, and like all other business men, they work to make as large profits as possible on their investments. They therefore buy the materials for manufacture at the lowest possible prices in any accessible market, and hire or employ the necessary laborers, skilled and unskilled, at the lowest possible prices they can induce them to accept. And in some instances where force can be used to any advantage, armed detectives and police are hired to overawe the laborers into submission to their own terms.

As they purchase materials, so they purchase the labor of their employés, and then sell the products of the laborers and their investments, the manufactured articles, at the highest prices obtainable in the protected market.

The demand for and the supply of the raw materials in the market determine the prices they have to pay therefor.

If there be a surplus of such materials in the market, an excess over the demand, the prices paid therefor are the lowest, and are graded according to the quantity of the surplus. If demand and supply be equal, the prices are fair, average, or general. If the demand be greater than the quantity of such materials in the market, the prices are higher, above the general average.

So it is in the sales of their products. If the demand for such products be greater than the supply or quantity of the products, they can sell the same at high prices, graded according to the excess of the demand over the supply. If the quantity or supply of such products in the market be greater than the demand therefor, they must either hold their surplus or sell at lower prices.

As in the purchase of materials and the sales of the products of the labor and materials, so in the purchase of the labor of the employés, the demand and supply, the number of employers, and the number of those seeking employment, to a very great extent regulate and control the rates of wages, the selling price of labor—the only product the laboring man has to sell—and sell this labor he must or suffer for the necessaries of life. He can not store it away and await an increase of the rates of wages. If there be only one laborer and one employer the laborer can secure a fair price or rate of wages. If there be one laborer and two employers the laborer can secure a higher rate of wages. If there be two laborers and only one employer he secures the laborer at the lower rates. If there be five, ten, or more laborers to one employer in the labor market such employer can almost dictate his own terms or rate of wages; while if there be five, ten, or more employers to one laborer he can almost dictate the rate of wages.

Protection therefore has absolutely nothing to do with the ability of the protected manufacturer to pay the present or increased rate of wages, and is of no possible benefit to the laborer.

All the prophecies of protectionists of dire disasters to the manufacturing establishments and of reduction of wages to follow the passage of the House bill are without foundation. The duties remaining on imported articles of the same kind manufactured here will, as an incident to the revenues they yield to the Treasury, be amply and more than sufficient to enable every healthful, legitimate manufacturing establishment to continue and to prosper and to pay the present and even an increased rate of wages, and not one will be closed by the passage of that bill that will not be closed if the bill never passes.

To show still more conclusively that the high tariff taxes—protection—do not regulate or increase wages, I submit the following statement, compiled from the Tenth Census, showing the value of various manufactured products, the labor cost, the percentage of labor cost, the existing ad valorem high tariff, and the rate proposed in the House bill:

Industries.	Value of product.	Labor cost.	Percentage paid labor.	Present tariff rate.	Tariff rate by House bill.
				Per cent.	*Per cent.*
Carpets	$31,792,802	$6,835,218	21.5	47	30
Cotton goods	210,950,383	45,614,419	21.6	50	40
Bolts, nuts, etc	10,073,330	1,981,300	19.7	39	35
Nails and spikes	5,629,240	1,255,171	22.3	43	34
Iron pipe, wrought	13,292,162	1,788,258	13.5	70	35
Oil, castor	653,900	44,714	6.8	194	97
Oil, linseed	15,393,812	681,677	4.4	54	21
Screws	2,184,532	456,542	20.9	50	35
Wool hats	8,516,569	1,893,215	22.2	54	40
Woolen goods	160,606,721	25,836,392	16.1	70	40
Worsted goods	33,549,942	5,683,027	16.9	68	40

The laborers in all these employments receive much less for labor—not even one-half of the tariff tax—than the amount of the protection secured to the product by this tax. And the rates of wages do not vary in different industries in proportion to the rate of tariff tax or protection afforded in each.

Our Republican friends claim and assert that protection—high tariff taxes—makes the wages of labor high and the prices of their products to the consumers low, and therefore, in the interest and for the benefit of the laborers and consumers, must be perpetuated. This is a pleasing claim, an attractive assertion, and very misleading and false. Analyze it and see the assertion as it really is. The assertion, in other words, is that high tariff taxes make the rates of wages higher and the prices of products lower than they would be under a revenue tariff or without a high tariff; in other words, high tariff taxes compel manufacturers to pay out more money and to increase their expenses, and to take in less money and to decrease their revenues; and therefore the manufacturers will be ruined, unless these high tariff taxes, which so compel them to pay out more money, increase their expenses, and to take in less money, decrease their revenues, are perpetuated.

They appeal, in that way they have so long found effective, to Congress to enact laws not merely maintaining, but largely increasing, the present war-tariff taxes on all imported products which compete with their products in the blessed home market, and blandly claim that such laws are not for their own benefit, profit, or enrichment, but especially for the benefit of the laborers, American labor, and of the consumers of both the imported and home-manufactured products, and when their claim is denied then they assert vigorously that such laws will so operate as to compel the foreign manufacturers and not the consumers of such imported articles to pay such high taxes, and to compel them to pay higher rates of wages to the laborers, and to sell their manufactures at lower prices, to pay out more money, and to take in less money than they could or would without such high tariff taxes, or with a revenue tariff. The falsity and the absurdity of their claims are thus made apparent.

They receive all the proceeds of the sales of their manufactures. Why do they not pay such higher wages to their laborers and sell their products to the consumers at lower prices without any law to compel them to do so? They can if they will, and no such laws are necessary to make them, and if they were they would be useless and inoperative and could not benefit laborers. Labor would still be bought in the market, laborers would still be hired at the lowest rates of wages at which obtainable in the free market.

High tariff taxes, protection to manufactures, can not and do not regulate or increase wages. This must be apparent from the facts I have presented.

But, Mr. President, instead of regulating or increasing rates of wages, high tariff taxes—protection to manufactures—tend to decrease, to lessen the rates of wages. They give the manufacturers a monopoly of the home market, but restrict them, by the taxes on many products used in their factories, from any serious efforts to secure markets in foreign countries.

As I have shown, the steam and water power in our industrial establishments is capable of turning out manufactures far beyond the possible consumption of such articles by our home market. And being restricted from the foreign markets upon equal terms with competitors the manufacturers must either sell at greatly reduced prices or stop production or reduce wages. They have had from 1880 to 1886, both inclusive, high tariff taxes. The results are that during this period there were 22,304 establishments involved in strikes, and 1,323,203 employés striking or involved in such strikes, and of this last number 1,020,156 employés originated the strikes. The employés before the strikes numbered 1,660,835, and after the strikes only 1,635,047, leaving 25,788 employés to seek labor elsewhere. There were 103,038 new employés engaged after the strikes, of whom 37,483 were brought from other places.

Strikes for increase of wages occurred in 9,439 establishments, against reduction of wages in 1,734, for reduction of hours of labor in 4,344, for increase of wages and reduction of hours of labor in 1,692, and for reduction of hours and against being compelled to board with employer in 800. During same period there were lock-outs in 2,214 establishments, involving 175,270 employés, of which 1,753, or 79.18 per cent., were ordered by combinations of managers.

TRUSTS.

In the great manufacturing States of New York, Pennsylvania, Massachusetts, Ohio, and Illinois the number of establishments in such States involved in strikes was 74.84 per cent. of all the establishments so involved in the whole country, and the number of lock-outs in such States was 89.48 per cent. of all lock-outs.

These five States, by the census of 1880, contained 49 per cent. of all the manufacturing establishments of the country.

Why this great strife and contention about rates of wages and these lock-outs by combinations of managers if high tariff taxes—protection—regulate or increase wages?

The figures I have given are taken from the third annual report of Hon. Carroll D. Wright, Commissioner of Labor. He also gives from the best obtainable data the estimated losses, and says:

> The loss to the strikers as given in these tables for the period involved was $51,814,723. The loss to employés through lock-outs for the same period was $8,157,717, or a total wage loss to employés of $59,972,440.

Verily high tariff taxes affect wages, but to decrease, not increase.

REASONS FOR HIGHER WAGES IN UNITED STATES.

Why are the rates of wages in dollars and cents, by the day, week, month, or year, higher in the United States than elsewhere, if high tariff taxes—protection—do not regulate or increase, but decrease or lessen them?

Mr. President, it would require a volume to show fully all the causes operating in this great country to make wages higher than in any other, and I can only briefly name some of these many causes.

First. Our democratic-republican system of governments, national and State, guarantying to every citizen, by written constitutions, civil, religious, and political liberty, perfect equality before the law, in the enjoyment of life and its protection, of property and its acquisition and disposition, and of labor and its fruits, and in the freedom to choose avocations in life and to attain the positions of honor, profit, trust, and distinction, from the humblest to the highest, in national and State governments, in civil and professional pursuits, and securing to the citizens of each State all privileges and immunities of citizens in the several States, and the perfect liberty to go and come at pleasure throughout all our territorial limits.

Second. The absolute freedom of trade and commerce between all our States and Territories and among all our citizens without any restrictions or impediments.

Third. Our immense public domain and territorial limits, extending from ocean to ocean, and through so many degrees of latitude, with such varieties of climate and soil and products, affording cheap homes to all who will choose them, and facilities to all to engage in so many diversified labors and pursuits, and to change from one to another without serious loss.

Fourth. Our systems of public, common, and purely secular schools, open and accessible to the children of all, the rich and the poor alike, wherein mingle on terms of equality the children of all our citizens, without rank, caste, or class distinction, and all can obtain such edu-

cational qualifications as will fit them for the ordinary business pursuits of life.

Fifth. Our higher educational facilities, universities, colleges, academies, theological, law, medical, technical, and other special institutions, open and accessible to all upon easy and comparatively cheap terms, wherein the varied attainments for the diversified pursuits in life can be acquired.

Sixth. The opportunities for safely investing any surplus of earnings and securing its safety and increase, which induce the habit of saving such surplus among all who are laudably ambitious to better their condition and improve their social surroundings and positions.

Seventh. The absence of a large standing army and freedom from its onerous burdens, its blood tax, and compulsory service in it.

Eighth. Our encouragement of the inventions of new and novel devices by our liberal system of patent laws, granting an exclusive monopoly of the right to inventors for a given term of years to use and make and sell such devices and the patent-rights thereto, which have led to so many useful mechanical and other inventions wonderfully increasing the powers of production beyond the power of the muscular labor of our entire population by utilizing and appropriating the combined powers of coal, steam, electricity, and machinery in production.

Ninth. The versatility, quickness, and power of our citizens to adopt the easiest and quickest means to accomplish the best ends, the largest results. That our citizens, native and foreign, have acquired, and very quickly acquire after becoming adopted these last advantages, can not be disputed, and these advantages result largely from the causes I have named which make our wages higher than in other countries. But the rate of wages of labor must not be measured by the dollars and cents paid therefor by the day, week, or month, but by its efficiency, its productive power, the cost of its product.

One man working by the day at $1 may cut and split 75 fence rails, another at same price 100 rails, another 125, another 150. Their daily wages are the same to the employer, but the cost of the product to the employer is very different. In the first case the rails cost him each 1⅓ cents, in the second 1 cent each, in the third four-fifths of 1 cent, and in the fourth two-thirds of a cent, or just one-half of the amount paid to the first hand; and measured by efficiency, productive power, cost of production, the fourth laborer was worth two laborers of the first one. This example only illustrates in a simple manner the real value of laborers to the purchaser, the employer. Any farmer having timber to be made into rails and seeking to purchase or hire the labor to make the rails could and would, if he knew the efficiency of the first and last named laborers, give the last $1.50 per day in preference to the first at $1 per day. So it is in all kinds of labor, skilled and unskilled. Measured by the value of labor to its purchaser or employer by its efficiency, its productive power, and the cost of its product to the employer, the rates of wages in this country by the day, week, or month are no higher to the employer, the manufacturer, than in other countries where much lower rates prevail.

Hon. Carroll D. Wright, in his sixteenth annual report as chief of the bureau of statistics of labor in Massachusetts, says:

> We venture the suggestion, however, that it is the sum of wages and not the rate which constitutes the true money standard of cost of labor, and we carry this suggestion to its logical outcome in the following proposition: In proportion as capital, through machinery, becomes more effective, the relative number of laborers is decreased in proportion to product, the rate of wages is increased, and the sum of wages is reduced; that is, lower cost is compassed by higher wages.

It is a settled fact, in my judgment, that can not be gainsaid, that high wages to the laborer are cheap wages to the employer or purchaser, higher wages cheaper wages, and the highest the cheapest wages. And low wages to the laborer are dear wages to the employer, lower wages dearer wages, and lowest wages dearest wages. And that the product of the highest paid labor to the employer, the manufacturer, is the cheapest. And while he pays such high rates of wages he secures a cheaper and better product, which he can sell in the market at a greater profit; therefore our high wages are not the result of protection, high tariff taxes, but of the efficiency, the productive power of the laborer and the low cost of its production. That our American labor is more efficient and productive than labor in other countries I will prove by protectionist authorities. Hon. WILLIAM M. EVARTS, when Secretary of State, in his report to Congress on the state of labor in Europe, submitted May 17, 1879, said:

> The average American workman performs from one and one-half to twice as much work in a given time as the average European workman. This is so important a point in connection with our ability to compete with the cheap labor manufactures of Europe, and it seems at first thought so strange, that I will trouble you with somewhat lengthy quotations from the reports in support thereof.

Hon. James G. Blaine, while Secretary of State, in his letter of June 25, 1881, submitting to Congress his report called "Cotton-goods trade of the world and the share of the United States therein," No. 12 Consular Reports, said:

> The wages of spinners and weavers in Lancashire and in Massachusetts, according to the foregoing statements, were as follows, per week:
> Spinners: English, $7.20 to $8 40 (master spinners running as high as $12); American, $7.07 to $10.30.
> Weavers: English, $3.84 to $8.64, subject, at the date on which these rates were given, to a reduction of 10 per cent.; American, $4.82 to $8.73.
> The average wages of employés in the Massachusetts mills is as follows, according to the official returns: Men, $8.36; women, $5.62; male children, $3.11; female children, $3.08. According to Consul Shaw's report, the average wages of the men employed in the Lancashire mills on the 1st of January, 1880, was about $8 per week, subject to a reduction of 10 per cent.; women, from $3.40 to $4.50, subject to a reduction of 10 per cent.
> The hours of labor in the Lancashire mills are fifty-six, in the Massachusetts mills sixty, per week. The hours of labor in the mills in the other New England States, where the wages are generally less than in Massachusetts, are usually sixty-six to sixty-nine per week.
> Undoubtedly the inequalities in the wages of English and American operatives are more than equalized by the greater efficiency of the latter and their longer hours of labor. If this should prove to be a fact in practice, as it seems to be proven from official statistics, it would be a very important element in the establishment of our ability to compete with England for our share of the cotton-goods trade of the world.
> From these returns it is seen that every American spindle consumes 66 pounds of raw cotton, while each British spindle consumes only 32 pounds, or less than one-half the American consumption per spindle.
> It thus appears that each American operative works up as much raw material as two British operatives, turns out nearly $1.50 worth of manufactures to the British operator's $1 worth, and even in piece goods, where the superior quality and weight of the American goods are so marked, the American operative turned out 2.75 yards to 2.50 yards by the British operative.

Mr. Charles S. Hill, a staunch protectionist, who in 1882 was statistician of the State Department and represented the Metropolitan Industrial League of New York, appeared before the Tariff Commission on October 20, 1882, and made the following statement (see Tariff Commission report, 1882, volume 3, page 1688):

> One point further in regard to labor in Europe vs. America. Here are some figures that show a remarkable, but what seems to be an irrefutable fact, or let him who questions it produce further evidence. The following comparison speaks louder than any argument.

Manufacturing industries.

Description.	United States.	Great Britain.
Hands employed	5,250,000	5,140,200
Value of product	$8,000,000,000	$4,000,000,000

Here is the positive proof that American mechanics in the aggregate accomplish exactly double the result of the same number of British mechanics. They are therefore very justly paid double in wages.

The efficiency of labor, its productive power, has been most wonderfully increased by the aids of coal, steam, electricity, and machinery, and the rates of wages have necessarily increased, but not in proportion to the increase of efficiency and productive power, and the labor cost in the product has been greatly decreased. Hence the higher wages and lower priced products. Numberless examples could be given in every branch of manufacture, showing the increase of the efficiency of labor, or in the amount of work done in each day by each hand with the aid of machinery, and steam, water, or electric power, and the reduced cost to the manufacturer of the articles so produced daily, and consequently reduced selling price.

Who are the beneficiaries of high tariff taxes of protection? If those engaged in the manufacture of the kinds of articles upon which a tariff tax is imposed when imported from a foreign country are not the beneficiaries of such high taxes, why do they demand their imposition? If the high tariff taxes imposed upon a foreign manufactured article when imported do not enable the home manufacturer of similar articles to sell his articles in the home market at a price just below the cost of the foreign articles with the tariff taxes added, why does he want any such tariff tax imposed?

If the high tariff taxes do not increase or add to the total cost and the selling price in our market of the imported article, how can they lessen, reduce, or prevent the competition of the imported article in our home market with our home manufacture? How can the home product be protected from competition? Those engaged in the manufacture or production of the class of articles upon which the high tariff taxes are imposed when imported are the sole beneficiaries of such taxes, aside from the revenues paid into the Treasury, coming only from the imported articles.

If they do not receive the benefits, no one does. Take a piece of cloth costing at the factory in the United States $100, and at the foreign factory $95. The foreigner can send his cloth to our market and sell it—there being no tariff tax—at the cost of the American cloth, and make a profit, less freightage, etc., of $5.

Now, impose a tariff tax of 6 per cent. ad valorem on the imported cloth, and the total cost here will be $100.70 when the home and foreign manufacturers are practically on equal terms in our market. Increase the tariff to 15 per cent. ad valorem, then the foreign cloth pays the duty, $14.25, and costs here $109.25, and the home cloth can be sold at just a little less, say $108, and make a profit of $8, or 8 per cent. Increase tariff to 30 per cent., then foreign cloth is subject to $28.50 tariff, and costs for sale here $123.50. Our home cloth can be raised in price to $120, or 20 per cent. profit. Increase to 50 per cent., then foreign cloth pays $47.50 tax, and costs $142.50. Then home cloth can be raised to $135 or $140, or 40 per cent. profit. Increase tax to 100 per cent., foreign cloth costs here $190, and Americans can sell just below that amount. A tariff tax so high as to make all sales of foreign goods in our markets entail a loss upon importer, whoever he may be, simply amounts to a prohibition of the import of such article.

Our Republican friends argue that the effect of protection, high taxes

on imports, is to cheapen the prices of the home products to consumers, and therefore results in benefit to them. This is a fallacious and misleading argument, and assumes that because a certain fact exists—that is, the reduced selling prices of all manufactured products in this country—therefore protection, high taxes on imports, has caused it. In other words, the prices of manufactured products in the United States have greatly fallen. The United States have a high tax on imports—a protective system. Therefore protection has caused the fall in the prices. Test it by England. The prices of manufactures have greatly fallen in England.

England has free trade.

Therefore free trade has caused the fall in prices. If protection has caused the fall in prices here, then equally must free trade have caused the fall in England. High tariff taxes—protection—have had nothing whatever to do in causing the fall in prices of manufactures here or elsewhere. Prices of all kinds of manufactured products, protected and unprotected just alike, in the United States and in all the countries of the world accessible and open to commerce, to trade, have very greatly fallen. The fall has not been in the United States alone.

The cause of such fall in prices is apparent. It has been the efficiency, the increased efficiency and productive power of human labor, aided by and intelligently and skillfully controlling and directing the powers of coal, steam, electricity, and machinery. Each man with such aids of power and machinery performs a vastly increased amount of work, can raise more wheat, corn, and farm products; can make more boots, shoes, hats, coats, pants, and all other articles of all kinds and classes, and the cost of such articles is much less, and consequently the prices much lower.

The efficiency of labor and its increased productive power have had the same effects, have produced the same results in all industrial pursuits regardless of tariffs.

How can high tariff taxes imposed on imported products, the articles themselves, and added to and becoming an integral, inseparable part of the total cost of such articles thereafter, regardless of the persons who may import, sell, or resell them, make similar articles manufactured here sell at lower prices? The claim is farcical.

The tariff duty imposed on an imported article is paid into the Treasury before it can be taken out of the Government warehouse, and thereafter forms a part of the selling price of such article.

The manufacturer here adds to the selling price of his product an amount which will make such price just a little less than the selling price of the import, and the purchaser of such article pays such amount so added in the price he pays and the manufacturer puts such amount into his pocket.

If he does not do this, then of what benefit is protection to him? What is the object of protection? If it fail, then protection is a failure. But our friends say: "Look at this article and at that article, they are actually selling in the home market for less than the amount of the tariff duties on such imports." Yes; such things have occurred, and will probably occur again; but high tariff taxes—protection—was not the cause of such things directly or indirectly. Such claim that protection caused such reductions is without foundation in fact, and can not be established by any legitimate proof. Years ago lead was selling in this country at a price considerably less than the amount of duty imposed thereon on importation, and, as a matter of course, none was imported. The tariff duty did not cause this reduced price.

The reduced price was caused by the great excess of lead in the market for sale over and above the demand and other causes, such as cheapness of production, etc., and the tariff was inoperative. The principle and the object of protection, high taxes, are as I have stated. To all general rules there are exceptions. Competition between rival establishments may cause a very great reduction, a cut in prices, just as so often occurs between our railway lines. Overproduction, a surplus of products beyond the demand, the consumption, may reduce prices. Industrial depressions will also reduce prices. Bad management and the failure of large establishments with heavy stocks of products to be thrown on the market suddenly will reduce prices. These are some of the incidents which attend protected industries as well as others, and are exceptions and not the rule.

Think seriously for one moment about this claim of manufactured products being so reduced in price. A sane, responsible, and intelligent American manufacturer, with large amount of capital invested in machinery for manufacturing woolen cloth, deliberately asks Congress to pass a tariff law imposing high taxes upon all imported woolen cloth, so that he, in the operations of such law, may be constrained or compelled to sell his product, so protected by such taxes from competition in our home market, for a less price than he could or would with only a revenue tariff or without any tariff!

How farcical! This statement only shows the fraud and false pretense of any such claim.

In order to show beyond any question that the protected manufacturers are the sole beneficiaries of the high taxes, I will quote some protectionist authorities.

Ex-President John Quincy Adams, in his report on manufactures before referred to, said:

> The doctrine that duties or impost cheapen the price of the articles upon which they are levied seems to conflict with the first dictates of common sense. But its supporters first appeal with confidence to the fact that most of the articles upon which additional duties were levied by the tariff of 1828 have since that time considerably fallen in price, and then they argue that it must be so by the excitement of competition in the market. It is certainly contrary to the natural course of things that an addition to the cost should be a reduction of the price of an article. True it is that the duty gives a spur to the production of the article at home. The price of any article in the market must always depend upon the relative condition of the demand and supply at the time and place of sale. But very slight variations of time or place affect often to a very great extent the relative proportion of the demand and supply, and consequently the price of the article. No safe conclusion can be drawn from the fact that subsequent to the tariff of 1828 the prices of the articles upon which the duties were then increased have fallen, unless from other circumstances it can be shown that the increase of the duty was the cause of the fall in price, nor will it be sufficient to prove so strange a paradox to account for it by the excitement of competition. Wherever there is a profitable market there will be competition. Had the tariff of 1828 never been enacted the competition in our markets would have been as great and would have been as effectual to reduce the prices as it has been with the aggravation of duties. In that competition our own manufactures might not indeed have shared, but it would have existed in all its force between those who furnished the supply, and could not have failed to reduce the prices to the level of the moderate profit necessary to the existence of the trade.

James P. Foster, president of the Republican League of the United States, wrote a confidential letter, dated May 23, 1888, headquarters of the Republican League of the United States, New York, and sent it in confidence to leading Republican manufacturers. It therefore contains the confidential, personal views and knowledge of Mr. Foster and the gentlemen to whom he refers. The following are extracts therefrom:

> It may not be of your personal knowledge, but it is a fact nevertheless, that the manufacturers of the United States who are most benefited by our tariff laws have been the least willing to contribute to the success of the party which gave them protection, and which is about to engage in a life and death struggle with free trade.
>
> A Republican United States Senator, from a State which never had a Democratic representative in either House of Congress or a Democratic State officer, in speaking of the well-known disposition of the manufacturing interest to lock up its money, fold its hands, and look on while somebody else fights for its success, says:
>
> "The campaign which we are about to enter will concern, more than anybody else, the manufacturers of this country. They have heretofore been very laggard in their contributions to the Republican cause. In fact, if I could punish them without punishing the cause of protection itself, I would consign them to the hottest place I could think of on account of their craven parsimony. If this class of people do not care to contribute to the success of the Republican party they are welcome to try their chances under a Democratic administration. I can stand it as long as they can." And again: "I was solicited to contribute to a protective-tariff league, and I replied that if the manufacturers of the United States in their associated capacity were an eleemosynary institution that I would vote to give them a pension, but that I did not propose myself to contribute money to advance the interests of men who were getting practically the sole benefit, or at least the most directly important benefits, of the tariff laws. I am in favor of protection; not precisely the kind we are having, but I might be willing to keep even that rather than not to have any; but I am sure I can get along without any of it fully as well as the manufacturers can, and if they think the Republican party is going to maintain a high protective corps for this benefit, and that the men who do the work in that party are going to keep up the expenses of a campaign out of their own pockets, leaving them to reap the fruits of the tariff policy without any deduction for political expenses, they are very greatly mistaken. I understand that in a general way the manufacturers of New England have been more liberal in their contributions than those of Pennsylvania.
>
> "In fact, I have it from the best possible source that the manufacturers of Pennsylvania, who are more highly protected than anybody else, and who make large fortunes every year when times are prosperous, practically give nothing toward the maintenance of the ascendency of the Republican party. Of course, I shall not violate what I consider to be a proper principle of action; but, if I had my way about it, I would put the manufacturers of Pennsylvania under the fire and fry all the fat out of them. If the Mills tariff bill comes to the Senate there will be some votes cast there which will open the eyes of some of these people who have, while gathering their millions, treated the Republican party as their humble servant."
>
> These are strong words and bitter, but they are true, and it now remains with you and your associates to determine whether they are to be reiterated after this campaign is over, and protection has, through your apathy, been struck its death-blow. If you give us the means to win the victory we will do it. Are you willing?
>
> Yours, very truly,
>
> JAMES P. FOSTER, *President*.

I now hold in my hands Tariff-League Bulletin, devoted to the protection of American labor and industries, volume 1, No. 23, New York, June 8, 1888, in which is an editorial commenting on Mr. Foster's letter. I read the following extracts therefrom:

> The Republican party is unfortunate in its friends. In 1884 it was defeated by the indiscretion of one who persisted in entertaining its candidate at Delmonico's, and by the over-enthusiasm of another, whose alliteration was trumpeted by a hostile press to every hamlet in the Union where a Catholic vote could be reached.
>
> Now it is a "confidential" letter issued from the "headquarters of the Republican League of the United States," and so confidentially circulated that it has received flattering attention from every Democratic editor in the country. The Chicago Times pronounces it "one of the most sensational political documents ever issued in this country."
>
> It would be useless to criticise the tone of this "sensational document," or the temper with which it assails American manufacturers, in words which it says "are strong and bitter, but they are true." And we will not here comment upon the unfortunate policy of the letter, which enforces a peremptory demand for money with a threat.
>
> It is important at this time only to review the charges against American manufacturers, which are the bone and sinew of this "confidential letter" without which it would receive from us no comment whatever. They are quoted, it is true, from an eminent Republican Senator, but they are quoted with approval, and declared to be true.
>
> These charges, when stripped of their discreditable verbiage, are, first, that the "campaign which we are about to enter will concern, more than anybody else, the manufacturers of the country"—"men who are getting practically the benefits, or at least the most directly important benefits, of the tariff laws." And, second, "that while reaping the fruits of the tariff policy they have been

very laggard in their contributions to the Republican cause." Their conduct is called "cravenal parsimony." The New England manufacturers, it is said, have been somewhat less parsimonious than the others. But of Pennsylvania manufacturers it says, in language both vigorous and picturesque:

"If I had my way about it, I would put them under the fire and fry all the fat out of them." * * *

But while manufacturers derive no greater advantages from protection than other classes in proportion to the magnitude of their enterprises, they nevertheless do contribute far more than all other classes to its support. The records of the Republican party prove it. Those who have been engaged in collecting funds for its defense will testify to it. We therefore deny the assertion of the Senator whom the Republican League has chosen for its mouthpiece, and we affirm that more than three-fourths of all the money used in support of Republicanism and protection has come from men directly or indirectly engaged in manufactures.

Facts might be adduced to defend the manufacturers of Pennsylvania from the charge which, in the Republican League document, has been especially made against them. But it is unnecessary. The absurdity of the charge is so apparent that the wonder is that any one holding an important position in the Republican party could have been found to make it.

I submit, Mr. President, with these facts before us, certainly no one can doubt that the business men, not the politicians, who are engaged in protected industries, know what they put in their pockets by the reason of high tariff taxes and how much they can afford to pay out of their profits to perpetuate Republicanism. What is the amount? "More than three-fourths of all the money (the millions of dollars) used in support of Republicanism and protection has come from men directly or indirectly engaged in manufactures." They are the beneficiaries, or they never would pay out such vast sums to perpetuate a system which was of no financial benefit to them.

While the persons engaged in protected industries are the sole beneficiaries of high tariff taxes imposed on imported competing articles, and the consumers, the purchasers of their protected products, pay to them the enhanced prices they are able to command in their monopoly of the home market, and the Government receives no part of such enhanced prices as revenue, the country at large, the masses of the people, and all other industrial enterprises are the sufferers. I assert as an indisputable proposition, principle, that no taxes, no system of tariff taxes, or other kinds of taxes can enrich any nation or people or increase the general wealth.

Taxes may be so imposed as to enrich one class or portion of the people, those engaged in particlar avocations not so taxed, but when so imposed they decrease the wealth of all other classes and avocations; and nothing is added to the general wealth. Peter is simply impoverished to enrich Paul. This is the inevitable result—nothing more, nothing less, and nothing else. Taxation is a burden. High tariff taxes induce an unnatural, abnormal flow of capital into the protected industries by reason of the promised large profits. Other fairly remunerative employments are abandoned. The employés in these are left without labor and thrown upon the labor market for employment.

Coal, steam, electricity, and machinery have all been made obedient laborers in production until our manufacturing establishments can largely more than supply our home market of consumption. An unhealthy rivalry ensues; cuts in prices, as in the rivalry of railroads, follows. The markets are deranged, business unsettled, and establishment after establishment fails or closes. Laborers are thrown upon the labor market; cuts or reductions in the wages result; strikes or lock-outs follow. Having the monopoly of the home market and consumption decreasing, a glut in the market is produced, and the surplus is shipped to some foreign country and sold at greatly reduced prices, and the markets there deranged. As soon as the home market recovers and prices rise, the same process is repeated. It is an abnormal, unnatural, hot-house condition.

To settle these facts beyond dispute I will read extracts, as follows:

Hon. James G. Blaine, in his report on the cotton goods trade of the world, to which I have already referred, commenting on the decrease of trade with China, said:

Our manufacturers, whenever a lull occurs in the home demand, use most commendable efforts for the enlargement of their trade in the various countries, but the moment a brisk home demand again arises they immediately withdraw from foreign markets to the great annoyance of and losses to their correspondents, who enter into their new business relations believing in their permanence.

The persistence of such practical merchants and the manufacturers, as those of the United States are wont to consider themselves, in such a grave commercial mistake as this is surprising both to our business correspondents and to our competitors for the world's trade, and an immediate reformation is demanded if we would hope to assume a permanent and leading place in international commerce.

In commenting on the trade with Australia, he quotes from Consul-General Spencer, at Victoria, as follows:

From information received at this consulate from merchants who were formerly engaged in importing cotton goods directly from America, it appears that some years since such goods were decidedly popular in this market and in good demand, but the importers, who draw their supplies directly from New York and Boston, soon found that the wholesale dry-goods merchants in this city were able to undersell them, the latter having purchased the same brand of goods in London at lower prices than were current at the same date in the American markets. The importers naturally inferred that these goods, representing the surplus stock of American manufacturers, had been "slaughtered" or sacrificed in the London market with a view of maintaining prices at home.

He quotes from Consul Winser, at Sonneberg, Germany, as follows:

Again, it is said that our manufacturers produce more goods than they can well dispose of, and unsettle the trade by filling each succeeding order at a lower price.

Finally, having overstocked the market, some cases are cited of manufacturers who have established sales-rooms in Germany themselves and disposed of their wares at prices far lower than their former largest customers could afford to sell, often on long credit. In many branches of manufacture traveling agents of American houses sell their wares to retailers at the same rates which wholesale dealers have been required to pay, thus cutting the ground from under the feet of the latter, to whom is due the credit of having introduced, after infinite pains and trouble, these very goods to the German people.

He quotes from Mr. Pickering, United States commissioner to the Melbourne exposition, Australia, as follows:

The great natural resources of Australia are too great to allow the present depression to be anything but temporary. It would be well for our manufacturers to bear this in mind, and those who have or who desire to have a share of this Australian trade should assure the merchants here that they may rely on being supplied with goods at the sacrifice (if necessary) of a few home orders. I am the more impressed to urge this, having just been shown a letter received by the agent of a Philadelphia firm who are exhibiting here, from which I quote: "Send us no more orders at present; our home demand prevents us filling foreign orders for some time to come."

In speaking of the field open to our cotton manufacturers he says:

It is estimated that the Chinese supply themselves with cotton goods manufactured by hand-looms, in their primitive manner, to the extent of over 7,300,000,000 yards annually, an amount almost equal to twice the total annual exports of cotton piece-goods from Great Britain. * * *

The cotton-goods trade of the world is a vast subject, and requires the best consideration of American manufacturers, united consideration to be followed by united action; but if the same masterly direction of forces be applied toward its diversion to the United States as has been applied by the statesmen and manufacturers of Great Britain to the development of their trade, the world offers a field large enough for the consumption of all the manufactures we can produce, even were our entire product of raw material converted into American cloth, instead of being exported in such large quantities as it is at present.

I quote from a speech of ex-President Garfield in the House, May 13, 1872, who said:

And I know, moreover, that for nearly two years the wholesale price of American salt in Toronto, Canada, was $1 lower per barrel than the same salt was selling for on the New York side of the lake. That is, we produced it, shipped it across, paying whatever portage, freights, and transportation were required, and then sold it to our Canadian neighbors at $1 per barrel less than it was sold to people on our shores. Certainly, gentlemen will not want a duty continued that enables that thing to be done.

I now quote the following consular report:

No. 67.] UNITED STATES CONSULAR AGENCY,
London, Ontario, September 15, 1888. (Received September 18.)

SIR: In reply to the circular of the Department of State, dated September 4, 1888, requesting information as to imports of agricultural machinery and tools from the United States into Canada, inquiry elicits the following facts:

I find that plows of American manufacture are among the most prominent of the imports in this line. The Oliver chilled plows (made at South Bend, Ind., and the one, I am told, that has the largest sale in the United States), the Syracuse plow, and the South Bend plow seem to be most in demand and to have the largest sale. I have before me on my desk an offer from an Ontario dealer in the Oliver plows to sell same f. o. b. at this city in Canada for $10 each in quantities. The retail price here is $12, and numerous transactions take place at that figure.

The same plows, I understand, are sold in quantities at the factory (not for export) at $14 each, and cost the American farmer at retail $16.

The Syracuse plow retails at $11 or $12 here, and, I am informed, sells for from $14 to $16 in the United States at retail, and the South Bend at $11 here and $14 at home.

It is pleasing to observe how cheaply our manufacturers must be able to turn out these goods, from the fact that the Canadian duty on this class of goods is 35 per cent. ad valorem. Even admitting that the manufacturer makes no profit on his sales in Canada, these figures are of interest:

	Per plow.
Price at which plow is sold in Canada	$10.00
Duty at 35 per cent. ad valorem and freight	$3.50
Profit to Canadian dealer, probably	1.50
	5.00
Leaving actual cost to manufacture	5.00
Retailed to American farmer at	16.00
Profit to manufacturer on all home sales	11.00

It would thus seem that the Canadian farmer has an advantage over his American neighbor in the purchase of necessary implements produced in his own country, and the latter before purchasing his plows might well figure as follows:

Price of plows at retail in United States	$16.00
Price of same in Canada	$12.00
Freight to return same to United States (duty is free on American goods returned)	1.00
	13.00
Profit to American farmer by purchasing American-made plow in Canada	3.00

Plows with tempered steel mold-boards and beams, which sell in the United States for $17 and upwards, are manufactured in Canada (from Pittsburgh steel on which duty has to be paid, and the wages of the workmen are substantially the same as in the United States), and are sold for $14 retail; thus showing excess of profit made by American manufacturing over Canadian manufacturing, $3 on each plow. When it is considered that the Canadian manufacturer has to pay a duty on his materials and freight upon same to Canada from Pittsburgh, it will be readily seen at a glance that the excess of profits to the American over the Canadian manufacturer is much greater than the sum named, $3.

I am credibly advised by a very prominent Canadian farmer that he has just bought an American self-binding reaper (Walter A. Woods) for $110. Laid down in an American city near the lines, the price of same machine in same place to an American farmer would be from $150 to $170.

In addition to the larger implements mentioned, farmers' or agricultural hardware imported from the United States consists of light shelf goods, dry paints, whilst agricultural hand-tools, (such as spades, shovels, forks, etc.) on which articles the duty varies from 35 to 70 per cent., although the printed tariff reads only from 30 to 35 per cent. This Government has, however, instructed its customs officers to advance prices on invoices in certain lines, which brings the duty up to a very high rate. Thus, on scythes, for instance, by means of a specific and ad valorem duty they have to pay from 60 to 70 per cent.

Notwithstanding these tremendous charges, a careful comparison of the wholesale and retail prices of the above tools shows that in all cases American goods can be bought in Canada as cheap, and in many cases cheaper, than in the United States.

It is conclusively proven by these facts that the American farmers are not receiving the full benefit of the low prices at which these goods can be produced in the United States These benefits are apparently reserved for the Canadians and other foreigners to whose markets we export goods; but existing conditions enable the American manufacturer to compel the purchase of his goods by the American farmer at exorbitant profits.

So great has been this discrimination by American manufacturers in favor of foreign purchasers that the Canadian customs authorities have come to regard with suspicion the prices on nearly all American invoices, as they can not understand why these goods should be sold to Canadians at such great reductions from the prices at which they are sold at home at the point of manufacture. As a consequence they have, during the past two years, largely adopted the plan of appraising these goods for duty at the home figures in preference to the prices stated in the invoices. For in-tance, an American manufacturer may be willing to sell a certain article for $5 to the Canadian trade, the price for the same article at home being $8. The valuation is placed at the latter figure, and even though he sells for the former the purchaser has to pay duty on $3 more than the goods cost him. The result of this practice is that we are losing our export trade to this and probably other foreign countries.

The falling off of the American export trade to this port on dutiable articles in one year having been $211,058.

The short-sightedness of our manufacturers in this respect, no less than the development of manufacturing in Canada, is closing this as it does other outside markets to our goods, and is driving us back to trade only within ourselves, to the injury of our great agricultural interests, to the reduction of the wages of our workingmen, and to the lessening of the products of our factories.

Replying thus to your circular by an enumeration of facts, I remain, sir,

Your obedient servant,

WM. DE H. WASHINGTON,
Commercial Agent.

Hon. GEO. L. RIVES,
Assistant Secretary of State, Washington, D. C.

I now read a letter from Mexico:

OFICINA DE L. LADNER Y HNO.,
COMMERCIANTES EN ESTUFAS, FERRETERIA Y OJALATERIA,
Piedras Negras, Mexico, August 9, 1888.

DEAR SIR: Yours of the 2d at hand. In reply take pleasure in giving you the figures asked for as nearly as possible. First, in regard to shovels. Our shovels bought for our Eagle Pass store cost us about $6 per dozen, exclusive of freight. Our shovels of the same class and material cost us laid down in Piedras Negras $2.91 per dozen. Another item: Agate ironware can not be bought for delivery anywhere in the United States at better than 35 per cent. discount. In Piedras Negras we can buy the same articles from the same houses at 60 per cent. discount. The list is the same in both cases. These are not the only articles. Disston's saws can be bought with an additional 20 per cent. discount, showing that the manufacturers could sell in home markets in competition with the outside producers. These figures are only a partial list. Every article known to the hardware trade can be bought from the American manufacturers for export cheaper than they can for home consumption. Hoping this will answer your purpose, we remain,

Very truly, yours,

A. J. LADNER & BRO.
Per H.

Mr. WALTER NEGLEY, *Hagerstown, Md.*

These extracts show conclusively the results from high tariff taxes, which the Senate substitute proposes to increase, and in some instances to the point of prohibition of imports.

A healthful competition with imported products in our home market is as necessary and beneficial to manufacturing interests as to all others.

Ex-President Garfield in the House, on April 1, 1870, in discussing the high tariff taxes, said:

I hold that a properly adjusted competition between home and foreign products is the best gauge by which to regulate international trade. Duties should be so high that our manufacturers can fairly compete with the foreign product, but not so high as to enable them to drive out the foreign article, enjoy a monopoly of the trade, and regulate the prices as they please. This is my doctrine of protection. If Congress pursues this line of policy steadily we shall year by year approach more nearly to the basis of free trade, because we shall be more nearly able to compete with other nations on equal terms. I am for a protection which leads to ultimate free trade.

This competition can never exist under the existing war tariff or the Senate substitute.

I do not seek to destroy or break down or injure our manufacturing interests. The House bill will not do it. I desire to see them prosper and grow. And would to God to-day that they could and would manufacture and supply our entire home demand at fair and legitimate profits and prices with all such articles as can be successfully manufactured here. No one country can produce and manufacture every article of human want.

As rich as we are in the varied products which supply our wants, we can not successfully and profitably, now or in the future, confine our wants to our own supplies and consume them. We will produce many surplus articles wanted in foreign countries, and will want many surplus products of other countries. In order to sell our surplus, we must buy. A revenue tariff, such as the House bill provides, will be more healthful and beneficial to our manufacturing and all other industries than the Senate substitute. The House bill will afford all the incidental protection to our manufacturing interests which they ought to ask, and at the same time reduce the surplus.

THE TARIFF LAW OF JULY 30, 1846.

Why will some of the highly protected industries not learn by the history of the past?

In 1824 the tariff taxes were increased; the greed for large gains was not satisfied. In 1828 the tariff of abominations was enacted, largely increasing the burdens of high taxes.

What did the manufacturers do?

Remember what Mr. Clay said. They saw the reaction, the sober second thought of the people. The situation was similar to the present. There was surplus, the debt was nearly paid, and the surplus threatened a constant increase beyond all the legitimate necessities of the Government.

Did they then propose the policy of the Republican platform and the Senate substitute—to increase the tariff taxes still higher, so as to exclude imports, and by such prohibitory taxes decrease the revenues?

Mr. Clay, in the language I have quoted, shows that they appealed to him to save them by reducing the high-tariff taxes. He presented and passed his compromise bill providing for a gradual reduction of duties to an ad valorem rate of 20 per cent. and declared his measure many years afterward to afford ample and abundant protection.

In 1842 the duties were increased and reaction again ensued, and resulted in the enactment of the Walker tariff of July 30, 1846, which imposed an average ad valorem tax of 25 per cent., 17 per cent. less than the House bill.

This law, this tariff rate of 25 per cent. proved so satisfactory and beneficial that no effort was even made by manufacturers or high protectionists to change, alter, or amend it for nearly eleven years, a longer period than any tariff law enacted since the organization of our Government ever continued in force without change. This is an unanswerable vindication of the wisdom, fairness, justness, and acceptability to the people interested, of this tariff law against all assaults which can be made upon it by our latter-day protectionists. Under its benign operations we heard nothing about the so-called American but real Chinese system of protection, nothing about protection of American labor, nothing about ruined, struggling, infant industries.

It was and is the true American system contemplated by our Constitution—tariff taxes for the purpose of raising the revenues necessary for an honest, economical administration of our Government; and at the same time affording such incidental protection to our necessary manufacturing industries as would secure a properly adjusted competition between their products and similar foreign products and not give them an exclusive monopoly of our home market.

Now, after it had been in operation nearly eleven years, what occurred? It was finally assaulted by the protected manufacturers, those who had so long enjoyed its beneficial operation. Why? I repeat, why? Because under it the revenues were exceeding the necessary wants and demands of the Government. The situation was similar to the present; the public debt was nearly paid and there was a threatened surplus, just like it was in 1832, when Clay passed his compromise tariff. Did the manufacturers propose, ask, or demand an increase of the tariff duties so high as to prevent imports, destroy healthful competition, and thus reduce the threatened surplus and give them a monopoly of the home market, as now proposed by the Republican platform and Senate substitute? Oh, no; that was not the panacea proposed or desired as a substitute for the then existing real American system. No Chinese, no British system was then proposed to be transplanted and acclimated here.

They proposed, and the tariff law of March 3, 1857, was enacted, reducing the rates of duties from the average ad valorem rate of 25 per cent. to 20 per cent.; a reduction of $5 on the $100 valuation.

Senators JOHN SHERMAN and JUSTIN S. MORRILL were then members of the House. From Maine, New Hampshire, Vermont, Massachusetts, Connecticut, and Rhode Island there were 18 yeas and 9 nays. From New York, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Delaware, and Maryland there were 24 yeas and 28 nays. From Ohio, Indiana, Illinois, Michigan, Wisconsin, Iowa, and Missouri, 14 yeas and 33 nays. From Virginia, North Carolina, South Carolina, Georgia, Alabama, Mississippi, Florida, Louisiana, Texas, Arkansas, Kentucky, and Tennessee the yeas were 60 and nays 2, and from California 2 yeas. Senator SHERMAN, who was a member of the House when the law of March 3, 1857, was passed, said on May 10, 1860, in the House:

The manufacturers have asked over and over again that they should be let alone. The tariff of 1857 is the manufacturers' bill; but the present bill is more beneficial to the agricultural interest than the tariff of 1857. Under that all wool costing less than 20 cents a pound was admitted free of duty. Under this bill wool costing less than 18 cents a pound is admitted free of duty, and imposes a duty of 8 cents a pound on all wool costing between 18 and 24 cents, and a duty of 9 cents a pound on all wool costing 25 cents a pound and upwards, thereby raising the duty on wool.

Senator ALLISON, one of the main authors of the Senate substitute, on March 24, 1870, said in the House:

It is claimed that the high rates of our present tariff are necessary, because the revenue to be obtained therefrom is essential to the Government, and that if we reduce the rates at all the effect will be the depression of all the industrial interests of the country. The tariff of 1846, although confessedly and professedly a tariff for revenue, was, so far as regards all the great interests of the country, as perfect a tariff as any that we have ever had. If any interest was depressed under the tariff of 1846, it was the iron interest.

I do not believe that this interest, as compared with other interests, had sufficient advantage under that tariff; yet, when we compare the growth of the country from 1840 to 1850 with the growth of the country from 1850 to 1860, the latter decade being entirely under the tariff of 1846, or the amended and greatly reduced tariff of 1857, we find that the increase in our wealth between 1850 and 1860 was equivalent to 126 per cent., while it was only 64 per cent. between 1840 and 1850, four years of which decade was under the tariff of 1842, known as a high protective tariff, but the average rate of which was about 70 per cent. below the existing rate, or 27 per cent. under the tariff of 1842 as against 44 per cent. upon all importations under the present tariff. Our industries were generally prosperous in 1860, with the exception, possibly, of the iron industry. This was the statement of Mr. MORRILL, of Vermont, on this floor during the discussion of the tariff of 1864.

The length of time the Walker tariff of 1846 remained unchanged—

and then the reduction of the average ad valorem rate of 25 per cent. to 20 in 1857, which was the first change, and the quoted language of Senator ALLISON, one of the authors of the Senate substitute, are complete vindications of the system of tariff taxes for revenue with such incidental protection as all tariff duties afford.

THE WAR TARIFF AND THE CLAIMS OF ITS REDUCTION.

Our Republican friends seem indignant when we charge the fact that the present rates of duty are still the war rates, and in reply they assert that they have been greatly reduced. Why were the very high rates imposed during the war? The records show that such increased rates were not imposed either for the protection of manufactures or for additional revenues solely, but were largely on account of the high rates of internal-revenue taxes imposed on manufacturers and manufactured products. For the proof of this statement I submit the statements of Senators MORRILL and ALLISON, certainly competent witnesses. Senator MORRILL, in the House on March 12, 1862, in advocating the bill "to provide internal revenue to support the Government and pay interest on the public debt," said:

If manufactures in the history of our Government have been fostered, they are now the strongest pillars of our support. A burden that would paralyze the agriculturists of the country will be taken on the backs of the steam giants with alacrity and confidence. But it will be indispensable for us to revise the tariff on foreign imports, so far as it may be seriously disturbed by any internal duties—on some things the tax proposed is more than the present tariff—and to make proper reparation, otherwise we shall have destroyed the goose that lays the golden eggs. From such a revision, including some articles that hitherto it has not been considered sound policy to take from the free-list and lower schedules of the tariff, it is expected also to increase the revenue several millions of dollars. If we bleed manufactures we must see to it that the proper tonic is administered at the same time. There are many articles, however, where the tariff is now high enough for revenue or protection, which will require no advance.

In June, 1864, in the House, Senator MORRILL said:

And when we impose a tax of 5 per cent. upon our manufactures and increase the tariff to the same extent upon foreign manufactures, we leave them upon the same relative footing they were at the start, and neither has cause of complaint. * * *

In making an estimate of the effect of such a war tariff as is now proposed, it is important that we should bear in mind that as we increase the cost of any article we diminish the number of those who are able to consume it. * * *

This is intended as a war measure, a temporary measure, and we must give it our support as such.

Senator ALLISON, in the House, on March 25, 1870, said:

Mr. Chairman, at the close of the session yesterday afternoon I was endeavoring to show the rise and progress of the existing tariff, and the causes therefor, originating in the internal-revenue laws that were passed from time to time from 1861 to 1865, for the purpose of raising revenue to maintain the Government in its struggle with the rebellion. I stated on the 30th of June, 1864, an ad valorem internal-revenue tax was imposed upon manufacturers in this country equivalent to 5 per cent. upon their gross products, and that tax of 5 per cent. was increased by an act passed in March, 1865, so that it became 6 per cent. upon the gross product of every article manufactured or consumed in this country in the way of internal-revenue tax.

This large internal-revenue tax was made the excuse and the cause of the advance of the tariff of July 14, 1862, and June 30, 1864. I quoted the language yesterday of the then chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means in 1862, Mr. Thaddeus Stevens, himself a protectionist, and certainly in favor of the protection of the great interest of Pennsylvania, iron. He made a pledge upon this floor in 1862 that those additions of duties upon manufactured articles imported in this country were made necessary because of the internal-revenue taxes. Both he and Mr. MORRILL, subsequently chairman of the Ways and Means Committee, declared that the act of June 30, 1864, was a temporary measure, a war measure, and was not intended as a measure which should remain upon the statute-book as a protective tariff in the time of peace.

In 1866, when Mr. MORRILL introduced into the Thirty-ninth Congress a tariff measure as a temporary measure, the manufacturers of the country were groaning under a weight of (internal) taxation equivalent to $128,000,000 per annum.

These taxes, by successive acts of repeal, have all been removed. First came the revenue act of July 13, 1866, when the internal tax was removed from most manufactures of iron and steel and reduced upon manufactures of woolens, and the free-list enlarged. In March, 1867, a further reduction of taxes was made, and by the act of March, 1868, all taxes upon manufactures were abolished save only the tax of $2 per $1,000 upon sales, thus practically relieving the domestic industry of the country of a burden which, in 1865, was $73,000,000, in round numbers; in 1866, $128,000,000; in 1867, $92,000,000; and in 1868, $62,000,000. The abolition of these taxes successively upon domestic manufactures had the effect to increase and still increases by so much the tariff on similar articles, inasmuch as no reduction has yet been made in the tariff.

It is admitted by all that the increase of the tariff was commenced and carried on upon the basis of the protective duties of the Morrill tariff of 1861, the increase of direct taxation, which, added to the price of domestic manufactures, rendered an increased tariff necessary in order to prevent our country from being flooded with cheaper foreign productions. Certainly, then, upon the decrease of internal taxation the tariff may be and ought to be decreased in proportion, the danger being no longer in existence which was sought to be averted by those increased duties.

But I may be asked how this reduction shall be made. I think it should be made upon all leading articles, or nearly all, and for that purpose, when I can get an opportunity in the House, if no gentleman does before me, I shall move that the pending bill be recommitted to the Committee on Ways and Means, with instructions to report a reduction upon existing rates of duty equivalent to 20 per cent. upon the existing rates, or one-fifth reduction. Even this will not be a full equivalent for the removal of all the internal taxes upon manufactures.

During the delivery of this speech Hon. S. S. COX, interrupting Mr. ALLISON, said:

I desire to say, in addition to what has been said by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. ALLISON], that I was on the committee of conference upon the tariff of 1864. The reason why that conference report was made as it was made, the reason given by Mr. MORRILL and Mr. Fessenden, was that the internal tax had been raised, but that the moment that tax was reduced they would be in favor of reducing customs duties. That was understood when the report was made upon the tariff of 1864; it was one of the conditions leading the conference committee to report that measure.

Hon. Zach. Chandler, in the United States Senate, in 1870, during this discussion, said:

The time has arrived when this tariff question must be settled and settled upon a permanent basis. New England, for the last fifty years, has been receiving the benefit of protection to every product of her looms and her anvils. She now is in the position of the rebels who, after they had established their government in the South, wanted "to be let alone." That is all New England wants now. She has got all the protection she needs on her products, and now her cry is: "Let us alone, and strike off protection from every other part of the United States." I give notice that I shall, at an early day, introduce a bill repealing the entire revenue system and placing a horizontal duty upon every article imported into the United States, except spirits, wine, and tobacco.

The extreme high war rates were imposed as an equivalent for the very heavy internal-revenue taxes imposed on manufacturers and their products, with the distinct understanding that they would be reduced as the internal-revenue taxes were.

Have they been so reduced?

The majority report of the Senate Finance Committee, proposing the substitute, states that "three important revisions of the tariff have taken place since 1870, namely, by the acts of July 14, 1870; of June 6, 1872, and of March 3, 1883;" and claims that by the act of July 14, 1870, one hundred and seventy-eight dutiable articles were placed on the free-list and rates reduced on fifty articles; and by the act of June 6, 1872, two hundred and thirteen items were added to the free-list and duties reduced specifically on forty-nine articles "in addition to those upon which a uniform reduction of 10 per cent. was made;" and by the act of March 3, 1883, seventy-two articles were placed on the free-list, while the rates were reduced on four hundred and twenty-seven paragraphs.

It is true that section 2 of the act of June 6, 1872, provided for a reduction of 10 per cent. after August 1, 1872, on the then existing duties on "all manufactures of cotton, etc., on all wools, etc., on all iron and steel, and on all manufactures, etc., of same, on all metals and manufactures of metals, etc., not otherwise provided for, on all paper, etc., on all manufactures of india-rubber, etc., on all glass and glassware, and on all cotton," not otherwise provided for.

This was a substantial reduction had it been permitted to remain. But by section 4 of the act of March 3, 1875, said section 2 of June 6, 1872, carried into the Revised Statutes as section 2503, was repealed, and the 10 per cent. duties restored as to all manufactures of cotton, etc. And by this act of March 3, 1875, the duties on "molasses, concentrated molasses, tank-bottoms, sirup of sugar, cane-juice, melada, and on sugars according to the Dutch standard in color," were increased 25 per cent. of the then existing duties.

Their claim of reductions by act of March 3, 1883, is not sustained. The Tariff Commission recommended a reduction of 20 to 25 per cent. The reduction actually made was not 4 per cent. average ad valorem. The war rates, therefore, have not been reduced as promised, and as the internal-revenue taxes were reduced.

They have reduced taxes, but they are the very taxes which caused the increased tariff taxes to be imposed, and not the war-tariff taxes. The following statement of the receipts into the Treasury from customs, or tariff taxes, and internal revenue will show how each has been comparatively reduced yearly:

Year.	Customs.	Internal revenue.
1866	$179,046,651.58	$309,226,813.42
1867	176,114,810.88	266,027,537.43
1868	164,464,599.56	191,087,589.41
1869	180,048,426.63	158,356,460.86
1870	194,538,374.44	184,889,756.49
1871	206,270,408.05	143,098,153.63
1872	216,370,286.77	130,642,177.72
1873	188,089,522.70	113,729,314.14
1874	163,103,833.69	102,409,784.90
1882	220,410,730.25	146,497,505.45
1885	181,471,939.34	112,498,725.54
1886	192,905,023.44	116,805,536.48
1888	219,091,173.63	121,296,871.98

These figures show how the war tariff still remains and the internal-revenue taxes have been reduced. The reductions made in the internal-revenue taxes are worthy of consideration and interesting. They have removed the internal-revenue taxes from apothecaries, auctioneers, banks and bankers, billiard-rooms, bowling-alleys, pawnbrokers, produce brokers, stock brokers, circuses, claim agents, express carriers and agents, insurance agents, even jugglers, lottery-ticket dealers, all manufacturers, patent-right dealers, peddlers, and theaters.

They also removed the internal taxes from all incomes (the tax being on incomes over $600), and all dividends or profits from banks, canal, insurance, turnpike, and railroad corporations and companies. From these income and dividend taxes, up to 1873 included, there had been paid into the Treasury the sum of $346,768,347.77.

They also removed the internal taxes from all legacies and successions, which yielded over $14,000,000 up to 1871.

And for the special benefit of the toiling laborers they removed all internal taxes on "billiard tables," carriages, plate of gold and silver, gold watches, piano-fortes kept for use, and yachts kept for use. But in order to show more clearly how the internal taxes have been reduced while the war-tariff taxes have been maintained, let us consider the percentage of the total internal taxes paid into the Treasury each year

under the internal-revenue laws, which have been repealed, or the percentage of collections of internal taxes under the repealed laws, to the total collections under all the laws.

This percentage of collections under laws since repealed was 82.76 per cent. in 1865, 81.61 per cent. in 1866, 77.04 per cent. in 1867, 76.65 per cent. in 1868, 52.82 per cent. in 1869, 49.18 per cent. in 1870, 38.95 per cent. in 1871, 30.24 per cent. in 1872, 15.58 in 1873, and 10 per cent. in 1874 and 1875, 9.39 per cent. in 1876, 8.83 per cent. in 1877, 9.27 per cent. in 1878, 8.94 per cent. in 1879, 9 per cent. in 1880, 8.71 in 1881, 9.15 in 1882, 7.90 in 1883, and fell below 1 per cent. in 1884 under tariff law of March 3, 1883.

In other words, 82 per cent. of the 100 per cent. of all internal-revenue taxes have been removed, while the war-tariff taxes still remain, and the Senate substitute proposes no general reduction, but an enormous increase on many articles over existing rates.

Republicans complain that they have had no chance to revise the tariff for the last five years on account of failure of the Democratic House to pass such a bill.

In the Forty-seventh Congress the Republicans were in power in both branches of Congress. March 3, 1883, they passed their tariff bill, pretending to reduce tariff taxation. They made an actual reduction on some articles, an increase on others, and on others still fixed specific instead of ad valorem duties, thus cunningly revising the law so as to impose higher average duties than before. The average ad valorem duty upon all dutiable articles for the year ending June 30, 1883, before that law took effect, was 42.45 per cent.; under the operation of the law as our Republican friends revised it this duty has been gradually climbing up, so that on the 30th day of June, 1887, it had reached 47.10 per cent.

Republicans now complain they have had no chance in the Senate to revise the tariff for five years past.

On the 6th of May, 1884, the Democrats were in possession of the House, and a motion was made to strike out the enacting clause of Mr. Morrison's bill reducing tariff taxation, and the bill was defeated by a majority of 4; 118 Republicans voted against this bill; they were aided by 41 Democrats; voting for the bill were 4 Republicans and 151 Democrats. On the 17th day of June, 1886, Mr. Morrison moved another bill to reduce tariff taxation. This was defeated by the votes of 107 Republicans aided by 33 Democrats; for the bill were 3 Republicans and 137 Democrats. The Democratic majority were unable to pass a bill through the House of Representatives because of the united opposition of the Republican members, aided by a few Democrats. Thus we see why no bill has, in former Congresses when the House was Democratic, been passed. It has not been the fault of the Democratic party. Why so much delay in reporting the House bill back to the Senate?

The celebrated tariff bill of 1846 was passed by the House July the 7th; in twenty-two days afterwards, July 28, it passed the Senate.

The tariff bill of 1857 passed the Senate six days after it passed the House. I do not cite, because it would not be fair, the rapidity with which such bills were rushed through the Senate during the war. I point only to what was done in time of peace. The tariff bill of 1867 was in the Senate committee fifty-four days, the longest time of any I have been able to find. The tariff bill of 1870 passed the House June 6; twenty-nine days thereafter, July 5, it passed the Senate.

Now we come to the last tariff bill that was passed, the bill of 1883. December 8, 1882, the Senate took from the Calendar a little internal-revenue bill, recommitted it to the Senate Committee on Finance, and January 4, 1883, that committee reported to the Senate a complete tariff bill tacked on to an internal-revenue bill—a thing never done before in the history of our legislation. I call attention to it to prove, and it undoubtedly does prove, that when they want to do a thing they can find a way to do it, and they are not always about it, either. They framed that bill, root and branch; they reported it to the Senate, perfect and complete, in twenty-seven days; and on the 20th of February they passed it.

The same committee that framed the bill of 1883 in twenty-seven days is in the Senate now, and was at work in committee, or pretended to be, on this bill for one hundred and thirty days. The Republican members of that committee were in 1883, Messrs. MORRILL, SHERMAN, Ferry, JONES of Nevada, ALLISON, and ALDRICH. Only one Senator has gone—Ferry. The other five have been there all the time since. They have had five years more of experience; five years more of service on that committee than they had had in 1883; five years more within which to familiarize themselves with the details of taxation: and losing Senator Ferry they have gained HISCOCK, at least his equal in ability and far his superior in knowledge of the subject, for Senator HISCOCK has had many years' experience as a member of the Ways and Means Committee in fighting and killing in the House bills for the relief of the people that never lived to be considered in the Senate. What is the matter with them? What has this committee to gain by taking one hundred and thirty days in which to frame a bill, when five years ago they could make one in twenty-seven days?

The answer can be made but in one way: delay—delay that would excuse them from voting. They have not intended to vote, they dare not vote upon their bill, for a vote would show their division. They prefer the bill should stand subject to amendment. In that shape it is pliable as any political platform that ever was built. In Kansas and on the Pacific coast they can promise to amend it in one particular. That means that the high tariff on sugar which the Kansas farmers want protected can be put back next session. All the Republican members from Kansas and the Pacific coast voted in the House against the reduction on sugar made by the Mills bill. The Senators from those States compromise to vote against the reduction on sugar in the Senate bill. Senators from the Northwest can promise to amend it in other particulars, and those from Pennsylvania and New England can promise still other amendments. The advantage, then, they have is that the Mills bill is the action of a Democratic House. If there are any defects in that bill Republicans can assail it—a Democratic House passed it. But if the Senate bill is defective, why, Republicans can promise that the Senate will amend it. The Senate has not indorsed it. It is only the bill of a committee.

Rumor has it that the distinguished Senator from Ohio [Mr. SHERMAN], before this bill was reported from the Committee on Finance, seducingly intimated to members of the other House that if they would pass a resolution to adjourn and send it here his side of the Senate would vote for it, and they would adjourn before any bill was reported at all.

What have they been waiting for? To take action on this bill? They have been waiting to wear out members of the other House so as to induce that House to pass a resolution to adjourn. They have been waiting to wear out the House and wear out the minority of the Senate, and if possible induce some tired Democrat to offer a resolution to adjourn, so that they can go upon the stump and proclaim to the world that the Democratic party had prevented them from passing this tariff bill.

Mr. SPOONER. There has not been much of a House left to wear out.

Mr. COCKRELL. The responsibility for passing or not passing this bill rests upon the Republican majority of the Senate and not upon the Democratic House. It does not make a bit of difference whether there is one man in the Democratic House or not, the Democratic House has done its duty; it has passed the bill, and it is here; and you have no right to make any inquiry as to whether there is a quorum in that body or not. It has nothing further to do with the tariff question until you have passed your bill and sent it back to that body.

Why have you not done that? There is a reason for it. There is always a policy behind the action of the Republican Senators, distinguished leaders, aspirants for the highest positions in the gift of their party. There is always a reason. The House passed a bill, and the Republican members of the House offered no substitute at all; they proposed to stand upon opposition to that measure. The Chicago convention met and they declared against the reduction. They declared for reducing duties by increasing the rates of duty. That was the policy upon which the Republican members of the House went. They therefore refused to do anything. The bill came here. The Republican Senators were not willing to charge the Democratic line under that kind of a banner. Therefore they must change the line, change front, if possible, in the face of the enemy; and they bring in a bill presumably, claimed to be reducing the tariff and at the same time increasing the rates of duty.

It is a keen, double-edged sword. There is fat to be fried out of somebody; there is fat to be fried out of the manufacturers. Here is one process of frying it: Increase the rates of duty on certain manufactures; they will fry liberally; generous streams will flow from them into the Republican campaign fund. Here is another class. The duties are lowered on them, and they, too, will fry as long as that bill is pending here in the Senate and promises can be made that the duties will be changed.

Only a day or two ago a controversy sprang up in West Virginia over putting a certain kind of coal on the free-list. Who was it who rose in his seat and asked what was the provision of the bill in regard to that article, and who was it who got up and made an explanation that it was a mistake and would be corrected?

In other words, this bill is to be kept open to fry the fat out of all kinds of manufacturers, those who are protected by increased duties and those who claim to be injured by reduced duties. Whenever anybody comes and makes a complaint, "Oh, we will correct that before the bill is passed; we have just reported it tentatively."

The committee say in their report that they are going to take additional testimony; that they are going to give the bill further consideration. What did you report it here for, then, if you are not ready to act upon it? Oh, it is a double-edged sword, and it is keen both ways and on both sides, with a sharp point. You wanted to bring all the manufacturers before you. Did you ever send for any of the farmers? Did you ever send for any of the wheelers? Did you ever send for any of the laborers, the toiling millions? Did you have a man before you who did not come there voluntarily, and whose expenses were not paid by somebody if not out of his own pocket?

We have not yet had the opportunity to see the testimony in print; but I understand you investigated that infamous jute combine out West, and you had before you, I understand, a St. Louis gentleman, one of my constituents, and he brought before you witnesses from Indiana, and from Ohio, probably, and other States, to tell you that it would not do to reduce the tariff on jute. When they were questioned

about it, they were made to confess that this jute man had hired them by the day to come here, and had borne their expenses to come here and swear in his interest.

That is the kind of testimony that you had before that tariff investigation; and this bill has not been reported to be passed. It never has been the intention to do it, and your only hope now to get out of your dilemma is that some Democrat, tired out, will introduce a resolution to adjourn and you will be enabled to let go.

What is your bill? It takes from the free-list and places on the dutiable-list the following articles to the following amounts, according to the importations of 1887:

Articles proposed by Senate Finance Committee to be transferred from the free-list to the dutiable list.

Articles.	Values.	Estimated duties under Senate substitute.
Aluminium	$9,458.00	$1,891.60
Oil of poppy	27,528.00	6,882.00
Gold size	7,461.00	2,984.40
Root flour	575.00	115.00
Macaroni	500,970.20	177,339.54
Animals for breeding—		
Cattle	401,168.83	70,970.00
Hogs	2,298.00	80.00
Horses	2,252,374.00	301,800.00
Sheep	56,348.00	14,267.50
All other	51,357.00	10,271.40
Total	3,309,538.03	586,601.44

Also, "fresh fish, when frozen or packed in ice." Of this no estimate can be made.

This substitute proposes to place some dutiable articles from the schedules of "chemicals," "sugar," "provisions," "cottons," "hemp, flax, and jute," and "sundries," of the aggregate value of $26,331,815.38 as imported in 1887, on the free-list.

On many of the schedules the duties are increased.

On the whole amount of metals imported in 1887, amounting to $55,111,922.37, the average duty paid was 40.77; under the Senate bill it would be 42.13. On cotton manufactures, amounting to $30,208,851.83, the average duty was 39.99; under the Senate bill it will be 40.74. On books, papers, etc., amounting to $5,214,635.21, the average duty has been raised. On sundries, amounting to $59,580,006.88, the average duty has been raised. On wool and woolens, amounting to $20,586,613.71, the average duty was 58.80; under the Senate bill it will be 66.12.

Ties for baling cotton and hay now pay a duty of 35 per cent. Capitalists not willing to manufacture them at the importer's price with 35 per cent. added, demanded such a duty as will enable them to "control the American market," and the Senate bill raises the duty to over 100 per cent. This would give us the benefit of a "cotton-tie trust." On woolen dress-goods costing abroad an average of 15 cents a yard, the duty now, 83 per cent., is raised to 92 per cent. These are only samples; look at whole schedules.

The following table shows the values of certain named articles as imported in 1887 and the amounts of duties collected under present and the average ad valorem duty thereon under present law. Also the amounts of duties payable thereon under the House bill, with the average ad valorem rate thereon, and the same under the Senate substitute, and the amounts of the excess of duties payable thereon under the Senate substitute over the same under present law and the percentage of increase, and also the percentage of increase of duties under House bill. This is the table from which my colleague [Mr. VEST] read yesterday, and I will not consume the time of the Senate in reading it.

Values of and duties collected on the below-named manufactured articles entered for consumption in the United States during the year ending June 30, 1887, with the estimated amounts of duty accruing on like imports under the provisions of House bill 9051 and the Senate substitute; also showing the excess in amounts of duty under the Senate substitute over like amounts under the present laws and House bill 9051.

Articles.	Values.	Duties collected under—						Excess of duties under Senate substitute over—			
		Present laws.		House bill.		Senate substitute.		Present laws.		House bill.	
		Amounts.	Av. ad valorem rates.	Amounts.	Av. ad valorem rates.	Amounts.	Av. ad valorem rates.	Amounts.	Per cent.	Amounts.	Per cent.
Woolens:			*Per cent.*		*Per cent.*		*Per cent.*				
Cloths	$10,022,370.67	$7,055,824.94	70.40	$4,008,948.26	40.00	$7,531,853.64	75.15	$476,028.70	6.75	$3,522,905.38	87.88
Dress goods	17,199,141.02	12,398,974.92	72.09	6,879,656.41	40.00	13,419,025.95	78.02	1,020,051.03	8.23	6,539,369.54	95.05
Knit goods	1,980,453.74	1,243,689.31	62.80	792,181.49	40.00	1,423,935.33	71.90	180,246.02	14.50	631,753.84	79.44
Shawls	1,029,998.19	654,008.00	63.50	411,999.27	40.00	703,154.00	68.27	49,146.00	7.51	291,154.73	70.67
Yarns	1,747,562.09	1,207,734.64	69.11	699,024.84	40.00	1,989,236.45	113.83	781,501.81	64.71	1,290,211.61	184.57
Cottons:											
Thread, not on spools	919,702.30	423,759.58	46.08	355,035.58	38.60	466,497.26	50.72	42,737.68	10.09	111,461.68	31.39
Cloths	3,555,347.28	1,617,200.80	45.49	1,422,138.91	40.00	1,777,010.63	49.98	159,809.83	9.88	354,871.72	24.95
Flax, hemp, and jute:											
Brown and bleached linens, etc	13,589,418.53	4,756,296.50	35.00	3,397,354.64	25.00	5,435,767.42	40.00	679,470.92	14.29	2,038,412.78	60.00
Laces and embroideries	1,142,473.85	342,742.00	30.00	342,742.00	30.00	571,236.67	50.00	228,494.67	66.67	228,494.67	66.67
Yarns	789,013.50	276,154.73	35.00	118,354.02	15.00	315,605.40	40.00	39,450.67	14.29	197,251.38	166.66
Iron and steel:											
Steel, in forms not specified	6,091,898.65	2,614,385.43	42.92	2,614,385.65	42.92	3,488,080.52	57.26	873,695.09	33.42	873,695.09	33.42
Railway bars	1,000,329.00	843,347.49	84.30	545,853.04	54.57	777,672.29	77.74	*65,675.20	*7.79	213,819.25	42.47
Tin-plates	16,883,813.95	5,706,433.89	33.80	Free		5,706,433.89	33.80			5,706,433.19	100.00
Needles, not for machines	307,484.44	76,871.10	25.00	Free		76,871.10	25.00			76,871.10	100.00

*Minus.

NOTE.—The amounts of duty stated as "collected" under House bill and Senate substitute are estimated upon the imports of 1887.

W. F. SWITZLER, *Chief of Bureau.*

TREASURY DEPARTMENT, BUREAU OF STATISTICS,
Washington, D. C., October 11, 1888.

Mr. ALDRICH. Will the Senator be kind enough to state what is the final result, what the average ad valorem rate on all dutiable goods?

Mr. COCKRELL. Under your bill?

Mr. ALDRICH. Yes.

Mr. COCKRELL. Why, you pretend to reduce it to 42.75 per cent.

Mr. ALDRICH. We do not pretend at all. That is not a part of our statement.

Mr. COCKRELL. It is your system, not your statement. I understand that. This statement was made by the Treasury Department, and that your system and mode of imposing these duties, calculated as best can be done before they are put in practical operation, shows that you levy an average ad valorem duty of 42.75 per cent.

Mr. ALDRICH. How much is it in the Mills bill?

Mr. COCKRELL. By the Mills bill it is 42.77 per cent., according to my calculation.

Mr. ALDRICH. It is higher by the Mills bill than by ours.

Mr. COCKRELL. Yes; that is, the general average is very slightly. What have you done? How have you cut your rates down? By striking at the sugar tariff, and there is your tender point. Your reductions are all made in the sugar tariff.

Before the House bill was finally reported from the Committee on Ways and Means and in the proceedings of that committee on March 19, 1888, the following proceeding was had:

Mr. BROWNE, of Indiana, moved to strike out lines 340 to 370, inclusive (being the sugar provision, and which would have left sugar at present rates). Lost by following vote: Ayes, Messrs. Kelley, Brown, Reed, McKinley, and Burrows—5; nays, Messrs. McMillin, C. R. Breckinridge, Turner, Wilson, Scott, Bynum, and Mills—7.

Thus when the sugar schedule was pending before the Committee on Ways and Means of the House—and the record has been made public and it is now public property—a Republican member of that committee, Mr. BROWNE, of Indiana, moved to restore the present tariff rates

upon it and not to reduce it at all, and every Republican member there voted for that, voted to restore sugar to the present duty, and they voted in the House against the measure of the majority to reduce the tariff on sugar.

Mr. CHACE. Why, Mr. President, does the Senator say that the Republican members of the Ways and Means Committee voted in the House against a reduction of the tariff duty on sugar?

Mr. COCKRELL. I do not know how they voted in the House on final action.

Mr. CHACE. I understood the Senator to say "in the House."

Mr. COCKRELL. They voted in committee to restore the duty to its present rate, to what it was before, and not to sustain the Democratic majority of the committee in reducing it.

Mr. CHACE. Did they not vote in the House to take off 50 per cent. of the duties on sugar?

Mr. COCKRELL. I do not remember.

Mr. CHACE. That is the fact, I believe.

Mr. COCKRELL. I do not know whether it is or not.

Mr. ALLISON. Certainly, it is the fact.

Mr. CHACE. I should like to say that I am advised by a member of the House of Representatives, who claims to know the fact, that the statement made by the Senator from Missouri is incorrect.

Mr. COCKRELL. What statement?

Mr. CHACE. That they did not vote in committee in that way.

Mr. COCKRELL. I have the official record, and I do not care what the member of the House may say. The official record of the vote by yeas and nays in the committee on March 19, 1888, shows just what I have read.

Mr. CHACE. Will the Senator pardon me one or two questions on this sugar schedule?

Mr. COCKRELL. If the Senator does not make a speech.

Mr. CHACE. I understand the Senator to make out that the average rate of duties in these two bills is about 42 per cent. Will he tell us what the ad valorem rate is in the Senate substitute on sugar?

Mr. COCKRELL. Forty-one and two-tenths per cent.

Mr. CHACE. That is about the same as the average rate of duties.

Mr. COCKRELL. Not at all, sir; the average rate of duties under the present law is 78 per cent.

Mr. CHACE. No; but I say it is about 41 per cent. in the Senate substitute, and the average of all the duties in both bills is about 42 per cent. Now, will the Senator please to tell us why sugar, an agricultural product, should have a rate of duty upon it higher than the average duties upon the most extreme manufactured articles in the country?

Mr. COCKRELL. If the protective system must be maintained at all hazards, and rather than yield one part of the protective system you are going to have free whisky, why will you make a 50 per cent. reduction upon sugar, an industry that, if its friends in Kansas and other States are correct, needs protection at this time, a new industry, the production of sugar from sorghum by machinery, while you increase your tariff on woolen goods manufactured in your own States 100 per cent.?

Mr. ALDRICH. Does the Senator from Missouri support the duty on sugar as a protective duty?

Mr. COCKRELL. It makes no difference whether I support it or do not support it. I am arguing about the Republican party and not about my views. I am attacking the Republican party. I am not defending myself. I am not on trial.

Mr. ALDRICH. I am asking the Senator for his views, if he is willing to give them.

Mr. COCKRELL. It is immaterial what my views are. That is not the question. The question before the American people is the Senate substitute as compared with the House bill. It is a measure that has been brought into the Senate to fry the fat out of the manufacturers by giving some of them high rates and others reduced rates, and then hold it here and never pass it, promising changes and amendments; and, as I said before, when the other day the people of West Virginia got scared, a distinguished Representative running for office sent word down here to the Senator from Iowa [Mr. ALLISON] or some of the Republican Senators that that would never do, and a Republican Senator very innocently gets up on the floor and interrogated the distinguished Senator from Iowa, and he tells him that that is all going to be arranged; that that was just simply a mistake. Let anybody else find any defect in the bill and the same promise can be made.

Mr. ALLISON. It will be.

Mr. COCKRELL. I have no doubt of it; and it is said, rumor has it, that the frying-pan was kept not far from the Senate Finance Committee, so that when the manufacturers and others came voluntarily before the committee, they had an opportunity of visiting that frying-pan and seeing what was wanted.

Mr. President, in addition to the Republican members of the Ways and Means Committee of the House voting to restore the tariff to its present rates, in 1886, when a tariff bill was before the Ways and Means Committee of the House, the Senator from New York [Mr. HISCOCK], then a member of the House, put a question to Mr. GAY, now, and then, a member of the House, in regard to salt and sugar. I read what occurred before the House Committee on Ways and Means March 10, 1886, whilst Mr. GAY was addressing the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. You have got an island of salt?

Mr. GAY. There is no telling the developments of it. There are now fifty cargoes of salt shipped by the day from that island, and its possibilities are unknown.

Mr. HISCOCK. The way with us to remedy the trouble is this: Gentlemen who think as you do should come over and vote on our side of the House, and then the gentlemen at this end of the table will be elevated up to the other end, and you will not be troubled with this thing any more.

Mr. GAY. Whether I stand on one side or the other, I am for the legitimate protection of every American industry.

Mr. HISCOCK. We want the men who think as you do to help us to organize the House so that the order at this table may be reversed.

In other words, you have reached that point where you form a tariff combination trust, and all your interests must stand or fall together.

Mr. ALDRICH. Those same gentlemen voted for the Mills bill. What kind of a combination was it that resulted in that vote?

Mr. COCKRELL. That is just what I wanted the Senator to say. That is the reason you cut sugar down. There it is in a nutshell. They did not vote with you in the House this time, and you are punishing them for it now. That is the reason; that is just exactly the question I wanted the Senator to ask.

Mr. ALDRICH. Will the Senator permit me?

Mr. COCKRELL. Certainly.

Mr. ALDRICH. Every single Republican Senator in 1883 voted for a reduction on sugar almost as great as now is included in this bill, notwithstanding the fact that the Senator says a reduction was proposed by a Democratic member in the House. It is a well-known fact that the gentlemen to whom I have alluded were opposed to the Mills bill up to a certain time, and afterwards they voted for it; and I was asking the Senator if he had any information upon the subject of what it was that caused the change.

Mr. COCKRELL. I have never heard of any cause for the change. I have never seen any cause why the Republican party of the Senate should go back upon the Republican party in the House in regard to this matter.

Mr. ALDRICH. The Republican party in the House voted, without a single exception, in favor of a reduction of 50 per cent. on the present tariff on a vote by tellers.

Mr. COCKRELL. Did the Kansas men vote for the reduction?

Mr. ALDRICH. I say every Republican member in the House.

Mr. COCKRELL. Do you call them Republicans?

Mr. ALDRICH. Yes, sir. With one exception every Republican member voted for a reduction of 50 per cent. on sugar, which is precisely the same reduction effected by the Senate substitute.

Mr. COCKRELL. Now, Mr. President, there is a formation among them, and there is no question about it, to hold up the tariff to the present high war-tariff rates.

Mr. President, I hold in my hand a list of articles on which the duty has been raised by the substitute of our committee. I will have it inserted at the end of my remarks.

You have taken hold of the tariff schedules. Schedule No. 226 changes the rate on tobacco, cigars, cheroots, etc., $2.50 per pound and 25 per cent. to $3.50 per pound, a reduction of $273,097 on importations of 1887.

By this change cigars worth $10 per 1,000, which now pay $2.50 per pound, or an average of $37.50, and 20 per cent., $40, would pay $3.50 per pound, or an average of $52.50 per 1,000, an increase of $12.50 per 1,000, while cigars costing $250 per 1,000, which now pay $100 duty per 1,000, would pay $52.50 per 1,000 under the substitute, the same as the cheap cigar, a reduction of $47.50 per 1,000. That, I suppose, is for the benefit of the laboring man!

Mr. ALDRICH. Let me suggest to the Senator from Missouri, if he has made that calculation upon cigars costing a dollar a thousand, which is quite as probable as Havana cigars costing $10 a thousand, he will show ten times as high an ad valorem rate.

Mr. COCKRELL. Mr. President, the question before the Senate and before the people to-day is a tariff to prohibit imports, because that is the practical policy, the declared policy of the Republican party in its platform, and a majority of the Republican Senate. A minority of the Republican Senate can not change that policy. That is your platform. Upon the other hand, the Democratic party stands upon the platform of a reduction of the rates of tariff duties to that amount which will yield revenues for the support of the Government and afford the incidental protection which all tariff duties afford.

You have not passed your bill; you do not intend to pass it. You are just waiting now to get some tired Democrat to introduce a resolution to adjourn, and you will gladly adopt it and go home, and then try to charge upon the Democratic party throughout the length and breadth of the land that the cause you have not passed the tariff bill is that the Democrats moved an adjournment.

APPENDIX.

ITEMS ON WHICH DUTY IS RAISED BY SENATE SUBSTITUTE.

Metals:

Chains less than three-eighths inch.

Sheets of iron or steel less than No. 29 wire gauge.

Sheets of iron or steel less than No. 29 wire gauge, galvanized.

Metals—continued.
Fence-wire rods smaller than No. 5.
Wire worth over 10 cents per pound.
Steel ingots, blooms, billets, etc., less than 1 cent.
Cotton-ties.
Bronze powder.
Table cutlery, and all knives.
Penknives and pocket knives.
Gold leaf.
Breech-loading shotguns, cheap.
Quicksilver.
Wood-screws one-half inch and less.
Type metal.
Wood:
Rattans, manufactured.
Tobacco:
Cigars, cigarettes, and cheroots, cheap.
Leaf-tobacco, wrapper.
Provisions:
Animals, live.
Cotton:
Medium yarns.
Cotton cloth exceeding 150 threads to 200.
Stockings and hose, fashioned.
Flax and hemp:
Yarns.
Brown and bleached linens.
Grass-cloth.
Sheetings.
Manufactures of flax, etc.
Sail duck.
Jute yarn.
Laces, embroideries, etc.
Cuffs and collars.
Wool:
Class 1, combing wools, cheap.
Class 2, clothing wools, cheap.
Class 3, carpet wools, dear.
Manufactures of wool:
Cloths.
Shawls.
All manufactures.
Flannels.
Blankets.
Hats.
Balmorals.
Yarns.
Women and children's dress goods.
Clothing, ready-made.
Cloaks, dolmans, and jackets.
Silk goods:
Laces, embroideries.
Wearing apparel.
Books and papers:
Blank books.
Photographs.
Buttons.

Mr. SPOONER obtained the floor.

Mr. COCKRELL. Before the Senator proceeds I should like to have read or put in the RECORD a letter from the Commissioner of Internal Revenue in regard to the system for the free use of distilled spirits in the arts and manufactures as provided for in the substitute of our Finance Committee.

Mr. HOAR. I suppose it may be inserted in the RECORD without being read.

Mr. ALDRICH. I want it read either before or after the Senator entitled to the floor gets through.

Mr. COCKRELL. I want it to go in as part of my remarks.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The Secretary will read the paper.

The Chief Clerk read as follows:

TREASURY DEPARTMENT, OFFICE OF INTERNAL REVENUE,
Washington, October 8, 1888.

SIR: Referring to your request for an expression of my views respecting the proposed exemption from tax of alcohol used in the industrial arts, as provided in the amendment reported by the Senate Finance Committee to House bill 9051, inclosed please find copy of a letter addressed from this office to Hon. JAMES B. BECK, under date of August 2, in response to a similar request pending the consideration of this proposed measure in committee. No copy of the proposed amendment was furnished this office at the time, and this suggested change in the law was considered simply as a proposition, without regard to the conditions imposed, and solely from a revenue standpoint. Notwithstanding the many safeguards now contained in the bill against the fraudulent use of the alcohol so exempt from tax, the proposed measure is, in my judgment, still open to the objections noted in my letter referred to; and as a measure for the relief of the manufacturer and the tax-payer, the amendment, I think, is open to still further objection.

The many requirements contained in the bill respecting the storage, custody, and use of the alcohol in the cases provided, and the large bond security exacted and other conditions imposed for the prevention of fraud, would, in my opinion, prove so burdensome and so difficult of compliance in many instances as to prevent the average manufacturer from availing himself of the proposed exemption.

The quantity of alcohol used in small lots by retail druggists and other small manufacturers in this country for pharmaceutical purposes and in the preparation of cologne-waters, toilet articles, etc., is very considerable and possibly exceeds, in the aggregate, the quantity used by the large wholesale manufacturers for like purposes. But, in order to obtain alcohol free of tax in the manner provided for in the bill (except in cases where the alcohol has first been methylated) the applicant must first provide a separate and secure room on his premises for the exclusive storage of the alcohol so obtained, and must file with the collector of his district the necessary notices and entries and a bond in a sum of not less than $5,000; and no portion of the alcohol, however small, can be removed from such store-room unless for immediate use and in the presence of the Government storekeeper having the custody of the room and spirits stored therein.

The practical difficulties here involved in the case of a small manufacturer, in providing the required store-room and securing the attendance of a storekeeper at the proper time, are such as would, in my judgment, effectually exclude this class of manufacturers from any benefits under the bill. If such should prove to be the case the business of manufacturing articles where alcohol is used in any considerable quantities would, of course, soon pass into the hands of a few large manufacturers who could easily comply with all the requirements of the proposed law. Such a law would be manifestly unjust; and the benefits which the consumer of the articles so produced would derive under the law would be such as the manufacturers would graciously concede. The provisions made in the bill for the establishment of "bonded alcohol warehouses," into which all bonded alcohol withdrawn from the distiller's warehouse must pass before reaching the manufacturer, would also in my judgment be greatly to the advantage of the large manufacturer over his smaller competitor.

The large bond security ($100,000) required of the proprietor of such warehouse would necessarily limit the number of warehouses so established, and would of course effectually prevent the small manufacturer from establishing his own bonded warehouse. By a system of wafehouse charges, commissions, etc., the small manufacturer would be entirely at the mercy of the proprietors of these bonded warehouses and the distillers of the alcohol. The opportunity afforded by this bill for a combination of alcohol distillers and large manufacturers to establish these bonded warehouses and control the spirits entered into and withdrawn therefrom is, to my mind, a most dangerous one.

One of the principal objections now urged to the present tax on distilled spirits, especially as to alcohol (on which the tax is nearly five times the cost of producing the article) is that, owing to this high rate of tax and the many onerous restrictions placed on the business, the manufacture of this article is controlled by a few distillers, who, by limiting their production, are able to fix their own price on the article produced. If, as I apprehend, the effect of this proposed amendment to the law imposing this large tax would be to confine the manufacture of articles from alcohol, free of tax, to a comparatively small number of manufacturers, the monopoly feature of the internal-revenue law, if it now exists, would, instead of being lessened, be greatly increased, and the whole system of revenue laws relating to distilled spirits would become so unequal and unjust as to invite their hasty repeal.

In view of this objectionable feature of the bill and the dangers to be apprehended from the fraudulent use of the alcohol as set forth in the accompanying letter, I can not but regard this proposed measure as inexpedient and dangerous in the highest degree.

Recent experiments conducted in this office with methylated spirits (the details of which will appear in my annual report of 1888) demonstrate the fact that such spirits, even when containing a large per cent. of methyl, can by a very simple and inexpensive process be so demethylated or cleansed as to admit of their being used in the compounding of liquors intended as beverages.

The provision found in the bill for the methylation of alcohol in the bonded alcohol warehouses, and the exemption of such methylated spirits from many of the restrictions applicable to pure alcohol, would seem to furnish another dangerous opportunity for fraud, instead of affording an additional safeguard against fraud as intended.

The proposed measure is open to the further objection that the employment of a force necessary to carry out the provisions of the bill, and to properly supervise the business therein authorized, would probably entail upon the Government an expense greater than any similar measure heretofore proposed, and perhaps equal to the present cost of collecting the entire receipts from distilled spirits, and that no provision is made in the bill for this large additional expense, or for the appointment of additional revenue agents, which would be absolutely necessary in case the bill should become a law.

Respectfully, yours,

JOS. S. MILLER, *Commissioner*.

Hon. F. M. COCKRELL,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

Mr. ALLISON. Mr. President, the Commissioner of Internal Revenue makes his criticisms upon our provision as respects alcohol used in the arts. One is that the provision respecting bonded warehouses is too severe, that we have tied it up too closely, and therefore there is danger that these bonded warehouses may be in a few hands. Inasmuch as the law authorizes the Secretary of the Treasury to establish as many bonded warehouses as he chooses to establish, I do not think there can be any sort of danger in that regard unless the Secretary of the Treasury chooses to act without due regard to the public interest.

As to the recovery of methylated spirits, I wish to say just one word. England and Germany to-day are allowing manufacturers to use methylated spirits, and the concurrent testimony in both those countries is that they can not be recovered except by redistillation. So I care not what the Commissioner of Internal Revenue may have stated in his report of 1888, he can not overcome the fact that in two great countries they use methylated spirits to-day.

Mr. VEST. Will the Senator, before he takes his seat, allow me to make one statement?

Mr. ALLISON. Yes, sir.

Mr. VEST. That is a very material question of fact. I assert now, and I can demonstrate, that this wood-alcohol or methyl can be taken out after it is used in the arts and sciences and prepared as a harmless drink, and in this very town inside of three days I have seen, on a machine costing $22, brandy and whisky manufactured after having been demethylated, equal quantities of fine brandy and of wood alcohol and of pure alcohol, and afterwards the methyl or wood-alcohol, which is a poison, taken out and then reduced by water until no man, except an expert, could tell the difference between it and the brandy and whisky sold in the saloons at high prices.

That is a question of fact. I assert that I can produce the process here that will manufacture it, and I say, no matter what has been done in England or in France or anywhere else, that this is done in this town; and if I had known that this matter would come up I should have brought the actual article manufactured, which can be drunk with perfect impunity and can not be detected.

Mr. TELLER. Would it make a man drunk?

Mr. VEST. As a matter of course. It has alcohol in it. I assert it as a fact, and it can be proved by actual demonstration; and the Senator from Ohio [Mr. SHERMAN] was right when he said that it was dangerous to put this provision in this bill, as he declared in his opening speech.

Mr. ALLISON. He did not say it so strongly as that. He said he had some doubt about it.

Mr. VEST. Yes; he said he had great doubts, so great that he be-

lieved it would almost destroy the internal-revenue system of taxation on spirits.

I will make this assertion good or else I will stand convicted here not only of inaccuracy, but of something worse. I say you can take the finest brandy or the finest bourbon whisky made at the Taylor distillery or any of the other distilleries of Kentucky, put with it equal quantities of wood-alcohol, which is a poison, and of a pure alcohol, which is not, and you can use the wood-alcohol together with the other in the arts and sciences, and afterwards you can extract by this process, on a machine costing $22, actual valuation, all the wood-alcohol or methyl, demethylate it, and then it is a harmless drink, and can be sold in all saloons.

Mr. ALLISON. What is the process?

Mr. VEST. I do not undertake to describe it. I have seen it.

Mr. ALLISON. It is a process of redistillation, and it requires the same effort that it requires to distill alcohol. If the Senator from Missouri has such a scheme, he has a scheme which under the House bill will enable a man to have in his bureau drawer a distillery for the manufacture of whisky.

Mr. VEST. I would rather the Senator should use another form of expression. I have not any such scheme.

Mr. ALLISON. Very well.

Mr. VEST. That machine is in the office of the Commissioner of Internal Revenue, and open to inspection.

Mr. ALLISON. Very well. I do not care where the machine is. I only want to say that the most distinguished experts——

Mr. VEST. I do not want my name put in any scheme.

Mr. ALLISON. Of course I meant it in no offensive sense to the Senator.

Mr. VEST. I understand that.

Mr. ALLISON. He said he had the machine.

Mr. VEST. No; I said I had seen it.

Mr. ALLISON. I of course know that the Senator from Missouri is not engaged in any such occupation as that. I only know that experts have made efforts in this country, in England, and in Germany for the extraction of wood-alcohol, and it has been regarded as the most important invention that could be made, and they all concur that this wood-alcohol can not be recovered except by a process of distillation or redistillation, which must be of the same nature as the original process of distilling alcohol.

It is true that in Germany they have adopted an additional safeguard by the injection of a small quantity of pyridine, a natural product of nicotine, but recently found in coal-tar, and which is extracted from it, and thereby they have made it more secure and more absolute; and we propose in this bill that the Secretary of the Treasury shall have authority to use the improved methods now in use in Germany and to some extent in Great Britain. So, I care not what the Commissioner of Internal Revenue may say or what machine the Senator from Missouri may have seen or observed, it is by a process of redistillation, in my judgment, which is a process, that if successful, will enable every man to produce alcohol, and it is the only way whereby this wood-alcohol can be recovered.

Mr. VEST. Before the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. SPOONER] proceeds, will he yield to me for a moment?

Mr. SPOONER. Yes, sir.

Mr. VEST. I desire to have put in the RECORD certain tables, which came to me this morning from the Treasury Department, in regard to the duties imposed by the Senate committee's substitute. I want them put in the RECORD for the use of all Senators.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The tables will be printed in the RECORD, if there be no objection. The Chair hears none.

The tables are as follows:

SCHEDULE K.—*Wool and manufactures of wool.*

Par. Senate bill.	Articles.	Importations for fiscal year 1887.		Rates of duty.			Amount of duties.			Value per unit of quantity.	Ad valorem equivalents.		
		Quantity.	Value.	Existing law.	House bill.	Senate bill.	Collected in 1887.	At new rates, based upon importations for fiscal year 1887.			Existing law.	At new rates, based upon importations for the fiscal year 1887.	
								House bill.	Senate bill.			House bill.	Senate bill.
	Class I.												
346	Wool, hair of the alpaca, goat, etc., value 30 cts. or less p. lb...lbs..	22,607,856.30	$4,127,025.97	10 cts. p. lb.....	Free...	11 cts. p. lb.....	$2,260,785.64	.....	$2,486,861.20	$0.182	54.78	.....	60.25
	Value over 30 cts. p. lb., lbs.....	17,586.00	5,875.00	12 cts. p. lb.....	Free...	11 cts. p. lb.....	2,110.32	.....	1,934.46	.334	35.92	.....	32.96
	Washed, value 30 cts. or less p. lb.....lbs...	383,275.00	131,006.00	20 cts. p. lb.....	Free...	22 cts. p. lb.....	76,655.00	.....	84,320.50	.342	58.51	.....	64.36
	Washed, value over 30 cts. p. lb.....lbs...	2,010.00	692.00	24 cts. p. lb.....	Free...	22 cts. p. lb.....	482.40	.....	442.20	.344	69.71	.....	63.90
	Scoured, value 30 cts. or less p. lb...lbs...	184,985.00	74,886.00	30 cts. p. lb.....	Free...	33 cts. p. lb.....	55,495.50	.....	61,045.05	.405	74.11	.....	81.52
	Scoured, value over 30 cts. p. lb.....lbs...	22.00	13.00	36 cts. p. lb.....	Free...	33 cts. p. lb.....	7.92	.....	7.26	.591	60.92	.....	55.84
		23,195,734.30	4,339,497.97	.....	.....	.....	2,395,536.78	.....	2,634,610.67	.187	55.20	.....	60.71
	Class II.												
	Combing wool, value 30 cts. or less p. lb..lbs...	9,568,431.00	2,213,331.00	10 cts. p. lb.....	Free...	11 cts. p. lb.....	956,843.10	.....	1,052,527.41	.231	43.23	.....	47.55
	Value over 30 cts. p. lb., lbs	129,573.00	54,026.00	12 cts. p. lb. ...	Free...	11 cts. p. lb.....	15,548.76	.....	14,253.03	.417	28.78	.....	26.40
	Scoured, value 30 cts. or less p. lb....lbs...	5,958.00	2,701.00	30 cts. p. lb.....	Free...	33 cts. p. lb.....	1,787.40	.....	1,966.14	.453	66.18	.....	72.79
		9,703,962.00	2,270,058.00	.....	.....	.....	974,179.26	.....	1,068,746.58	.234	42.91	.....	47.08
	Class III.												
347	Carpet wool, value 12 cts. or less p. lb.....lbs...	61,811,967.40	6,185,733.00	2½ cts. p. lb.....	Free...	2½ cts. p. lb.....	1,545,299.26	.....	1,545,299.26	.10	24.98	.....	24.98
	Scoured..... .....lbs...	6,717.00	1,206.00	7½ cts. p. lb.....	Free...	7½ cts. p. lb.....	503.78	.....	503.78	.179	41.77	.....	41.77
	Carpet wool, value over 12 cts. p. lb.....lbs...	19,685,714.00	3,554,823.00	5 cts. p. lb.....	Free...	6 cts. p. lb.....	984,285.70	.....	1,181,142.84	.181	27.69	.....	33.23
	Scoured..... .....lbs..	79.00	52.00	15 cts. p. lb.....	Free...	18 cts. p. lb.....	11.85	.....	14.22	.658	22.79	.....	27.35
		81,504,477.40	9,741,814.00	.....	.....	.....	2,530,100.59	.....	2,726,960.10	.12	25.97	.....	27.99
	Total unmanufactured wool.....	114,404,173.70	16,351,369.97	.....	.....	.....	5,899,816.63	.....	6,430,317.35	.143	36.08	.....	39.32
351	Woolen rags, shoddy, mungo, waste, etc., lbs.....	4,902,381.00	1,855,618.00	10 cts. p. lb	Free...	10 cts. p. lb.....	490,238.10	.....	490,238.10	.379	26.41	.....	26.41
354	Woolen cloths, valued not over 40 cts. p. lb..... lbs.	.....	.....	.....	.....	35 cts. p. lb. and 35 p. ct.	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
	Valued above 40 cts. and not above 60 cts. per lb.....lbs..	.....	.....	.....	.....	35 cts. p. lb. and 40 p. ct.	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
	Valued above 60 cts. per lb.....lbs.	.....	.....	.....	.....	40 cts. p. lb. and 40 p. ct.	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....

SCHEDULE K.—*Wool and manufactures of wool*—Continued.

Par. Senate bill.	Articles.	Importations for fiscal year 1887.		Rates of duty.			Amount of duties.			Value per unit of quantity.	Ad valorem equivalents.		
		Quantity.	Value.	Existing law.	House bill.	Senate bill.	Collected in 1887.	At new rates, based upon importations for fiscal year 1887.			Existing law.	At new rates, based upon importations for the fiscal year 1887.	
								House bill.	Senate bill.			House bill.	Senate bill.
	Woolen cloths—cont'd.												
	Valued not above 80 cts. per lb.....lbs.	1,117,564.40	$713,315.94	35 cts. p. lb. and 35 p. ct.			$640,802.21	$4,008,948.26	$7,531,853.63	$0.638	89.84	40.00	75.15
	Valued above 80 cts. per lb.....lbs.	7,689,699.02	9,309,054.73	35 cts. p. lb. and 45 p. ct.	40 p. ct.		6,415,016.73			1.211	68.91		
	Total woolen cloths.	8,807,263.42	10,022,370.67				7,055,824.94	4,008,948.26	7,531,853.63	1.138	70.40	40.00	75.15
	Woolen shawls, valued not above 80 cts.....lbs...	42,604.31	27,903.34	35 cts. p. lb. and 35 p. ct.			24,667.63	411,999.27	703,154.00	.655	88.44	40.00	68.26
	Valued above 80 cts.....lbs..	237,778.30	327,460.85	35 cts. p. lb. and 40 p. ct.			214,206.74			1.337	65.41		
	Composed wholly and in part of worsted, etc.....lbs...	447,504.26	674,634.00	40 cts. p. lb. and 35 p. ct.	40 p. ct.		415,123.58			1.508	61.53		
	Valued not above 40 cts .....lbs...					35 cts. p. lb. and 35 p. ct.							
	Valued above 40 cts. and not above 60 cts.....lbs...					35 cts. p. lb. and 40 p. ct.							
	Valued above 60 cts.....lbs...					40 cts. p. lb. and 40 p. ct.							
	Total woolen shawls.....	727,886.81	1,029,998.19				654,008.00	411,999.27	703,154.00	1.415	63.50	40.00	68.26
354	Yarns, woolen and worsted:												
	Valued not above 30 cts. per lb.....lbs...	99,869.50	29,031.60	10 cts. p. lb. and 35 p. ct.	40 p. ct.	35 cts. p. lb. and 35 p. ct.	20,148.01			.290	69.40		
	Valued above 30 cts. p. lb. and not above 40 cts. p. lb.....lbs...	661,086.43	211,074.00	12 cts. p. lb. and 35 p. ct.			163,706.28	108,042.24	360,871.49	.365	67.90	40.00	133.60
	Valued above 40 cts. p. lb. and not above 60 cts. per lb...lbs...	753,993.72	410,264.12	18 cts. p. lb. and 35 p. ct.	40 p. ct.	35 cts. p. lb. and 40 p. ct.	279,311.35	164,105.64	428,003.44	.544	68.08	40.00	104.32
	Valued above 60 cts. p. lb. and not above 80 cts. p. lb.....lbs...	1,275,844.79	875,280.12	24 cts. p. lb. and 35 p. ct.	40 p. ct.	40 cts. p. lb. and 40 p. ct.	612,550.81	350,112.04	860,449.95	.686	69.08	40.00	98.30
	Valued above 80 cts. p. lb.....lbs...	157,866.50	191,942.25	35 cts. p. lb. and 40 p. ct.	40 p. ct.	40 cts. p. lb. and 40 p. ct.	132,018.19	76,764.90	139,911.50	1.216	68.79	40.00	72.90
	Total yarns.....	2,948,660.94	1,747,562.09				1,207,734.64	699,024.82	1,789,236.38	.592	69.11	40.00	102.38
354	Manufactures, n. o. p. f., made wholly or in part of wool:												
	Valued not exceeding 80 cts. p. lb.....lbs...	123,783.46	80,510.00	30 cts. p. lb. and 35 p. ct.	40 p. ct.	40 cts. p. lb. and 40 p. ct.	71,502.76			.650	88.81		
	Valued above 80 cts. p. lb .....lbs...	993,500.11	1,421,735.00	35 cts. p. lb. and 40 p. ct.			916,419.10	600,898.00	1,047,811.42	1.431	64.46	40.00	69.74
	Manufactures of worsted, hair of the alpaca, goat, etc.:												
	Valued not exceeding 30 cts. p. lb.....lbs...	100,189.00	24,146.00	10 cts. p. lb. and 35 p. ct.	40 p. ct.	35 cts. p. lb. and 35 p. ct.	18,470.00			.241	76.49		
	Valued exceeding 30 cts. p. lb. and not above 40 cts. p. lb.....lbs...	174,018.25	60,737.00	12 cts. p. lb. and 35 p. ct.			42,140.14	33,953.20	125,681.63	.349	69.38	40.00	148.06
	Valued exceeding 40 cts. p. lb. and not above 60 cts. p. lb..... .....lbs.....	1,568,069.60	859,029.70	18 cts. p. lb. and 35 p. ct.	40 p. ct.	35 cts. p. lb. and 40 p. ct.	586,512.92	343,611.88	899,436.24	.541	68.28	40.00	104.70
	Valued exceeding 60 cts. p. lb. and not above 80 cts. p. lb.....lbs...	3,785,978.60	2,740,630.00	24 cts. p. lb. and 35 p. ct.	40 p. ct.	40 cts. p. lb. and 40 p. ct.	1,867,855.36			.724	68.15		
	Valued exceeding 80 cts. p. lb .....lbs...	1,343,256.80	1,469,661.73	35 cts. p. lb. and 40 p. ct.			1,058,004.68	1,684,116.69	3,735,810.85	1.094	71.99	40.00	88.73
	Total manufactures not elsewhere specified.....	8,108,795.82	6,656,449.43				4,560,904.96	2,662,579.77	5,808,740.14	.821	68.52	40.00	87.26
354	Balmorals:												
	Valued above 30 cts. p. lb. and not above 40 cts. p. lb.....lbs...	1,009.00	370.00	12 cts. p. lb. and 35 p. ct.	40 p. ct.	35 cts. p. lb. and 35 p. ct.	250.58	148.00	482.65	.367	67.72	40.00	130.44
	Valued above 40 cts. p. lb. and not above 60 cts. p. lb.....lbs...	724.00	426.00	18 cts. p. lb. and 35 p. ct.	40 p. ct.	35 cts. p. lb. and 40 p. ct.	279.42	170.40	423.80	.588	65.59	40.00	99.48
	Valued above 60 cts. p. lb. and not above 80 cts. p. lb.....lbs...	873.00	632.00	24 cts. p. lb. and 35 p. ct.	40 p. ct.	40 cts. p. lb. and 40 p. ct.	430.72	897.20	1,731.60	.724	68.15	40.00	77.20
	Valued above 80 cts. p. lb.....lbs..	1,213.00	1,611.00	35 cts. p. lb. and 40 p. ct.			1,068.95			1.328	66.35		
	Total balmorals.....	3,819.00	3,039.00				2,029.67	1,215.60	2,638.05	.796	66.79	40.00	86.80

SCHEDULE K.—*Wool and manufactures of wool*—Continued.

Par. Senate bill.	Articles.	Importations for fiscal year 1887.		Rates of duty.			Amount of duties.			Value per unit of quantity.	Ad valorem equivalents.		
		Quantity.	Value.	Existing law.	House bill.	Senate bill.	Collected in 1887.	At new rates, based upon importations for fiscal year 1887.			Existing law.	At new rates, based upon importations for the fiscal year 1887.	
								House bill.	Senate bill.			House bill.	Senate bill.
355	Flannels:												
	Valued not above 30 cts. p. lb. .....lbs...	73.00	$19.00	10 cts. p. lb. and 35 p. ct.	40 p. ct.	10 cts. p. lb. and 35 p. ct.	$13.95	$7.60	$13.95	$.260	73.42	40.00	73.42
	Valued above 30 cts. and not above 40 cts. p. lb.....lbs...	456.00	175.35	12 cts. p. lb. and 35 p. ct.	40 p. ct.	12 cts. p. lb. and 35 p. ct.	116.09	70.14	116.09	.381	66.20	40.00	66.20
	Valued above 40 cts and not above 60 cts. p. lb .....lbs...	4,819.00	2,653.37	18 cts. p. lb. and 35 p. ct.	40 p. ct.	18 cts. p. lb. and 35 p. ct.	1,796.10	1,061.34	1,796.10	.551	67.69	40.00	67.69
	Valued above 60 cts. and not above 80 cts. p. lb .....lbs...	136,889.00	100,633.33	24 cts. p. lb. and 35 p. ct.	40 p. ct.	40 cts. p. lb. and 40 p. ct.	68,075.03			.735	67.65		
	Valued above 80 cts. p. lb .....lbs...	77,097.15	81,722.45	35 cts. p. lb. and 40 p. ct.			59,673.03	72,942.31	158,536.77	1.060	73.02	40.00	86.93
	Total flannels.....	219,334.15	185,203.50				129,674.20	74,081.39	160,462.91	.844	70.02	40.00	86.64
	Blankets:												
	Valued not above 30 cts. p. lb.....lbs...	3,707.00	830.00	10 cts. p. lb. and 35 p. ct.	40 p. ct.	10 cts. p. lb. and 35 p. ct.	661.19	332.00	661.19	.224	79.66	40.00	79.66
	Valued above 30 cts. p. lb. and not above 40 cts. p. lb.....lbs...	602.50	250.60	12 cts. p. lb. and 35 p. ct.	40 p. ct.	12 cts. p. lb. and 35 p. ct.	160.01	100.24	160.01	.416	63.85	40.00	63.85
	Valued above 40 cts. p. lb. and not above 60 cts. p. lb.....lbs...	1,010.00	526.00	18 cts. p. lb. and 35 p. ct.	40 p. ct.	18 cts. p. lb. and 35 p. ct.	365.90	210.40	365.90	.521	69.56	40.00	69.56
	Valued above 60 cts. p. lb. and not above 80 cts. p. lb.....lbs...	700.5	489.30	24 cts. p. lb. and 35 p. ct.	40 p. ct.	40 cts. p. lb. and 40 p. ct.	339.38			0.698	69.36		
	Valued above 80 cts. p. lb.....lbs...	1,550.0	1,790.62	35 cts. p. lb. and 40 p. ct.			1,258.81	911.96	1,812.20	1.155	70.30	40.00	79.48
	Total blankets.....	7,570.0	3,886.52				2,785.29	1,554.60	2,999.30	.513	71.67	40.00	77.16
	Hats of wool:												
	Valued above 40 cts. p. lb. and not above 60 cts. p. lb....lbs...	818.00	387.00	18 cts. p. lb. and 35 p. ct.	40 p. ct.	18 cts. p. lb. and 35 p. ct.	282.69	254.80	282.69	.473	73.04	40.00	73.04
	Valued above 60 cts. p. lb. and not above 80 cts. p. lb.....lbs...	428.00	329.00	24 cts. p. lb. and 35 p. ct.	40 p. ct.	40 cts. p. lb. and 40 p. ct.	217.87			.769	66.22		
	Valued above 80 cts. p. lb.....lbs...	2,027.46	5,878.98	35 cts. p. lb. and 40 p. ct.			3,061.21	2,483.19	3,465.37	2.900	52.07	40.00	55.82
	Total hats of wool..	3,273.46	6,594.98				5,561.77	2,637.99	3,748.06	2.014	54.01	40.00	56.83
356	Women's and children's dress goods, coat linings, Italian cloth, etc., composed in part of wool, worsted, etc.:												
	Valued at above 15 cts. p. sq. yd. and not above 20 cts. p. sq. yd.....sq. yds...	26,929,224.70	4,094,403.06	5 cts. p. sq. yd. and 35 p. ct.	40 p. ct.	7 cts. p. sq. yd. and 40 p. ct.	2,779,502.28			.152	67.89		
	Valued at above 20 cts. p. sq. yd....sq. yds ..	9,701,047.32	3,562,967.99	7 cts. p. sq. yd. and 40 p. ct.	40 p. ct.	7 cts. p. sq. yd. and 40 p. ct.	2,104,260.54	3,062,948.42	5,627,067.46	.377	59.06	40.00	73.48
357	Same, composed wholly of wool, worsted, etc.:												
	Weighing 4 ounces or less per sq. yd., sq. yds.....	31,136,149.20	6,522,568.51	9 cts. p. sq. yd. and 40 p. ct.	40 p. c..	11 cts. p. sq. yd. & 40 p. c.	5,411,280.91	2,609,027.40	6,034,003.89	.209	82.96	40.00	92.51
	Weighing over 4 ozs. per sq. yd.....lbs...	2,560,715.83	3,019,201.46	35 cts. p. lb. and 40 p. ct.	40 p. c..	40 cts. p. lb. and 40 p. c.	2,103,931.19	1,207,680.58	2,231,966.91	1.179	69.68	40.00	73.92
	Total women's and children's, etc.....	.....	17,199,141.02	.....	.....	.....	12,398,974.92	6,879,656.40	13,893,028.26	....	72.09	40.00	80.77
	Bunting.....sq. yds...	242.50	53.00	10 cts. p. sq. yd. & 35 p. c.	40 p. c..	11 cts. p. sq. yd. & 40 p. c.	42.80	21.20	47.87	.219	80.75	40.00	90.33
	Clothing, ready-made, and wearing apparel n. o. p. f..lbs...	330,415.94	689,002.38	40 cts. p. lb. and 35 p. ct.	40 p. c..	40 cts. p. lb. and 45 p. c.	373,317.15	275,600.95	442,217.38	2.085	51.18	40.00	64.18
358	Knit goods, all goods made on knitting-frames:												
	Valued at not above 30 cts. p. lb...lbs...	48.00	9.00	10 cts. p. lb. and 35 p. ct.	40 p. c.	40 cts. p. lb. and 45 p. ct.	7.95			.187	88.33		
	Above 30 cts. p. lb. and not above 40 cts. p. lb. .....lbs...	201.37	70.95	12 cts. p. lb. and 35 p. ct.			52.13			.397	65.20		
	Above 40 cts. p. lb. and not above 60 cts. p. lb .....lbs...	20,109.00	10,601.60	18 cts. p. lb. and 35 p. ct.			7,330.18			.527	69.14		
	Above 60 cts. p. lb. and not above 80 cts. p. lb.....lbs...	73,417.25	50,835.08	24 cts. p. lb. and 35 p. ct.			35,433.42			.693	69.62		
	Above 80 cts. p. lb. lbs...	1,238,052.29	1,918,868.11	35 cts. per lb. and 40 p. ct.			1,200,865.63			1.550	62.58		
	Total knit goods, etc...	1,331,827.87	1,980,453.74				1,243,689.31	792,181.50	1,423,935.33	1.437	62.80	40.00	71.89

SCHEDULE K.—*Wool and manufactures of wool*—Continued.

Par. Senate bill.	Articles.	Importations for fiscal year 1887.		Rates of duty.			Amount of duties.			Value per unit of quantity.	Ad valorem equivalents.		
		Quantity.	Value.	Existing law.	House bill.	Senate bill.	Collected in 1887.	At new rates, based upon importations for fiscal year 1887.			Existing law.	At new rates, based upon importations for the fiscal year 1887.	
								House bill.	Senate bill.			House bill.	Senate bill.
359	Cloaks, dolmans, etc., lbs	476,129.73	$772,240.65	45 cts. p. lb. and 40 p. ct.	40 p. ct.	45 cts. p. lb. and 45 p. ct.	$523,154.55	$308,896.25	$561,766.58	$1.622	67.74	40.00	72.74
360	Webbing, gorings, suspenders, etc., composed of wool, worsted, etc....lbs...	239,817.00	443,808.95	30 cts. p. lb. and 50 p. ct.	40 p. ct.	30 cts. p. lb. and 50 p. ct.	293,849.58	177,523.58	293,849.58	1.851	66.21	40.00	66.21
361	Carpets: Aubusson, Axminster, and chenille, sq. yds	162,244.80	425,924.46	45 cts. p. sq. yd. and 30 p. ct.	40 p. ct.	45 cts. p. sq. yd. and 30 p. ct.	200,787.53	170,369.78	200,787.53	2.625	47.14	40.00	47.14
362	Saxony, Wilton, and Tournay velvet, sq. yds	56,614.54	99,410.58	.....do.....	40 p. ct.	.....do.....	53,949.70	39,764.23	53,949.70	1.854	54.27	40.00	54.27
363	Brussels carpets, sq. yds	190,118.24	196,464.87	30 cts. p. sq. yd. and 30 p. ct.	40 p. ct.	30 cts. p. sq. yd. and 30 p. ct.	115,975.06	78,585.94	115,975.06	1.033	59.03	40.00	59.03
364	Patent velvet and tapestry velvet carpets, sq. yds	83,630.13	83,313.38	25 cts. p. sq. yd. and 30 p. ct.	40 p. ct.	25 cts. p. sq. yd. and 30 p. ct.	45,901.52	33,325.35	45,901.52	.966	55.10	40.00	55.10
365	Tapestry Brussels, sq. yds	106,377.88	68,348.04	20 cts. p. sq. yd. and 30 p. ct.	40 p. ct.	20 cts. p. sq. yd. and 30 p. ct.	41,779.98	27,339.21	41,779.98	.643	61.13	40.00	61.13
366	Treble ingrain, three-ply, and worsted chain Venetian carpets ...sq. yds...	25,437.00	19,332.00	12 cts. p. sq. yd. and 30 p. ct.	40 p. ct.	12 cts p. sq. yd. and 30 p. ct.	8,852.04	7,732.80	8,852.04	.760	45.79	40.00	45.79
367	Yarn, Venetian, and two-ply ingrain carpets ....sq. yds...	74,262.00	40,416.00	8 cts. p. sq. yd. and 30 p. ct.	40 p. ct.	8 cts. p. sq. yd. and 30 p. ct.	18,065.76	16,166.40	18,065.76	.544	44.70	40.00	44.70
368	Druggets and bockings, printed, etc., sq. yds	3,962.00	1,353.00	15 cts. p. sq. yd. and 30 p. ct.	40 p. ct.	15 cts. p. sq. yd. and 30 p. ct.	1,000.20	541.20	1,000.20	.341	73.92	40.00	73.92
369	Carpets and carpetings of wool, flax, or cotton, etc., n. o. p. f. .....sq. yds...	35,432.87	35,206.82	40 p. ct	40 p. ct.	40 p. ct.....	14,081.52	14,081.52	14,081.52	.994	40.00	40.00	40.00
370	Mats, screens, hassocks, etc., not exclusively of vegetable material.....	.....	502,889.37	40 p. ct	40 p. ct.	40 p. ct.....	201,155.76	201,155.76	201,155.76	.....	40.00	40.00	40.00
	Total carpets.....	.....	1,472,655.52	.....	.....	.....	701,549.07	589,062.19	701,549.07	.....	47.64	40.00	47.64
371	Belts or felts for paper or printing machines.....lbs...	191,143.75	167,166.00	20 cts. p. lb. and 30 p. ct.	40 p. ct.	20 cts. p. lb. and 30 p. ct.	88,378.55	66,866.40	88,378.55	.875	52.87	40.00	52.87
	Total manufactures of wool.....	.....	41,235,243.64	.....	.....	.....	29,729,717.50	16,951,850.18	33,897,853.19	.....	67.21	38.32	76.63
	Total raw wools and manufactures of wool.....	.....	60,586,613.61	.....	.....	.....	35,629,534.13	16,951,850.18	40,328,170.54	.....	58.81	27.97	66.56

Mr. HOAR. Mr. President, the Senator from Missouri [Mr. VEST] has just put in the RECORD certain papers. I should like permission, without detaining the Senate at this time by any remarks of my own, to put upon the record for the use and for the instruction of the Senate the statement of the most distinguished free-trade statistician in this country, Mr. Edward Atkinson, as to the—I will not say the effect of a protective tariff, because he would not ascribe these results to the tariff in any large degree, but as to the comparative condition of progress of the nation during the last twenty years, when a high protective tariff has been in operation, as compared with the previous years.

Mr. Atkinson, who is unquestionably the most distinguished free-trade statistician in this country, and whose integrity I never heard any person who differed from him most warmly question, or his desire for honest and accurate results, has recently contributed to a magazine called The Forum, for the present month, a statement of the progress of the nation since 1860, or since 1865 or 1870—he takes different dates for the comparison in different cases—as compared with the immediately preceding period, and his results cover and overthrow at every point, so far as I recollect, the elaborate speech of the Senator from Texas [Mr. REAGAN], made the other day. The Senator from Texas attributed to protection certain results which by a process of *à priori* reasoning he undertook to demonstrate would happen, and which he affirmed did exist in this country.

Now, here is the great free-trader's statement of the facts which I desire to put on the record of the Senate.

All the changes—

Speaking now of the period since 1865—

All the changes have been in the direction of lower prices, smaller profits proportionately to each transaction, accompanied by higher wages.

Then he goes on to say:

While the earnings of workmen have increased, the earnings of those charged with the direction and application of capital have increased, while mere possession of capital has become less and less remunerative to the owner.

That is the comment furnished by the facts upon the Senator's statement that some $500,000,000 or $600,000,000 a year were passing into the pockets of the capitalists who were engaged in manufacturing. Says Mr. Atkinson:

While great fortunes have become more conspicuous they yet bear in the aggregate a lessening proportion to the total savings of the community.

The great gain and the increase in consumption in recent years have been chiefly in the consumption of articles which are of common use by the great mass of the people rather than in luxuries or articles of voluntary use.

We find that while the population increased from 1870 to 1887 only 55 per cent. the product of hay, which is synonymous with meat and the products of the dairy, increased from 70 to 80 per cent.; the product of grain 85 per cent.; the consumption of wool, domestic and foreign, nearly 100 per cent.; the product of pig-iron 285 per cent.; the construction of railways 223 per cent.; and so on in varying proportions, all in excess of population, with regard to all the necessities and comforts of life.

The value of the imports of merchandise over and above our exports, from 1866 to 1875 inclusive, was, in round figures, $817,000,000. The value of our exports of merchandise above our imports, from 1876 to 1885 inclusive, consisting wholly of the products of agriculture, was one thousand five hundred and seventy-four million.

On what elements did this depend? The railway charge upon the twenty-six great systems of railway which diverge from Chicago east and west, from 1866 to 1875, was 2.1837 cents per mile; from 1876 to 1885, it was 1.1037 cents per mile, making a saving of 1.08 cents per mile on the traffic of these specific lines on which 35 to 40 per cent. of the whole railway service of the country was performed, yet this difference in the rate of charge on these specific lines only, from 1876 to 1885, inclusive, came to more than $1,700,000,000, as compared to the rate charged in the previous ten years. This saving alone more than accounts for the excess of our exports over our imports, which excess enabled us to redeem our bonds or to import the coin necessary for our use.

He then gives a marvelous table and chart, in which he declares and illustrates by a picture to the eye:

No. 1. Average wages of mechanics, engineers, carpenters, machinists, and printers connected with the mills and works treated in volume 20, United States Census, which he has verified and confirmed by

separate investigations of his own. Establishments in Eastern, Middle, and Western States:

	Per day.
1860	$1.56
1885	2.40

Table No. 2—and I desire to call the attention especially of the Senator from Texas to this table—

No. 2. Average cost of one day's supply of food, fuel, and material for clothing customarily used by such mechanics, computed at retail prices on twenty shops, ten east and ten west of Buffalo:

1860	$0.3065
1885	.30

So that the average cost of food, fuel, and material for clothing since 1860 has diminished .95 of a cent a day, while the earnings of these classes that Mr. Atkinson sums up have increased from $1,56 to $2.40 per day.

No. 3. Purchasing power of three hundred days' wages in equal portions of the same kinds of food, fuel, and cloth, as above given:

1860	$15.72
1885	24.00

His table No 4 I will put in in this connection, although it is not immediately applicable to the present debate.

No. 4. Quantity per capita of coin, convertible bank-notes and legal-tender notes in circulation or in use as money at the respective dates:

1860	$14.06
1885	27.25

These tables are, as I have said, the result of the most careful inquiry of an eminent scientific man, a free-trader, and made, so far as there is any purpose to be extracted from them, in the course of an investigation which does not especially concern the issue which is now under debate in the Senate.

Mr. REAGAN. Will the Senator from Wisconsin allow me one word?

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. Does the Senator from Wisconsin yield to the Senator from Texas?

Mr. SPOONER. I will yield if for only a minute. I can not yield for any length of time, as I desire to leave the city at 7 o'clock this evening.

Mr. REAGAN. I only ask the Senator to yield for a moment.

Just how far the tables presented affect the question which I was discussing I am not able now to determine. They do not overthrow the fact, however, that there were five billion and some hundred million dollars' worth of products manufactured in the United States, as shown by the census of 1880, and that if we subtract two billion from the five billion to correspond with the free-list, leaving three billion to correspond with the tax-list, a tax of 47.10 per cent. would yield $1,557,071,798; and that if we subtract from that sum the result of a tax of 30 per cent. it would still leave five hundred and seventy-six-odd million, I believe it is, unnecessarily drawn from the people. But altogether it transfers by operation of the law, if the calculation is correct, over a billion and a half of money as a result of that system, and no tables which a doctrinaire can present can alter those great facts.

Mr. HOAR. These are statements of fact. The Senator from Texas is the person to whom the term "doctrinaire" would be applied, of course not offensively; but he reasons *à priori* from what he thinks ought to exist.

Mr. REAGAN. I leave it with the statement I have made.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. CLARK, its Clerk, announced that the House had passed the joint resolution (S. R. 116) authorizing the Secretary of War to protect the Washington Aqueduct tunnel, with an amendment in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message also announced that the House had appointed Mr. CLEMENTS, Mr. MCMILLIN, and Mr. RYAN members on the part of the House of Representatives of the Joint Select Committee to Investigate the Washington Aqueduct Tunnel.

WASHINGTON AQUEDUCT TUNNEL.

Mr. HALE. I ask the Chair to lay before the Senate the action of the House of Representatives on the Senate joint resolution in regard to the Washington Aqueduct tunnel.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore* laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the joint resolution (S. R. 116) authorizing the Secretary of War to protect the Washington Aqueduct tunnel.

The amendment of the House of Representatives was to add to the joint resolution—

That the joint select committee of the Senate and House authorized by a concurrent resolution of Congress to make inquiry and report concerning all of the work and contracts therefor on the Washington Aqueduct tunnel and other matters in relation thereto, are hereby, in addition to the powers conferred by said concurrent resolution, authorized and directed in their discretion to inquire and report touching all plans and estimates prepared under the auspices of the Government for extending the water supply of Washington City, and finally the said committee may extend their inquiries as to any and all other matters concerning the extension of said water supply that may aid the Congress in ascertaining and fixing the responsibility for any mismanagement therein, or for the future construction and management thereof.

Mr. HALE. I see no objection to that amendment. I move that the Senate concur.

The amendment was concurred in.

LEGAL REPRESENTATIVES OF ELIZA M. FERRIS.

Mr. SAWYER. I wish to enter a motion to reconsider the vote by which the Senate passed the bill (H. R. 1152) for the relief of the legal representatives of Eliza M. Ferris, and I ask that the House be requested to return the bill.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. When did the bill pass the Senate?

Mr. SAWYER. About three or four days ago.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. Unanimous consent, then, will be necessary.

Mr. SAWYER. I ask unanimous consent.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The Senator from Wisconsin asks unanimous consent that the vote by which the Senate passed the bill named by him may be reconsidered.

Mr. SAWYER. I only ask to enter the motion to reconsider.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. And the Senator accompanies the motion with a request that the House of Representatives be asked to return the bill. It will be so ordered, if there be no objection. The Chair hears none. The motion to reconsider will be entered.

THE REVENUE LAWS.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 9051) to reduce taxation and simplify the laws in relation to the collection of the revenue.

Mr. SPOONER. Mr. President, I do not intend to enter at this time into an argument upon the comparative merits of the Senate or House tariff measures, or to consider the principles upon which the Republican party justifies its adhesion to the protective system, or even to discuss the objections to it. I shall reserve that discussion for the time when the Senate is seriously at work with a quorum upon this subject. My present purpose is simply to prove by witnesses who have been friendly to free trade, who live where it was born and where it has its home, that its results are not satisfactory, and that there is clamor for its overthrow and demand for its abandonment.

If free trade, or, what is the same thing, "tariff for revenue only," as contradistinguished from "protection," is a system in itself so beneficial to capital and to labor, as our Democratic friends assert, its beneficence must be apparent in its operation in the United Kingdom, if anywhere on the earth, for that is the only distinctively free-trade nation in the world. I propose now only to prove that under the influence of free trade or a tariff for revenue only in Great Britain there has been for twelve years or more past, with slight intermissions, a very serious depression in industry and trade of almost every kind, and a depression in agriculture which defies parallel. The downward tendency was so great as to attract the attention of English statesmen, and to compel an investigation with a view to legislative or diplomatic action for relief.

In 1885, the 29th day of August, Victoria, "by the grace of God, of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland, Queen, Defender of the Faith," issued a commission to certain "trusty and well-beloved cousins and councilors," and others, numbering twenty-six, the Earl of Iddlesleigh being the first and the Earl of Dunraven being the second, the object whereof is set forth in the commission, as follows:

Whereas we have deemed it expedient that a commission should forthwith issue to inquire and report upon the extent, nature, and probable causes of the depression now or recently prevailing in various branches of trade and industry, and whether it can be alleviated by legislative or other measures.

This commission entered upon its work, and it was wonderfully thorough. It called before it a number of distinguished witnesses, one of whom, Mr. Robert Giffen, an official of the Board of Trade, on the 7th of October, 1885, testified, among other things, as follows:

There has been a very rapid increase of consumption of cotton in the United States. It rises from 382,000,000 pounds in 1866-'70 to about 881,000,000 pounds in 1884. That is a very great increase in the consumption of raw material in the country which produced the raw material.

He testified that the consumption in the United States down to 1884 showed an increase of about 130 per cent., and that it was accounted for "by their using up their own raw material." He also testified that at the same time the continent of Europe showed an increase of about 100 per cent. During those periods the consumption of the raw material in England increased only 53 per cent.

Our Democratic friends, it seems, would take the duty off of cotton cloths, after a while and stop all this consumption by home manufacturers. They seem to think it would be wiser to send all of our cotton to England, and buy it back from England manufactured at prices fixed there without restriction. The Republican theory is that we manufacture all our raw material in this country if we can, furnishing employment to our people, investment for our capital, and a market for our agricultural products, shipping our surplus to England and other countries.

I could spend profitably some time in quoting from the testimony of prominent Englishmen, including officials, facts pertinent and important, by way of vindicating the American principle of protection to home markets, but it is apart from my present purpose, and would take too much time. My main object is to lay before the people in form convenient for circulation and reference testimony which can not be disputed, showing that the condition of trade and industry and agricult-

ure in free-trade England is now, and has been for years, what we hope never to see in this country.

The commission addressed a circular of inquiry to the various chambers of commerce in the United Kingdom. These chambers of commerce are important institutions, in a commercial way, in England and other portions of the kingdom. Their methods of investigation, the regularity of their meetings, the reports of their committees, the representation in them of every department of business, and the reports which they make to the Government, all combine to render them competent witnesses as to matters within their jurisdiction. These were each interrogated as to the trades or industries of especial importance to its district.

They were also asked, among other things, how the trade and industry of the district had been affected during the last five years, as compared with the periods 1865 to 1870, 1870 to 1875, 1875 to 1880—when the depression began—when it reached its lowest point, and what were its most common symptoms. They were also specifically interrogated as to the fact of overproduction and the effect of foreign competition, foreign tariffs, and bounties; and they were asked to suggest remedies.

I intend to quote freely from the answers of these chambers of commerce, commencing with—

Aberdeen and surrounding district. Industries: Spinning, the manufacturing of wool, flax, hemp, and jute, the spinning of cotton, the manufacturing of paper, combs, soap and candles, provision curing, granite stone dressing and polishing, ship-building and ship-owning, engineering, fisheries, agriculture, and the industries dependent upon agriculture.

They say—

Most trades and industries at present are depressed, especially shipping, ship-building, and agriculture.

The progress of the depression in most industries may in general be said to have been uniform. No signs of improvement are apparent. Assuming that the depression of trade means reduction of profits, it began about the year 1881. It has now reached a lower point than for many years, with at present a downward tendency. Industries are seriously affected by foreign competition, and to a large extent by foreign tariffs and bounties.

The condition is largely attributed to overproduction.

Barnsley and district. Industries: Coal trade, linen trade, glass-bottle trade, and paper trade:

Paper trade and glass-bottle trade very depressed. Uniform downward depression since 1876.

They say foreign tariffs and bounties

Are at the bottom of all our troubles.

Batley. Industries: Manufacture of heavy woolens, worsted coatings, and blankets; also, to a less extent, coal and iron trade:

All branches may be fairly described as depressed. Depression having begun in 1874, and now at its lowest point. Its most prominent symptoms are low prices of raw material and manufactured goods, which, after a long-continued fall, are probably lower now than ever they were before. Real property, and especially mills and machinery, being unsalable, except at a great sacrifice. Its progress has continued for many years, trade having gone from bad to worse. Production has exceeded demand, and with a falling off in foreign trade there seems to be no prospect of immediate improvement.

Very injuriously and very considerably affected by foreign tariffs.

Belfast. Industries: Linens, iron foundry and machine making, ship building, flour milling.

Principal foreign trade with United States, British possessions, West Indies, and South America, and continental Europe.

The linen trade is depressed, in the sense that it fails to give an adequate return on the capital invested. The depression, which commenced about ten years ago, has been marked by a fall in prices during the first years, and by a continuance of low prices and sluggish demands in subsequent years. The present rate of wages is slightly below the average of the last twenty years. The condition of the linen trade has been adversely affected by the changes in the hours of labor, fall in prices, foreign competition, and foreign tariffs.

Iron foundry and machine making:

Speaking generally, depression began in 1868, continued to end of 1870; trade improved from then to 1875; reached its lowest point in 1879 and 1880; since then it has been languid owing to want of demand.

It is attributed in part to "severe competition," and trade is said to have been severely injured by foreign tariffs.

Flour milling:

Most unfavorably affected, owing to the large importation of foreign manufactured flour.

Trade has been generally depressed during the last ten years.

Birmingham. Industries: The iron metal, hardware, jewelry, guns, leather, glass, and coal trade:

The trade and industry of the district have been much depressed during the years 1880 to 1885, and before, but the extent of such depression, the loss of profits, the diminution of capital, and decreased demand for labor, can only be guessed at, the necessary factors for making any accurate or reliable estimate not being available. Every trade, special and ordinary, can only be described as depressed. This depression began in 1876–'77; lowest period during the present year; depression on the whole uniform in duration and intensity, with occasional short periods of activity in special trades, arising from recent government reforms and other exceptional causes.

It is attributed—

to German and Belgian competition, foreign labor, duties on many manufactured goods exported abroad, the exorbitant cost of carriage of goods from Birmingham to the seaboard, which has placed inland districts at a great disadvantage, compared with maritime towns. They recommend as a remedy, in addition to legislation regulating railways and railway rates, and emancipating the canals from the control of railway companies, "the imposition of an import duty on foreign manufactured goods in all cases where the same class of goods are manufactured in this country."

Thus it will be seen that Birmingham, everywhere famous, complains of the competition of the world, and recommends as a remedy for its depressed trades the imposition of tariff duties and the protection of home industries.

Other grounds to which they impute the depression are the better technical education of the foreign workman and the great agricultural depression, caused by a long series of bad seasons, and foreign competition, resulting in diminished purchasing power.

Birstall, near Leeds. Industries: The manufacture of heavy woolen cloth, worsted coatings, and blankets; also, other industries subordinate thereto.

Generally, they say, the industries in—

1882 were, and are now, as depressed as at any time; excessive depreciation in the value of mill property, serious diminution of profit on the capital invested, want of employment for a considerable number of machines and work people, and serious accumulation of stocks in the hands of manufacturers. Since 1882 the depression has increased gradually, and we are not able to anticipate its further course.

They report that their industries have been materially affected by foreign competition in home markets, and very seriously by the imposition of hostile duties, which "helped to exclude our manufactured goods from foreign markets."

Mr. HOAR. May I ask the Senator a question?

Mr. SPOONER. Yes, sir.

Mr. HOAR. Does the Senator find in his researches that there is any suggestion that that foreign competition which England says is so injurious to her comes from any countries that are not themselves protected?

Mr. SPOONER. None except perhaps Belgium, which has protection after a fashion, but is in a sense a free-trade country. This is all from British witnesses, chambers of commerce; nothing that I assert; no inference that I draw from testimony taken.

Dewsbury. Industries: Manufacturers of heavy woolen cloths, blankets, and carpets, and their kindred industries, including a large sale of rags and shoddy.

As to carpets:

It is the opinion of a large majority of persons engaged in trade that industry is depressed, and that the future is gloomy and discouraging.

The depression began in 1878, and its most prominent symptoms are work people out of employment, machinery standing idle, and depreciation in value of factory and other property.

Attributable to overproduction and foreign tariffs.

Mr. TELLER. I should like to inquire of the Senator if he is reading now exactly the report?

Mr. SPOONER. I am reading exactly the report.

Mr. TELLER. It is a quotation?

Mr. SPOONER. It is a quotation. I am quoting from the various reports.

Dudley. Industries: Coal and iron industries and fire-clay and glass manufacture.

From 1880 to 1885 depressed.

Local trades are generally depressed.

From about 1878—

the depression has been continuous. We can give no answer as to the immediate future. The district is suffering considerably from the inequality of railway rates and the monopoly caused by the absorption of local canals by railway companies.

Among the remedies they recommend is modification of foreign tariffs. They say foreign competition severely felt in some branches of manufactures.

Trade is greatly restricted and diminished by adverse foreign tariffs.

Dundee. Industries: Spinning and manufacturing of jute; the same of flax and hemp, machine and engine building for home and export requirements; also ship-building, steam and sailing, and ship-owning, and the carrying on of seal and whale fishing at Greenland, Newfoundland, and Davis Straits:

The volume of the flax industry has steadily decreased since 1876. The volume of the jute trade since 1865 increased largely to 1884, but has diminished suddenly within the last twelve months, say 12 to 15 per cent. During the last few years the gross value has continued to decrease largely in proportion to the volume; during the last twelve months a further reduction from a very low standard of value has taken place, averaging about 25 per cent. The net profit has been gradually getting less within the last few years, and at present mills and factories are running at a considerable loss. The capital invested is as large as ever, but as the industries have become unprofitable nothing approaching to the invested capital could be realized. This refers not only to the industry of jute and flax, but also to all the industries mentioned above. The quantity of labor has not been seriously affected, but the remuneration has been reduced.

They attribute it to the foreign duties and the increase in the erection of mills and factories in Germany, Austria, Spain, Italy, and Russia since 1880, for the purpose of manufacturing similar yarns and goods as are produced in that district.

The rate of wages is at present lower than it has been for the last ten or twelve years, and also slightly lower than the average of the past twenty years. This is general, but it applies to both skilled and unskilled labor.

How many of our laboring men will want to go to Dundee and live under free trade after reading this?

Exeter. Industries: Iron-foundry trade, mineral-oil trade, and tanning trade; principally, however, the paper trade:

From 1875 to 1880 the trade dropped to its lowest level, at which it now remains, the volume showing a slight increase, but gross value and net profit remaining at the lowest point. The general trade of the district has been materi-

ally affected by the agricultural depression we have for some years been suffering from, as both landlords and tenants have not had money to spend. The depression has since 1875 been uniform; no profit whatever is now got from a great portion of the trade. There are thirteen paper mills now left as against fifteen in 1870, but in the last fifteen years there have been fourteen failures among those fifteen mills, some having failed more than once.

How delightful it would be to the paper manufacturers of the United States, and those who depend upon them for wages and employment, to be put on the Exeter basis!

This continued depression is imputed to the factory act, and to fall in prices due to foreign competition.

Greenock. Industries: Sugar-refining, ship-building and marine engineering and ship owning.

In sugar-refining depression is reported. They say:

The refiners have not only had to contend with the losses arising from the diminishing value of sugar, but they have also had to meet the competition of foreign refiners, who, through the assistance of export bounties, are enabled to pay the cost of sending their refined sugars to this country, and at the same time to undersell the British refiners in their own home market.

As to ship-building:

The gross value has decreased largely; contracts have been lately taken at such extreme low prices in order to keep works open as to yield practically no profit. The number of workmen at present and for the last two years employed in this trade and subsidiary trades has largely decreased. It is reckoned that during the last period of depression, which culminated in 1879, the workmen then employed did not exceed 60 per cent. of the number employed in 1874. In 1882-'83 the gross number employed did not rise to the amount of 1874, but in 1885 the number is fewer than in 1879, the total being estimated at not more than 57½ per cent. of the number employed in 1874.

As to ship-owning:

Profits have been diminishing, especially since 1882, until now they are almost *nil*, and if shipping property were to be realized heavy losses would be sustained. Fewer men are employed than formerly.

As to sugar refining:

The depression began about 1875. It is worse now than ever. A prominent symptom is that from time to time works are shut up, and never for years have all the refineries in Greenock been working at the same time.

As to ship-building:

The depression began about two years ago. Most prominent symptoms are want of work by both employers and workmen; many workmen idle, etc.

The remedy recommended as to sugar refining is—

That the artificial help our foreign competitors get from export bounties should be withdrawn. This could be done either by the imposition of countervailing duties, which we do not desire to be resorted to, or by our government using strong diplomatic action to persuade the foreign governments to adopt free trade. A perfect cure for our grievance would be the abolition of sugar duties all over the world!

They complain, and this is significant, that their ship-building industry is depressed—

Because since 1882 the continental orders have ceased; the ship-owners of Germany, France, Italy, and of the countries which were the principal customers of Greenock builders have now ceased to order vessels in Great Britain to the same extent as formerly, and for the following reasons:

First. Because under the conditions of the subventions granted under color of mail service and under direct bounty inducements it is more profitable or obligatory to have the vessels constructed in their own countries.

Second. Because under the above conditions, and in France especially, under the stimulus of direct bounties given to the ship-builders, a large number of powerful ship-building yards have sprung into existence on the continent, capable of furnishing all the tonnage required.

This is worth a second thought in connection with the policy of the Democratic party of refusing any assistance or encouragement to American steam-ship lines.

Hartlepools. Industries: Ship-building, engine-building, timber, saw-mills, iron manufacturing, timber and grain exports, ship-owning, cement manufacturing, wood-pulp making, coal and glass exports:

All the industries in this district are depressed at present. The present depression began in 1883, and is now at the lowest point. No sign of any improvement.

They impute this to foreign competition and foreign tariffs.

Heckmondwike. Industries: Blanket and carpet manufacturing, principally; also, rags and cloths:

In 1874 and 1875 it gradually grew worse. The depression continued until 1880, when there occurred an American boom which temporarily lifted prices and induced activity; 1880 to 1885 progressively bad and unprofitable years. Prices continuously drooping.

The carpet trade of this district, which is distinct from that of Halifax and Kidderminster, is very depressed from the following causes: First—

The important market of Canada has been taken away from us by the encouragement given to manufacturers in that country by the excessive duty levied on our goods.

If Canada had been as near to the mother country as poor Ireland, her industries would have been stifled generations since, and Heckmondwike would not have had this cause of complaint. They say that they anticipate an improvement for the reason, among others, that there is a great improvement in the United States, and it is sure to react on their markets. They complain of foreign tariffs and foreign competition, including colonial competition. They say:

Indeed, these foreign and colonial manufacturers are often Englishmen who see their way to make money abroad more than at home.

This circular was also addressed to the Huddersfield Chamber of Commerce. Huddersfield comprises thirty-four townships, an area of 68,884 acres, and a population in 1881 of 156,504 people. Its industries are woolen and worsted manufactures, dyeing and finishing, cotton spinning, woolen and Angora yarn spinning, chemical manufactures, and machine making.

The Huddersfield yarn spinners under date of September 29, 1885, addressed a letter to the chamber of commerce in which they say:

We, the undersigned yarn spinners, beg to impress upon your notice the serious depression which has now existed for so long a period in the yarn-spinning trade of this district. As there is now a commission appointed to inquire into such depression, we ask you in returning answers for this center not to overlook or ignore the serious depression and decline this industry has fallen into, and more especially as this decline has taken place in the face of an ever-increasing importation of foreign yarns.

Another communication upon the same subject, dated October 7, 1885, contains the following sad statement of depression and ruin, notwithstanding the operation of the blessed free-trade principle, "Buy where you can buy the cheapest and sell where you can sell the dearest:"

As a proof of the deplorable state this trade has been in for the past fourteen or fifteen years we most respectfully beg to inform you that we hold a list of over fifty firms of spinners who have been ruined and brought into the bankruptcy court during that period. This list can be produced for your perusal, if required. The sole cause we think of the unprofitableness in the yarn trade is brought about by the large imports of foreign yarns which is monthly increasing, and gradually beating down the home spinner in our market, while we are debarred by high tariffs from exporting coarse yarns, which our machines are eminently adapted for producing cheaply. The foreign spinner comes here in times of depression and realizes his yarn at under cost of production to the great loss and embarrassment of the home spinner.

They say:

The productions of other countries, and even of our own colonies, have much to do with the present depression.

The answers of the committee of the East India and China trade section of the incorporated Chamber of Commerce of Liverpool, after referring to the effect of the demonetization of silver as the cause of the depression of trade in Europe and America, say:

Low prices have led to overproduction and efforts to make small profits on a large turn over, and the result has been loss. By all means let us have free trade, but bounties should be met by countervailing duties, and hostile tariffs on English goods should not be countenanced in commercial treaties.

They want free trade, if they can get it, thus to break down the manufacturers in other countries and control the markets of the world; but if they can not have free trade they want protection. Certainly. We do not intend they shall have free trade so far as the United States is concerned, if the Republican party can prevent it.

Lancashire. Sugar refiners' association report sugar-refining industry depressed:

For twenty years it has suffered from foreign bounties. The manufacture of loaf sugar has been extinguished for at least ten years, and that of moist sugar is suffering most acutely at the present time. Refining trade suffers from a large importation of bounty-fed refined sugar. This condition might be met by diplomatic action; failing this, by countervailing duties.

By this is probably meant "diplomatic action" similar to the attempt to force free trade in fish on the United States by the outrageous and abusive treatment of our fishing vessels and fishermen at sea by the Canadian authorities.

Liverpool. The seed-crushing trade:

There had been long-continued depression until July and August last, when, owing to prospective short supplies of seed from Russia, our markets became more active.

They attribute depression to overproduction in part.

The want of demand on the one hand, induced from the farmer's poverty, and, on the other hand, foreign competition. From all parts of the world we now receive cattle-feeding cakes at the mill, and we are unable, owing to foreign tariffs, to obtain any advantage by selling our oil in the markets of our competitors.

Now, I ask attention to what follows here from Liverpool as to the watchmaking trade. There is hardly a man in the Senate who does not remember the time when Liverpool watches were regarded as among the best and filled this country. My friend from Maine [Mr. FRYE] carries one now.

Liverpool. Watch manufactures: T. R. Russell, a representative watch manufacturer of Liverpool, makes this statement as to the manufacture of watches. It is pathetic, and I give it with fullness. He says:

Watch manufacturing was formerly of special importance; it is now of little importance in Liverpool. Thirty years ago the amount of capital invested was probably two hundred thousand to three hundred thousand pounds. Probably eighteen hundred operatives were employed in the various branches. At present I do not think there are two hundred, mostly old men, and none or few apprentices being taken.

The bulk of the operatives before dying suffered greatly, became casual dock laborers, and entirely sunk in the social scale. The production has of course fallen in proportion to the diminished labor and capital employed, both being about one-tenth of what it was thirty years ago. Thirty years ago four-fifths of the large number of watches made in Liverpool were exported to the United States. This trade has been entirely killed by the increased American tariff. In fact it may be said that whatever an English watch can be sold abroad for, it is thus excluded or crippled while the home market is flooded with American and Swiss surplus stock.

This is the condition of the watch-manufacturing industry of Liverpool because of the encouragement given in America by the protective system to the watch-manufacturing industry here, and to-day we make as cheap watches as can be found in the world, and the market of England is supplied with them as well as the markets in other countries.

We have now fifty or sixty watch factories giving steady and remunerative employment to many thousands of skilled workmen and others, and there are no better watches in the world.

In Geneva, Switzerland, last summer I asked the hotel proprietor to point out to me the portion of the city where I could look at watches,

and, approaching it, the first sign I saw was one high up, in a language I could understand, bearing these familiar words, "Waltham watches;" and the Waltham watches were especially advertised in Paris as of great utility.

Mr. Russell continues—this is not American testimony; it is no Republican speech upon the effects of free trade:

I believe the watch trade, not in Liverpool only, but in Coventry and in London, is more depressed now than at any period within the past thirty years, or so far as I have learned it by tradition from father and grandfather during their time. In fact it is a dying industry. The depression began when the United States seriously raised their tariff, and is at the lowest point now if it does not go any lower. The wages have been pretty well wiped out, because the great bulk of the operatives have been wiped out of the trade.

By all means let us adopt the Democratic policy and build up the watch trade of Liverpool, Coventry, and London and destroy our own!

Luton (comprising parts of Bedfordshire, Hertfordshire, Buckinghamshire, and a part of Essex). Industries: Straw-plaiting and manufacturing of straw-plaits into hats and bonnets. Two-thirds home trade, one-third foreign. Straw plaits to Germany, America, and France. "Decrease in regard to the making of straw-plaits, an increase in regard to the importation of foreign plaits." Depression is confined to straw-plaiting. From 1871 to the present date, prices not remunerative. They say:

In negotiating foreign tariffs insist upon the duties being considerably modified, and, if possible, annulled and removed in relation to our local industry.

Certainly. Why not?

Macclesfield. The silk industry, including the sewing and spinning of waste and raw silk and power-loom weaving; also the manufacture of union tablets, such as cotton and silk, and spun and pure silk, and the dyeing of silk:

Thrown silk has in past years been largely exported to America and the continent of Europe, but its reduced production to-day indicates corresponding limited demand both at home and in Europe.

In a note they say:

The exportation as regards America has almost entirely ceased in consequence of the duty of 35 per cent.; annually less.

As regards manufactured goods, large orders were formerly executed for America. France subsequently became a moderate customer. To-day the exportations to America are all but *nil*, while perhaps 20 per cent. of our productions are sent abroad.

In the last five years trade and industry has shown unmistakable signs of prostration and decay. There have been fitful and brief periods of revival both in volume, gross value, net profit, and quantity of labor employed. The decrease of production is apparent.

Prior to 1860 the trade of Macclesfield was in a fairly flourishing condition—fifty-five mills, with an approximate of 14,000 hands. From that day to 1870 there was great depression. The fifty-five mills were reduced to thirty-two, and the hands employed were reduced from 14,000 to 5,000. There was a general depreciation of property, and over two thousand houses being vacant within the borough. During the Franco-German war, when all the continental forces were mobilized, we enjoyed a uniform prosperity—1870 to 1876—but since the latter date the silk industry has gradually languished, and at the present time there are over thirty mills closed entirely.

What an unmixed and uniform blessing free-trade is to England! They impute their loss to foreign tariffs.

Manchester. Industries: Coal, copper, iron, machinery, coal, and chemicals.

Eighteen hundred and sixty-five to 1869 so unsatisfactory that the Manchester Chamber of Commerce reported at the close of 1869—

The extreme depression of trade has resulted in an extent of disasters almost without parallel within the history of our commerce. In this year alone upwards of eighty spinners and manufacturers in this district failed, while those whose wealth enabled them to avoid ruin were left with crippled means and greatly depreciated property. Such property fell to a third and in some cases to a fourth of its former value, and was even at times unsalable. Many mill owners in apparently affluent circumstances were driven to seek for subsistence in subordinate situations, and even in emigration. Destitution caused an enormous advance in the poor rates, and in order to avoid liability to taxation in unworked factories the machinery of many was cleared out, and even sold for old metal.

1870 to 1874: The first two years were prosperous ones. (The Franco-German war.) The three following more or less unsatisfactory. 1875 to 1879: The whole period was unsatisfactory. Many very important failures in financial and other commercial circles occurred in 1875 and 1878. 1880 to 1884: The first two years were, generally speaking, fairly profitable ones, but the last three have witnessed steadily extending depression.

What a wonderful, never-ending blessing, certain of beneficent results, is free trade!

In Great Britain in 1883 there were 42,000,000 cotton-using spindles; on the Continent, 22,500,000; in the United States, 12,660,000; in the East Indies 1,700,000. We want to use our vast cotton product in our own country, and multiply our spindles to 42,000,000, and reduce Great Britain's number to 12,660,000. It will not be done by the application of the principle of the Confederate constitution to our economic system.

Let me give here the characteristics of the cotton trade as to profit as given by Messrs. Ellisons' circulars, and they are authority and are reported by the Royal Commission:

1865. Gloomy, but more encouraging at close.
1866. Most disastrous.
1867. Most unsatisfactory.
1868. Not so unsatisfactory as 1867.
1869. Unprofitable.
1870. Good.
1871. Unexampled prosperity (Franco-Prussian war).
1872. Unprofitable.
1873. Not satisfactory.
1874. Dull.
1875. The year closed unregretted.
1876. Less unsatisfactory than 1875.
1877. Not a single redeeming feature.
1878. Unparalleled depression.
1879. The depression culminated. Revival in October.
1880. Improving.
1881. Fairly remunerative.
1882. Diminished profits.
1883. Very far from satisfactory.
1884. Very unsatisfactory.

A beautiful record for nineteen years of free trade in the English cotton trade!

George Lord, director of the Manchester Chamber of Commerce, says, by way of recommending a remedy:

Government might, however, exert its influence, so far as practicable, in endeavoring to produce modification of the tariffs of foreign countries, and even of some of our own colonies, which are now so onerous as to restrict, and in some cases prohibit, the import of the manufactures of this country.

The mother country ought to direct the combined influence and educational power of the Cobden Club to bringing some of her recalcitrant colonies to appreciate the beauty of free trade before revolutionizing the economic policy of the United States.

Morley. Industries: Woolen and linen trades:

All branches of trade in this district have never been for twenty years past so depressed as at present. Depression began in the year 1877. Lowest point is the present period. Symptoms: Heavy stock, small profits, and severe competition. Attributed to increase of foreign hostile tariffs, especially in respect to France, Germany, Austria, and America.

They recommend legislation securing more favorable treaties with foreign nations, and they say:

The protective and hostile tariffs of other countries, and especially of our own colonies, have much to do with the present depression, as their effect is most severely felt in this district.

Salt. Chamber of Commerce: Manufacture of salt and rock-salt mining:

The salt trade is very much depressed.

In 1884 they exported 233,170 tons to the United States.

The depression began three years ago, and is now at its worst, causing want of employment for the men, one-third of the works being permanently idle for want of trade; houses unoccupied; and still there is every possibility of further depression.

They impute it to competition on the part of foreign countries.

Salt being imported to England from our own colonies.

And the remedy which they suggest is the reduction of duties in foreign countries; to wit, the United States, etc.

Very many such reports might be quoted.

Similar questions were also addressed to various commercial associations, and the answers, if I might take the time to read them, would be exceedingly instructive and interesting. With few exceptions they complain of foreign tariffs and foreign competition, many including tariff and competition by their English colonies, and in some cases recommend as a remedy countervailing duties.

The Tin-Plate Manufacturers' Association made a report admitting great depression, in which they attribute the principal cause to overproduction. There is one item in their report which is worthy of special note. It is this:

This price being below the cost of production, a combination was formed to reduce production by stopping one week in every month, to the end of the year. This combination has been in operation for three months, and has greatly improved the market.

Is this a trust? It is certainly "a combination to put up prices," and it certainly was not caused by protection in England.

Circulars were addressed to the different guilds and trade societies and unions in the United Kingdom, representing workmen in every department of skilled labor, and their replies generally show long-continued depression, and in them there is much of despondency and hopelessness.

The reports and testimony obtained by this commission constitute a mine of great wealth in the way of information bearing upon the effect of free trade, and one finds in them almost limitless vindication of the efficiency and utility of the American system.

I will later in my remarks give the summing up of all the testimony upon the subject by the commission in its report, but before that I desire to show that, depressed during so many years as the industries have been, agriculture has fared infinitely worse than any other department of labor. I fancy the English farmer would thank God with all his heart if he could have a few years of American protection and of the prosperity which that system has for so many years brought to the American farmer.

Sir James Caird, the senior land commissioner for England, and a great authority, testified to the continual depression and ruin among the agricultural classes of England. After giving the result as to the different countries, he was asked:

Have you made any generalization of the result?

Answer. Yes, I have. The present as compared with ten years ago as deduced by me from these figures, which I have already given, would show on an average that the landlords have lost 30 per cent., the tenants 60 per cent., and the laborers 10 per cent., and putting that into figures, it brings out that on £65,000,000 of rental for the United Kingdom the landlords' loss of 30 per cent. would be equal to about £20,000,000, and the tenants' 60 per cent., inasmuch as their income may be taken at half the rental, would be just the same: that is to say, 60 per cent. on half the rental is also £20,000,000. With regard to the laborers there was a difficulty in estimating the amount of reduction, but I will place before your lordships the way in which I endeavored to arrive at it.

Without taking time to give his method, he estimates the reduction upon labor to be 10 per cent. of £28,000,000, which would be £2,800,000, and the total loss to the landed interest in spendable income for the last year, which was the year 1885, he figures at £42,800,000, or $214,000,000 in one year, one million more of annual loss to those engaged in agriculture than all the sums collected last year by the Treasury from customs duties. I wish every American farmer could read his testimony. How much of such "blessing" does the American farmer want? For ten preceding years the annual loss in agriculture had been as great, and in one or two years greater than in the year to which I have called attention.

Another item to which I desire for one moment to call attention is, that the number of applications for patents in Great Britain for 1854 was 2,764; the number of patents granted 1,878; the average for five years down to 1859 was, applications 3,054, granted 2,020; the average for five years to 1864, applications 3,306, granted 2,084; for five years down to 1869, applications 3,668, granted 2,298; the average for five years down to 1874, applications 3,938, granted 2,693; for five years down to 1879, applications 5,052, granted 3,379; the average for five years down to 1884, 8,122; the number granted is not given. This is absolutely trifling compared with the applications made and granted in the United States during the same years.

Who will deny, in the face of these figures, the proposition that the "protective system," encouraging the investment of capital, stimulating home competition, has encouraged invention and made us to lead the world in patentable ideas and improvements?

I turn to the final report of the commission, where, with a strong bias of course toward England, and a desire not to injure national credit or to cripple the successful operation of free trade, the entire testimony and investigation of the commission is thus summed up.

Mr. HOAR. Will the Senator allow me to make an observation there?

Mr. SPOONER. Certainly.

Mr. HOAR. I understand that the result of that comparison looking into English patents is made even more impressive by the fact that according to English law they give a patent to everybody who asks for it, while under our law the application for a patent is carefully examined to see whether it infringes on one already granted.

Mr. SPOONER. That intensifies the value of the contrast, and I thank the Senator from Massachusetts for the suggestion.

Now here is the final report. I desire it to be remembered that it is a report of a commission of Englishmen, some of them noblemen, all of them prominent men, most of them members of the House of Commons and of the House of Lords, and their report is exceedingly significant:

With very few exceptions trade is reported to be depressed, and in many cases it is considered to be more depressed than at any previous period. The number of workmen out of employment at the time when the answers were drawn up showed considerable variation according to the districts and trades to which they belonged, but there appears to have been a greater want of employment among the unskilled than among the skilled workmen. The rate of wages for time work appears on the whole to be slightly higher than the average of the last twenty years, but it is not now at its highest point. The rate for piece-work has diminished for nearly all cases. A reduction is reported in hours of work of from three to four hours a week during the last fifteen years. Both the quantity and the quality of the work produced have largely increased. Summarizing very briefly the answers which we received to our questions, and the oral evidence given before us, there would appear to be a general agreement among those whom we consulted.

A. That the trade and industry of the country are in a condition which may be fairly described as depressed.

B. That by this depression is meant a diminution and in some cases an absence of profit, with a corresponding diminution of employment for the laboring classes.

C. That neither the volume of trade nor the amount of capital invested therein has materially fallen off, though the latter has in many cases diminished in value.

D. That the depression above referred to dates from about the year 1875, and that with the exception of a short period of prosperity enjoyed by certain branches of trade in the years 1880 to 1883, it has proceeded with tolerable uniformity and has affected the trade and industry of the country generally, but more especially those branches which are connected with agriculture.

These unimpeachable witnesses establish the existence of a condition which we do not wish to have duplicated in the United States.

My friend from Colorado [Mr. TELLER], who has had access to a later report than this, has brought to my attention this fact, that in the last year a single association of skilled workmen in Great Britain, the Organized Association of Engineers, paid out of their treasury, contributed out of their earnings, $400,000 to keep from want the members of the association who were out of employment and who were compelled to rely upon such assistance to maintain themselves and their families. He also calls my attention to the fact that in that year the poor-rate of England paid by parliamentary grant amounted to $92,220,510, while all the money paid by Great Britain for educational purposes—and I wish I had time to read the items—amounted to only $27,224,910, and there never has been a time when there was a larger number of men out of employment, of both skilled and unskilled laborers, than to-day in free-trade Great Britain.

The report continues:

As regards the causes which have contributed to bring about this state of things, there was, as might be expected, less unanimity of opinion, but the following enumeration will, we think, include all those to which any importance was attached:

First. Overproduction.

How is this? We have heard it claimed for a great many years that overproduction was due to the artificial stimulus given by protection. This contention ought to be forever silenced by this finding of the royal commission.

Second. The continuous fall of prices caused by the depreciation of the standard value.

Third. The effect of foreign tariffs and bounties and the restrictive commercial policies of foreign countries in limiting our markets.

No wonder Great Britain desires above all other things, save the extinction of the spirit of liberty in Ireland, that the industries of the United States and other countries may be broken down that she may supply the world with manufactures.

Fourth. Foreign competition, which we are beginning to feel both in our own and neutral markets.

"The tariff is a tax!"

Fifth. An increase in local taxation and the burdens of industry generally.

"Buy where you can buy the cheapest; sell where you can sell the dearest."

This sweet-sounding formula of free trade has not diminished local taxation or lifted the burdens from industry generally in free-trade England apparently.

Sixth. Cheaper rates of carriage enjoyed by our foreign competitors.

It has been claimed that because of the tariff on iron and steel our rates of carriage were too high, and therefore we should let in at lower rates of duty the iron and steel products of other lands. England complains greatly of high rates of carriage and of discrimination, and concedes cheaper carriage to other countries, including the United States.

Seventh. Legislation affecting the employment of labor in industrial undertakings.

Eighth. Superior technical education of the workmen in foreign countries.

This last is quite significant! Is not this remarkable as one of the causes for the continued and terrible depression reported by this royal commission?

I can not follow the commission through its analysis, or attempted analysis, of causes. Time will not permit.

Dealing with the nature of the depression, after having established its existence, they say:

Those who may be said to represent the producer have mainly dwelt upon the restriction and even the absence of profit in their respective businesses. It is from this class, and more especially from the employers of labor, that the complaints chiefly proceed. On the other hand, those classes of the population who derive their income from foreign investments, or from property not directly connected with productive industries, appear to have little ground of complaint. On the contrary, they have profited by the remarkably low prices of many commodities.

This is always so. Wages may go down among the American workmen to meet the wages of other lands, the standard of living may be reduced, but the mortgages upon their homes, the moneys they owe to those of fixed income, and the rate of interest will not go down. The money-lenders will profit, and they alone, "by the remarkably low prices of many commodities," which are to follow the adoption of the Southern philosophy upon this subject. The report continues:

We may therefore sum up the chief features of the commercial situation as being:

A. A very serious falling off in the exchangeable value of the produce of the soil;

B. And increased production of nearly all other classes of commodities;

C. A tendency in the supply of commodities to outrun the demand;

D. A diminution in the profits obtainable by production; and

E. A similar diminution in the rate of interest on invested capital.

The diminution in the rate of profit obtainable, from production, whether agricultural or manufacturing, has given rise to a widespread feeling of depression among all the producing classes. Those, on the other hand, who are in receipt of fixed salaries, or who draw their incomes from fixed investments, have apparently little to complain of, and we think that so far as regards the purchasing power of wages a similar remark will apply to the laboring classes.

They find that there has been "systematic overproduction continued during a long period, and resulting, according to the unanimous testimony of the witnesses who appeared before us, in little or no profit to the producing classes."

What a mass of goods England must have accumulated through all these years of "systematic overproduction," which she holds ready to flood the American market with, at ruinous prices, the moment the principle of the Confederate constitution shall become the ruling principle in the United States!

Systematic overproduction for fifteen years in England in every department almost of effort, we do not want the benefit of!

They say:

We are disposed to think that one of the chief agencies which have tended to perpetuate this state of things is the protectionist policy of so many foreign countries, which has become more marked during the last ten years than at any previous period of similar length. The high prices which protection secures to the purchaser within its protected area naturally stimulates production and impels him to engage in competition in foreign markets. The surplus production which can not find a market at home is sent abroad, and in foreign markets undersells the commodities produced under less artificial conditions. The natural growth of the industries of foreign countries, possessing in many cases the population and other resources required for successful manufacturing enterprise, has also contributed to produce the same result.

I call attention also to what this commission say in this final report in regard to their home market:

We have, as above pointed out, suffered a serious loss in our purchasing power by reason of the deficient or unremunerative character of the produce of the soil. Sir James Caird estimates the loss in purchasing power of the classes engaged in or connected with agriculture at £42,800,000 during the year

1885, and the loss in several of the preceding years must no doubt have been equal to or even greater than this. This amount has been lost to the markets in which it was formerly spent, and can not fail to have had an important influence upon the demand for manufactured goods.

What a blessing is free trade to the English farmer!

Again:

An effect of a similar kind, though less in degree, has been produced by the increased competition in our own market of foreign manufactured or partly manufactured goods, the importation of which appears to grow at a slightly more rapid rate than population, having been £1.97 per head in the year 1870-'74, and £2.35 per head in the period 1880-'84.

They also say that—

The reputation of British workmanship has also suffered in another way by the fraudulent stamping of inferior goods of foreign manufacture with marks indicating British origin. This appears to be principally the case with the hardware goods of Birmingham and Sheffield, which have secured so wide a reputation in the markets of the world. We regret, however, to be obliged to add that the practice of fraudulent marking appears, from the evidence before us, to be not unknown in this country.

The report proceeds—and now I ask attention to this, because it shows the point to which they have come and the prospect for the future, both as respects their industry and as respects their labor:

It is, however, right to point out that while the share of the aggregate wealth produced in the country which now falls to labor is larger than it was twenty years ago, a corresponding diminution has taken place in the share which falls to capital. In other words, that while wages have risen profits have fallen, and that this is obviously a process which can not be continued beyond a certain point. This point has, we think, been very nearly, if not quite, attained already. A time may therefore come when capital will lose all inducement to lend itself to the work of production, and if the employer is driven out of the field the laborers will necessarily suffer with him.

A brilliant prospect for the British manufacturer and the British laborer under the benign influence of free trade after having given it a splendid trial!

Announcing that they have few recommendations to make, the commission say—and there is an undertone of sadness running through it which if England had been less brutal in her treatment of others would be quite affecting:

We think also that the increasing severity of the competition of foreign countries is a matter deserving more serious attention than it has received at the hands of our commercial and industrial class. We can not perhaps hope to maintain to the same extent as heretofore the lead which we formerly held among the manufacturing nations of the world. Various causes contributed to give us a position far in advance of other countries, which we were able to hold for many years, but those causes could not have been expected to operate permanently, and our supremacy is now being assailed on all sides.

It is only being assailed, however, by countries which have grown prosperous under the principles of protection, including some of the colonies of Great Britain.

What a royal tribute to the wisdom and power of protection as an economic principle is given by this royal commission!

"And our supremacy is now being assailed on all sides!" Even by the colonies of Great Britain, which will have none of free trade; by Germany, which adopted the protective system in 1879, and which under its impulse has grown with a rapidity in every department of industry never known to that country before. And the United States, which under the protective policy has outstripped in wealth and growth and industrial progress the world, is one of the factors assailing, and to continue to assail, if the Democratic party does not succeed in forcing the Confederate principle upon the country, the supremacy of Great Britain.

To-day England may still be mistress of the seas, but the testimony taken shows that she is in deadly fear of losing that position; that her ship-building and ship-owning industries are languishing because the protection given by France and other countries to ship-building and ship-owning has brought her a competition difficult to be met. She does not any longer hold the markets of the world. The brutality and selfishness with which she sought to kill the industries of the American colonies, and after the war of 1812 to stifle the industries of America by flooding the country with British-made goods at a loss; the brutality and selfishness and outrage with which she killed, and has kept down, the industrial independence and prosperity of Ireland, have outlived their usefulness, and there has come a day when Great Britain is forced to admit that her "supremacy is assailed on every side," and that she can no longer expect to maintain the position as the leading manufacturing nation which she once possessed.

But for the 3,000 miles of ocean which lie between Great Britain and the United States our fate might have been the fate of Ireland; and underlying the opposition of England to the principles of home rule in Ireland to-day is this old-time dread of commercial and industrial competition, the fear well grounded that if Ireland had her home-rule parliament it would adopt its own commercial system, would quicken into life its dead industries, and rich in raw material and natural resources and in the ingenuity and patriotism of its people, would become a dangerous rival.

It is not long since Baron Bramwell, an eminent English jurist whose name is known to all lawyers, in an article entitled "Has Ireland a grievance?" published in the Forum of August, 1887, and addressed to the American people, "lets the cat out of the bag."

Home rule—

He says—

is a step to the establishment of a separate state in Ireland, with the certainty that other steps will be taken; the establishment of a separate state, with good ports and harbors opposite the entrance to the Clyde, and Glasgow, Liverpool, the Bristol Channel, all the channel ports, and the Thames.

Mark how: England fears the development of Irish industries and the growth of Irish commerce!

I can not forbear to quote from the dissenting report of George Auldjo Jamieson what he says about the free trade of England. After having signed the majority report, he criticises it for omitting to enter upon the subject of the effect of foreign tariffs and the remedy to be found in protection. He says:

I must attribute the comparative reticence and the apparent apathy of the report on this subject to the reluctance of the commission as a body to enter on any inquiry which could tend to a conflict of opinion on the question of free trade; but it seems to me impossible to deal with this matter, which is thrust on our notice very forcibly by the evidence, without grappling to some extent with that question. I think the reluctance to deal with it is due greatly to misconception. Controversy can not touch the axioms which combine to form the principle of free trade. It is the efficiency or the imbecility of the method which applies that principle to the practical business of the country which may be questioned.

If a beneficent principle fails to accomplish beneficent results the fault must lie with those who have to put it into practical operation. That there is some delinquency is apparent from the evidence. Free trade justly credited with every capacity for good comes before us in much of this evidence laden with the broken promises and disappointed hopes due to the extravagant advocacy of its early supporters. It was to convert the world; and after forty years no nation of importance has adopted it, and some have abandoned it. It was to confer great benefits on its votaries, and corresponding evils were to assail those who rejected it. The prosperity we enjoyed was shared while it lasted with other nations, and the ratio of their advance not infrequently outstripped our own; the depression which other nations have suffered we have shared with them, though we alone have had the benefit of free trade.

Enterprise was to be paralyzed and invention stifled where free trade did not prevail; but Germany has rivaled if not excelled us in enterprise; and America has been more prolific of invention than any other nation; and to neither Germany nor America has free trade contributed its stimulus. A system which can confer prosperity on its votaries only when those who abjure it are also prosperous, and which permits depression to assail with strict impartiality those who adopt and those who reject it, appears to me either to have much reason to complain of the method of its application, or to require some further justification than those arguments which prevailed before prophecy was falsified by history.

I think, therefore, that it is much to be regretted that any attempts to reconcile the results of free trade with its beneficent principles, and to reduce it to its proper level as the weapon and not the master of true statesmanship, are so keenly resented by those who are most jealous of its reputation; they seem to have passed into that phase of opinion when inquiry is deemed pernicious, and men allow themselves to become the slaves of doctrine, their zeal for the dogma outweighing alike consideration for its truth and concern for its effects.

No system of human politics or economics can be absolutely true. It can be true only relatively to the circumstances and conditions of the society to which it is applied. What was true in a political sense, *i. e.*, good in the thirteenth century, would be untrue, *i. e.*, inapplicable, in the nineteenth. What in a political sense is true in London would be in a similar sense untrue at Honolulu. No investigation, therefore, could, in my opinion, have been more useful, and none more profitable as bearing on the depression of our national industry than an inquiry whether the circumstances of 1886 are in all respects equally as appropriate as those of 1846 to the adoption and application of free trade as it was then adopted and applied. * * * But it is the first duty which a State owes to its citizens to protect their industries from invasion, and a government which confesses its impotence or professes its reluctance to fulfill that duty abdicates one of its primary functions.

Nor is this all. Mr. Jamieson was not alone of the royal commissioners in his view of the fallibility of free trade as a system adapted now even to England. In another report, signed by Dunraven, W. Farrer Ecroyd, P. Albert Muntz, and Nevile Lubbock, occurs the following significant declaration:

Sir James Brady, inspector of Irish fisheries, remarked, under date September, 1886, "there were over 8,000 tons of salted fish imported into Ireland last year; treble the quantity might and ought to be exported."

This reads like the utterance of an American protectionist.

The report continues—

We have already described the way in which the high protective duties levied by foreign nations, whose industries are almost or quite on a par with our own as regards cheapness of production, constitute in effect a bounty upon their exports of protected articles. So far as this affects their competition with our purchasers in neutral markets we have, of course, no direct remedy in our hands. Of the possibility of applying an effectual though indirect remedy, we shall have hereafter to speak, but as regards their practical subsidized competition in our home market, which is doing so much to destroy the profits of our producers, and to diminish the employment of labor, we have at command an effectual remedy.

The imposition of duties equal to 10 or 15 per cent. upon all manufactures imported from foreign countries would, we believe, sufficiently countervail both the bounty-creating effect of their protective tariff, and the unenviable economy of production obtained through longer hours of labor and less effective inspection and regulation of its conditions. For our aim ought not to be to countervail any natural and legitimate advantage which foreign manufactures may possess, but simply to prevent our industries being placed at an artificial disadvantage by the interference of either home or foreign legislation, and to replace them, as nearly as may be, in the position in which they would have found themselves but for such interference.

Such duties would undoubtedly to a considerable extent keep foreign manufacturers out of our home market and thereby give increased employment to our home industries. But in this country so insufficient is the present employment of the available labor and agencies of production, and so great is the pressure of capital seeking investment and labor seeking employ, that in our opinion neither prices, profits, nor wages could possibly be raised by the operation of such duties above the lowest remunerative level.

* * * * * * *

The measures which we have indicated would counterwork the effect of protection and strengthen the position of our producers directly in the home market, and indirectly, though substantially, in neutral markets. It is of course out of our power to obtain more free access to the protected markets of countries like the United States, France, and Germany themselves. In past years we had little occasion to regret this, or to trouble ourselves about it. Their course of action did not harm us so long as we were able in spite of it to obtain full employment for all our available labor.

That is, as long as the balance of trade was against these countries,

including the United States, and instead of working up their own raw material they were steady customers of Great Britain's manufactured products; but under the influence of protection these countries have become manufacturers instead of so great buyers, and England long since began to feel the change in her situation. Her manufacturers and labor suffer, while the manufacturers and labor of protected countries prosper.

To buy everything in the cheapest market, though not permitted to sell in the dearest, may be the best policy, so long as we can find other fields of equally remunerative employment for the home enterprise and industry which we displace in so doing, but no longer, for from the moment in which the combined effect of protective tariffs abroad and foreign competition at home limits our market, so as to cramp the full and free exercise of our industries, it begins to choke the living fountain of our wealth, our social well-being, and our national strength. We think the evidence is conclusive that during the past ten or twelve years this point has been reached, and that the adoption of a national policy suited to the changed conditions is imperatively demanded.

Dunraven, however, wished it understood that he was not in favor of protection!

Our Democratic friends want free trade in the United States, or what is practically free trade, a tariff for revenue only, while very many in Great Britain are demanding in an essential and potential way protection to her stagnant and decaying interests, and protection as a relief, the efficacy of which it doubts, to the labor which is now suffering in that country.

I wish I might read some extracts on the subject of England's necessity for protection, and the fallacy of free trade, from the little book, "A Forbidden Topic," by Sir Edward Sullivan, but time will not permit on this occasion.

In a recent article in the London Post he makes these suggestive comparisons, which are well worthy of attention:

Under free trade the masses must get poorer, because they get less employment. A well-known statistical work gives a comparison of the material progress of France under protection and England under free trade. If there is any truth in figures it ought to startle us from our free-trade dream.

The comparison is based on the returns of legacy duty:

In 1826 England was 10s. a head richer than France.
In 1850 England was 19s. a head richer than France.
In 1877 England was 5s. a head poorer than France.

France has 57 per cent. of her land under tillage, and it is increasing every year.

The United Kingdom has 30 per cent. of land under tillage, and it is diminishing every year, but the population of England increases much more rapidly than the population of France.

The commerce of England has increased 21 per cent. in ten years.
The commerce of France has increased 39 per cent. in ten years.
The commerce of the United States has increased 68 per cent. in ten years.
The commerce of the world has increased 26 per cent. in ten years.

So much for the blasting effect of free trade.

Certain it is, from what I have shown, that free trade has not for many years been satisfactory in its effect in England, and that there are already signs of revolt among the English people against that system.

While we all of both parties admit the necessity for a reduction in the revenues, and the Republican party stands pledged to a revision of the tariff, this is not a wise time, if one ever shall come, for the American people to follow the Southern Democracy and Northern *doctrinaires* and the importers into the experiment of free trade.

The British diplomatic representatives reported from every nation on the habitable globe to the royal commission the condition of industry and trade, and a glance at their reports shows that with few exceptions the general condition of nations in respect of trade was prosperous, while that of England was depressed. Set against this picture, drawn by the royal commission and the various bodies to whose testimony I have adverted, of England's condition under free trade, the marvelous growth and prosperity, in the face of war and other adverse elements, of the United States under protection, and the object lesson thus afforded is unanswerable in favor of the protective system, and against our trying any experiment to hazard the well-being of labor and the growth and development of our country.

The Democratic party will vainly attempt to convince the people that it is engaged in no free-trade crusade, and that the Mills bill is a protective measure. If there is a people on the earth not liable to be mistaken as to what constitutes free trade it is the English people. They know the article when they see it, and the joyful acclaim with which the merchants of England, burdened with the goods of many years of "systematic overproduction," hailed the advent of Mr. Cleveland's message as a commercial deliverance to them will not be forgotten.

The conspicuous English newspapers promptly welcomed it as free trade, and but for the fact that they soon ascertained that their enthusiastic plaudits excited the suspicion of the American people, and tended to delay "the good time coming," every newspaper in Great Britain would have been working enthusiastically to-day for Cleveland and Thurman and free trade. The prudent Englishmen, doubtless informed from America of its effect, warned English newspapers that it would not do. Therefore there appeared speedily the following in the London Pall-Mall Gazette:

Free-traders would be well advised if they moderated the ecstacy of their jubilation over President Cleveland's message. Every word which they say in its favor will be used as a powerful argument against the adoption of its recommendations.

And later, on this side of the Atlantic, from the Halifax (Nova Scotia) Herald, the following:

There is slight doubt but that we Canadians will have a large sympathy with President Cleveland's candidature, and it would be unfortunate if any expression of this sympathy on our part should serve to embarrass the Democratic party in those States where the real contest centers. The Southern States have very friendly feelings toward the Canadian Provinces, but they are already strong in their adhesion to the Democratic party. The present contest will be close. The odds are heavily in favor of the Republicans, but, inasmuch as we desire to see President Cleveland successful, it is most certainly advisable that the Canadian press should guard against embarrassing his party, and precluding his success, by tendering his administration indiscriminate and fulsome compliment.

So there came silence over the English press and the Canadian press, and while in the debate upon the Mills bill not one word was said in the House of Representatives by any man who favored it in support of the principle of protection, the Democratic party is engaged now from morning till night, from Monday till Sunday, in shouting throughout the United States that the English papers were mistaken; that the Canadian papers were mistaken; that England does not know free trade when she sees it; that the Democracy is not in favor of free trade, and that the Mills bill is a protective measure.

But the wisdom of silence came to the English and Canadian press too late. Neither their sudden and continued silence after the first joyful outburst, nor the retaliation message of the President, whose purpose none have misunderstood, will drive from the minds of manufacturers and wage-workers and farmers in the United States the fact which stands boldly out and is palpable that the warmest adherents of the President's policy, as indicated by his message, are the Southern Democracy, long ago committed by national platform and Confederate constitution to the principle of free trade, the New York importers, and England.

Mr. TELLER. Mr. President——

Mr. COCKRELL. I presume it will be impossible for the Senator from Colorado to finish his remarks this evening. There is a little executive business that ought to be transacted. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

Mr. HOAR. I move that the Senate adjourn.

Mr. COCKRELL. Let us have just a short executive session. It will not take three minutes.

Mr. HOAR. Why not wait until to-morrow?

Mr. FRYE. I wish to get in a report in executive session.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. Does the Senator from Massachusetts withdraw his motion to adjourn?

Mr. HOAR. I do.

EXECUTIVE SESSION.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The Senator from Missouri moves that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business. After four minutes spent in executive session the doors were reopened, and (at 5 o'clock and 42 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until Wednesday, October 17, 1888, at 12 o'clock m.

NOMINATIONS.

Executive nominations received by the Senate October 16, 1888.

UNITED STATES MARSHAL.

George Moorman, of Louisiana, to be United States marshal for the eastern district of Louisiana, *vice* Reuben B. Pleasants, deceased.

FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE ARMY.

Sixteenth Regiment of Infantry.

Additional Second Lieut. Capers D. Vance, of the Twenty-first Infantry, to be second lieutenant, October 1, 1888, *vice* Wright, promoted.

FOR PROMOTION IN THE ARMY.

Medical Department.

Capt. Leonard Y. Loring, assistant surgeon, to be surgeon with the rank of major, October 9, 1888, *vice* Meacham, deceased.

Sixteenth Regiment of Infantry.

Second Lieut. Walter H. Wright, to be first lieutenant, October 1, 1888, *vice* Cushman, resigned.

FOR PROMOTION IN THE REVENUE SERVICE.

First Lieut. Joseph W. Congdon, to be a captain in the Revenue Service of the United States, *vice* Constable, deceased.

CONFIRMATIONS.

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate October 10, 1888.

RECEIVER OF PUBLIC MONEYS.

Harry E. Shields to be receiver of public moneys at Seattle, Wash.

UNITED STATES ATTORNEY.

George S. Duryee, of New Jersey, to be attorney of the United States for the district of New Jersey.

UNITED STATES MARSHAL.

James A. Moore, of Nevada, to be marshal of the United States for the district of Nevada.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

TUESDAY, *October* 16, 1888.

The House met at 12 o'clock m. Prayer by Rev. J. H. CUTHBERT, D. D.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

UNLAWFUL REGISTRY OF VESSELS.

The SPEAKER laid before the House a letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a letter from the Commissioner of Navigation in response to a resolution of the House calling for information relative to alleged unlawful registry of vessels as vessels of the United States; which was referred to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, and ordered to be printed.

BRIDGE AT LA CROSSE, WIS.

The SPEAKER also laid before the House a bill (H. R. 11139) to authorize the building of a bridge or bridges across the Mississippi River at La Crosse, Wis., with amendments of the Senate thereto.

Mr. HUDD. Mr. Speaker, the amendments of the Senate are merely formal, and I ask unanimous consent that they be now concurred in.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the amendments.

The amendments were read, as follows:

Page 1, at the end of line 13, insert: "And there shall be submitted to the Secretary of War, for his examination and approval, a design and drawing of the bridge, and a map of the location, giving, for the space of 1 mile above and 1 mile below the proposed location, the topography of the banks of the river, the shore-lines at high and low water, the direction and strength of the current at all stages, and the soundings, accurately showing the bed of the stream, the location of any other bridge or bridges, and all other information required."

Page 1, line 17, after "Wisconsin," insert "and approved by the Secretary of War."

Page 2, strike out lines 12 and 13.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin that the amendments of the Senate be concurred in?

There was no objection.

The amendments were concurred in.

REPORT OF THE BUREAU OF ANIMAL INDUSTRY FOR 1887.

The SPEAKER also laid before the House a concurrent resolution of the Senate authorizing the printing of 50,000 copies of the fourth annual report of the Bureau of Animal Industry for the year 1887.

Mr. RICHARDSON. I ask unanimous consent that that concurrent resolution be now considered.

The resolution was read, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That there be printed 50,000 copies of the fourth annual report of the Bureau of Animal Industry for the year 1887, of which 13,000 copies shall be for the use of the members of the Senate, 27,000 copies for the use of members of the House of Representatives, and 10,000 copies for the use of the Commissioner of Agriculture; the illustrations to be executed under the supervision of the Public Printer in accordance with the directions of the Joint Committee on Printing; the work to be subject to the approval of the Commissioner of Agriculture.

Mr. RICHARDSON. Mr. Speaker, that provides for a large edition, 50,000 copies, and the resolution should be self-appropriating. I have drawn an amendment, which I ask unanimous consent to have considered at this time.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. RICHARDSON] that this concurrent resolution be now considered?

Mr. OATES. I should like to know what is the necessity for printing so large a number of copies of this document?

Mr. RICHARDSON. It is the annual report of the Bureau of Animal Industry, and the number is the same as was printed last year and the year before. The resolution last year was not self-appropriating; it was so the year before last, but this one is not, and therefore I have drawn an amendment to make it so, and also to change the concurrent resolution to a joint resolution. The estimate for this printing is $27,930 for an edition of 50,000 copies.

Mr. OATES. This is not an agricultural report?

Mr. RICHARDSON. It is not an agricultural report, but it is the report of the Bureau of Animal Industry, which bears the same relation to live-stock that the agricultural report bears to agriculture.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

There was no objection.

The amendments offered by Mr. RICHARDSON were read, as follows:

Add to the resolution the following:

"And that there be and is hereby appropriated out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated the sum of $27,930, or so much thereof as may be necessary for that purpose."

Also change the resolution from a concurrent to a joint resolution.

The amendments were agreed to.

The concurrent resolution was passed.

Mr. RICHARDSON moved to reconsider the vote by which the concurrent resolution was passed; and also moved that the motion to reconsider be laid on the table.

The latter motion was agreed to.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. BLISS, indefinitely.

To Mr. O'NEILL, of Pennsylvania, indefinitely, on account of important business.

To Mr. MANSUR, indefinitely, from October 16, on account of important business.

INVESTIGATION OF THE WASHINGTON AQUEDUCT.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will appoint as a committee to investigate the work upon the Washington Aqueduct, in accordance with the law passed this session, the gentleman from Georgia, Mr. CLEMENTS; the gentleman from Tennessee, Mr. MCMILLIN, and the gentleman from Kansas, Mr. RYAN.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED.

Mr. KILGORE, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that the committee had examined and found duly enrolled bills and joint resolutions of the following titles; when the Speaker signed the same:

A bill (H. R. 1239) to extend the jurisdiction of the Light-House Board to the Sacramento and San Joaquin Rivers, California;

A bill (H. R. 1249) for establishing a light-house and fog-signal on Roe Island, Suisun Bay, California;

A bill (H. R. 1641) for the erection of a light-house at or near a point about midway between Barnegat and Navesink lights, in the State of New Jersey;

A bill (H. R. 2196) for the relief of S. T. Marshall;

A bill (H. R. 2972) authorizing the President to appoint and retire Alfred Pleasonton with the rank and grade of major;

A bill (H. R. 5700) to facilitate the transportation of life-saving and light-house supplies at Hog Island, Virginia;

A bill (H. R. 6514) for the allowance of certain claims reported by the accounting officers of the United States Treasury Department;

A bill (H. R. 6619) for the relief of Eliza A. Cutler Jones;

A bill (H. R. 7421) for establishing a light off Pamlico Point, North Carolina;

A bill (H. R. 7547) granting the right of way to the Yankton and Missouri River Railway through the Yankton reservation in Dakota;

A bill (H. R. 7604) for the establishment of a light-house and fog-signal at or near Gull Shoal, Pamlico Sound, North Carolina;

A bill (H. R. 8855) for the establishment of a light-ship with a steam fog-signal at Sandy Hook, New York;

A bill (H. R. 8674) for the relief of Sterling H. Tucker and others;

A bill (H. R. 10183) to establish a light-ship off Great Round Shoal, near Nantucket, Mass.;

A bill (H. R. 11107) to amend an act entitled "An act to authorize the Fort Smith and Choctaw Bridge Company to construct a bridge across the Poteau River, in the Choctaw Nation, in the State of Arkansas;"

A bill (H. R. 11581) making an appropriation for the enforcement of the Chinese exclusion act;

A bill (S. 45) for the relief of Col. James C. Duane;

A bill (S. 307) for the relief of Margaret Kennedy;

A bill (S. 1190) for the relief of the estate of Joseph Fenno, deceased;

A bill (S. 1137) for the relief of Adam L. Epley;

A bill (S. 1494) to secure to the Cherokee freedmen and others their proportion of certain proceeds of lands under the act of March 3, 1883;

A bill (S. 2110) granting the right of way for the construction of a railroad through the Hot Springs reservation, State of Arkansas;

A bill (S. 2663) granting an increase of pension to Mrs. Mary M. Ord;

A bill (S. 2802) to fix the number of unbound and bound Journals of the Senate and House of Representatives, and to provide for their distribution;

A bill (S. 3433) authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to accept the surrender of and cancel land-patents to Indians in certain cases;

A bill (S. 3559) to allow persons who have abandoned or relinquished their homestead entries to make another entry, and for other purposes;

A bill (S. 3597) to provide for the disposal of the Fort Wallace military reservation, in Kansas;

A bill (S. 3620) supplementary to the act approved February 3, 1887, entitled "An act to fix the day for the meeting of the electors of President and Vice-President, and to provide for and regulate the counting of the votes for President and Vice-President, and the decisions of questions arising thereon;"

Joint resolution (S. R. 112) authorizing the Secretary of War to receive for instruction at the Military Academy at West Point Henry Lecomte, of Switzerland; and

Joint resolution (S. R. 59) authorizing Brig. Gen. Absalom Baird, United States Army, to accept from the President of the French Republic a diploma conferring the decoration of commander of the National Order of the Legion of Honor.

LAND OFFICE AT FOLSOM, N. MEX.

Mr. CONGER. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill (S. 2040) to establish a land office at Folsom, in the

Territory of New Mexico. I desire to state it was agreed that the eastern half of New Mexico should be divided into two land districts, and the two bills for the creation of these districts should have passed at the same time. During my absence last week one was passed. This is a Senate bill, and has been unanimously reported by the Committee on Public Lands of this House.

The SPEAKER. The bill will be read, after which there will be opportunity for objection.

The bill was read.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of this bill?

Mr. McMILLIN. I wish to know whether this bill has been recommended by the Department of the Interior?

Mr. CONGER. It has been; and it has also been reported unanimously by the Committee on Public Lands.

Mr. McMILLIN. We have already, if I remember correctly, established one additional land office for that Territory during this session.

Mr. HENDERSON, of Iowa. The gentleman will allow me to state that I have talked on this subject with the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HOLMAN] and also with the delegate from New Mexico [Mr. JOSEPH], and they both favor the passage of the two bills. This bill should have gone through at the same time as the other. Both offices are necessary for the accommodation of that large Territory.

Mr. McMILLIN. It seems to me that this is a rather sudden multiplication of demands on behalf of that Territory.

Mr. HENDERSON, of Iowa. It is a large Territory.

Mr. JACKSON. The gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. McMILLIN] will allow me to say to him that I had charge of making the report in this case at the instance of the Committee on Public Lands; and whilst I might agree with him that this would seem like multiplying offices (to which there may be some objection on the ground that probably it furnishes places for some appointees of the gentleman's own party), at the same time the Department, in the report which I have examined, seems to favor the establishment of this office; at least it was stated in the report that the office is one which would accommodate the people of the Territory. I think the Department would approve of establishing this office.

Mr. McMILLIN. "Would approve?"

Mr. JACKSON. I think I can say the Department does approve, because, although the request for information was not made in connection with this bill, the Department in its answer upon another question stated that there was no objection to the bill.

Mr. McMILLIN. I think the bill itself ought to be referred to the Department before we enter upon an increase of offices. So far as concerns the remarks of my friend from Pennsylvania [Mr. JACKSON], that this will give us some additional offices, I will say that we are not thirsting for any new offices beyond what the public interest demands.

If the gentleman has no objection to letting this bill go over for the present, I will look into the matter between now and to-morrow morning; and if it seems to me correct I shall make no objection to the passage of the bill.

Mr. HENDERSON, of Iowa. I hope the gentleman will not interpose objection this morning. This bill came over here from the Senate before the bill establishing the other land office, and the Delegate from the Territory [Mr. JOSEPH] wanted this bill referred until both could go through together.

Mr. McMILLIN. I suggest to my friend that we are not now crowded with business, and this matter will keep, I suppose, until to-morrow. I think I must object to action on the bill now; but if, on examination, the measure seems to me correct, I shall not object to-morrow.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Tennessee objects for the present. The request will be considered as pending to-morrow morning.

ORDER OF BUSINESS.

The SPEAKER proceeded to call the committees for reports.

Mr. OATES. I move to dispense with the morning hour for the presentation of reports. I do not suppose anybody wants to make any reports.

Mr. PLUMB. Will that interfere with the regular order, which would be, I understand, the call of the Labor Committee?

The SPEAKER. It will not. It is a means for getting at the hour for the consideration of bills reported from committees.

The motion of Mr. OATES to dispense with the morning hour for the presentation of reports was agreed to.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

A message from the Senate, by Mr. PLATT, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had agreed to the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 1432) granting a pension to Sarah C. Taylor.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed joint resolutions of the following titles; in which the concurrence of the House was requested:

Joint resolution (S. R. 115) authorizing the Departments of the Government to use articles in their possession for exhibition at the Paris Exposition of 1889; and

Joint resolution (S. R. 116) authorizing the Secretary of War to protect the Washington Aqueduct tunnel.

ORDER OF BUSINESS.

The SPEAKER. The next business in order is the consideration for one hour of bills reported from committees.

WASHINGTON AQUEDUCT.

Mr. SAYERS. A joint resolution in regard to the Washington Aqueduct has come over from the Senate, and it is proper that the House take some action on it immediately. I ask unanimous consent that it be read and considered at the present time. Its immediate passage may be very necessary in order to preserve the aqueduct.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will cause the joint resolution to be read, after which objection to its consideration will be asked for.

The Clerk read as follows:

Joint resolution (S. R. 116) authorizing the Secretary of War to protect the Washington Aqueduct tunnel.

Resolved, etc., That the Secretary of War be, and is hereby, authorized and directed to use so much of any unexpended balance of appropriations for the work of the Washington Aqueduct tunnel, District of Columbia, as may be necessary, for the purpose of protecting and preserving the work already done upon said tunnel.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the joint resolution?

There was no objection.

Mr. McMILLIN. I have an amendment to offer, which I think is important.

The SPEAKER. The amendment will be read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Add to the resolution:

"That the joint select committee of the Senate and House of Representatives, authorized by concurrent resolution of Congress to make inquiry and report concerning all of the work and contracts therefor, on the Washington Aqueduct tunnel, and other matters in relation thereto, are hereby, in addition to the powers conferred by said concurrent resolution, authorized and directed in their discretion to inquire and report touching all plans and estimates prepared under the auspices of the Government for extending the water supply of Washington City, and, finally, said committee may extend their inquiries as to any and all other matters concerning the extension of said water supply that may aid the Congress in ascertaining and fixing the responsibility for any mismanagement therein or for future construction and management thereof."

The amendment was adopted.

The joint resolution as amended was ordered to be read a third time; and it was accordingly read the third time, and passed.

Mr. SAYERS moved to reconsider the vote by which the joint resolution was passed; and also moved that the motion to reconsider be laid on the table.

The latter motion was agreed to.

ORDER OF BUSINESS.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Alabama was recognized.

Mr. OATES. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi for a moment.

Mr. HOOKER. I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the Senate joint resolution, just reported from that body, authorizing the various departments of the Government named therein to send their exhibits to the Paris exhibition. It appropriates no money at all, I will remark, but simply authorizes the unexpended balance remaining over from the Cincinnati exhibition, if any, to be used for this purpose. It is important that it shall be passed now, if at all.

The SPEAKER. But the gentleman from Illinois has demanded the regular order.

Mr. PLUMB. I will withdraw the demand temporarily to hear what this is.

The SPEAKER. The joint resolution called up by the gentleman from Mississippi will be read subject to objection.

The joint resolution (S. 115) was read at length.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of this resolution?

Mr. KILGORE. I must object.

Mr. HOOKER. I hope the gentleman will permit me to make a brief statement.

Mr. KILGORE. Oh, well, I think we had better proceed with other matters.

Mr. HOOKER. This involves no appropriation, let me state.

Mr. KILGORE. I want to inquire then how this affair can be carried on without the expenditure of money?

Mr. HOOKER. It only authorizes the appropriation of the unexpended balance remaining over from the Cincinnati Exposition.

Mr. KILGORE. Then I object. There ought not to be a cent expended for any such purposes.

FINAL ADJOURNMENT.

Mr. OATES. Mr. Speaker, I now call up the resolution I offered on yesterday.

The SPEAKER. That is a privileged matter.

Mr. OATES. I ask that the resolution be read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives, That the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives be authorized

to close the present session by adjourning their respective Houses on Wednesday, the 17th day of October, at 12 o'clock m.

Mr. OATES. I ask to amend the resolution by striking out "Wednesday, the 17th" and inserting "Thursday, the 18th."

Mr. SOWDEN. I move a further amendment to the amendment, to strike out "Thursday, the 18th" and insert "Wednesday, the 24th day of October."

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment to the amendment.

Mr. RICHARDSON. Mr. Speaker, from time immemorial, I think, resolutions fixing the date for the final adjournment of Congress have invariably come into the House, during the control of both parties, from the Committee on Ways and Means. Inasmuch, therefore, as that has been the custom, and there is such a widespread difference of opinion, at least among members on this side of the House, as to the time to be fixed for final adjournment, it seems to me we ought not to depart from that old custom, and therefore I move the reference of the resolution to the Committee on Ways and Means.

The SPEAKER. That motion is in order.

Mr. OATES. I would ask the gentleman to show me and to show the House the Committee on Ways and Means. [Laughter.] It has disappeared. Some of the members are here, very respectable and intelligent gentlemen; but the committee as a committee does not appear.

Mr. RICHARDSON. I desire to say that I see four or five members of that committee here now.

Mr. OATES. That is not the committee.

Mr. RICHARDSON. I am quite sure a quorum of that committee could be obtained. The chairman was here yesterday. I see the gentleman who is second on the committee present; and the chairman is here to-day, I am told. I see about five members of the committee, and it only takes seven or eight to make a quorum; so that there could be no difficulty in getting a quorum now, as I am informed by members of the committee. I do not see a quorum of the committee present, but I take it for granted that if a resolution of this character be referred to that committee, it being the leading committee of the House, its members would feel that it was their duty to have a quorum to consider that resolution. I have no doubt a quorum could be had in twenty-four hours.

Mr. OATES. Mr. Speaker, a resolution for adjournment was introduced and referred to that committee——

Mr. FARQUHAR. And kept there.

Mr. OATES. And that committee never reported it. It is well known that a caucus of the majority side of the House considered it, and that action was satisfactory to me; but it did not change my opinion respecting the purpose of the resolution; and yet I acquiesced as cheerfully as any man could. And, sir, in answer to the point made by the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. RICHARDSON] as to the custom of referring such resolutions to the Committee on Ways and Means, I may say that there is nothing in the rules of the House which requires a resolution of that character to go to that committee. There is nothing in the definition of the jurisdiction of that or any other committee of this House which would render it necessary for that resolution to go there. But, sir, I am not disposed to depart from the custom if that committee were here. It is known to all that there is not a quorum of that committee here. There is not a quorum of any committee of this House present.

Mr. RICHARDSON. I beg the pardon of the gentleman from Alabama. I have the honor to be a member on a committee, and I know it has a quorum present.

Mr. WHEELER. I have a committee, and there is a quorum of that committee present.

Mr. OATES. Oh, yes; of little committees of five or seven members there may be a quorum present.

Mr. RICHARDSON. I could not permit the statement of the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. OATES], that there was not a quorum of any committee present, to go unchallenged.

Mr. OATES. Oh, well——

The SPEAKER. A motion to refer is not debatable, except by vote of the House.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE, of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. OATES] will permit me, I will ask if it is in order to postpone the motion to refer until to-morrow?

The SPEAKER. The Chair knows of no instance where a motion to recommit has been postponed.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE, of Kentucky. I do not make the motion to postpone the reference. I rise to make a parliamentary inquiry as to whether a motion to postpone the consideration of that resolution and the motion for a reference would be in order?

The SPEAKER. A postponement of the motion to refer would leave the resolution still pending for consideration in the House.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE, of Kentucky. I move to postpone the consideration of the resolution and the motion made by the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. RICHARDSON] to refer it to the Committee on Ways and Means.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will examine the rules in reference to the motion.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE, of Kentucky. I will now yield the floor back to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. OATES].

Mr. OATES. Mr. Speaker, I desire to complete the statement I had risen to make. In reply to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. RICHARDSON] I would state that no one has a greater respect for the Committee on Ways and Means or several of its members than myself. They have done very able and efficient service all through this session; but, sir, a member on this floor, because he is a member of that committee, has no more right or higher right on this floor than I have or any one else. But when that committee was supposed to have a quorum, or a quorum of its members were supposed to be present, that resolution to adjourn was referred with my approbation to that committee. Now doubtless it is well known that there is not a quorum of that committee present, and they could only act and advise as individual members of this House. We all know the rule requires a majority of a committee to make a legal report on anything, and the fact that I offer this resolution and ask for action does not deter them from giving their valuable opinions to this House. I therefore insist that it is not a departure from any established custom nor a reflection upon any of those gentlemen in the least. It is a matter upon which every member here has a right to call for action, and every member is responsible to his constituency for his action and to no one else. Now, sir, I know there is not perfect harmony of opinion upon this subject.

Mr. TURNER, of Georgia. Will the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. OATES] tell me if it is more necessary to have a quorum of the Committee on Ways and Means than it is to have a quorum of this House to act on this resolution? I believe the preamble of the gentleman's resolution states that there is not a quorum here.

Mr. OATES. That was a part of my speech, which has been withdrawn. [Laughter.] It presented the anomaly of reciting a truth which in that form defeated action. We have got to resort to falsehood, or at least to suppress the truth, in order to act in this matter. [Laughter.] To such a farce have we come in attempting legi-lation at this late day. Of course my friend from Georgia [Mr. TURNER] and every member here knows that it requires a quorum to fix a day to adjourn, if any member chooses to make that point.

I am perfectly aware of that, but I trust that no member will make the point. Mr. Speaker, I want to see this resolution adopted and sent to the Senate. If they are not ready to adjourn, there is no coercion of them in this resolution. They have the same power over the question that the House has, and if they want more time they will take it and we can acquiesce and go along. It is a custom which has prevailed for fifty years, perhaps throughout the entire history of our legislation, that these adjournment resolutions always originate in the House of Representatives, just as bills to raise revenue always originate here, and I suppose it was that fact which gave rise to the custom of referring the adjournment resolution to the Committee on Ways and Means. Now, sir, we are remaining here from day to day in the face of the fact that a member on the other side of this Chamber has given notice that no measure shall pass except, I believe, such as relate to pensions and labor bills; and if a point like that were made in the Senate, or anything that required a yea-and-nay vote, they could not move a peg, they could not adopt a single amendment to the important bill which they now have before them for consideration. Can it be hoped, then, that they are going to take any action in the way of passing a bill of such importance? It is to be presumed that a quorum would be required to be present before they could make any progress whatever in that direction, and now, with only two or three weeks remaining before the Presidential election, I do not believe that any good can be accomplished by continuing this session of Congress. Every movement now toward legislation of any character is certain to be political; but it is to be hoped, and I believe, that after the Presidential election legislation can be enacted which will be of more substantial benefit to the country than it would be possible to have now, even if we had a quorum present. Every consideration, to my mind, is in favor of an early and almost immediate adjournment of Congress.

I have expressed these views, with the indulgence of the House, merely to explain the reasons which have prompted me in the discharge of what I believed to be a duty, as no other member had moved in the matter, and, having discharged that duty, I desire now to have a vote upon the resolution. If a vote is had upon referring it to the Committee on Ways and Means with no quorum of that committee present in the city, in my judgment it will be equivalent to a defeat of the resolution, because even if the members of that committee who are present should to-morrow report back a resolution in favor of an adjournment, any member on this floor could make the point that it was not a legal report because there was not a quorum of the committee present, and we would have the resolution before us in substantially the same shape as now.

Therefore nothing could be accomplished in that way, and if any gentleman here is hostile to the resolution all he has to do, upon the vote being announced, is to demand a quorum, and that is the end of it.

Mr. KILGORE. Regular order.

Mr. RICHARDSON and Mr. MCMILLIN addressed the Chair.

Mr. WHEELER. I desire to offer a substitute.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. KILGORE] de-

mands the regular order. The resolution is not debatable, and no substitute can be offered at this time, because there are two motions pending, both of which have priority over amendments. One is the motion to refer the resolution to the Committee on Ways and Means, and the other is the motion to postpone its consideration until to-morrow. The question is first on the motion to postpone.

Mr. MCMILLIN. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. KILGORE], at my request, withdraws the demand for the regular order for a moment, and in that moment I desire simply to say a word, in order that there may be no misunderstanding of the motives of the Ways and Means Committee in declining to report back the adjournment resolution which was introduced by the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. OATES]. I should not comment upon that now but for the fact that the gentleman has spoken of that resolution and of the action of the party in reference to it.

Mr. OATES. Which I said disposed of it in a manner satisfactory to me.

Mr. MCMILLIN. Yes. It is, however, proper for me to state that it was the concurrent judgment of this side of the House, after that resolution was introduced and after mature deliberation, that the resolution should not be reported favorably, and I undertake to say that there is not a member on this side of the House, I undertake to say that there is not a gentleman in the United States agreeing with us in political views, who will not say to-day that the action of the Ways and Means Committee in refusing to report that resolution, and the action of the party in declining to adjourn, was as wise as it could have been. We would have adjourned, leaving the Senate without having reported any tariff bill whatever, and with the bill which the House presented to fire at during the balance of the campaign; whereas we now have their admission that there ought to be a reduction of the revenue to the amount of at least $70,000,000.

Mr. OATES. I want to interrupt the gentleman to ask him to make a little exception to his broad statement. There are gentlemen who think it would have been wise to have adopted the resolution at that time.

Mr. MCMILLIN. I did not know that. I thought the gentleman from Alabama himself said he thought the action then taken was proper.

Mr. OATES. I said that I did not blame the Ways and Means Committee, because the matter was considered in caucus, and I acquiesce cheerfully in the action of the caucus, but it did not change my opinion at all.

Mr. SOWDEN. Mr. Speaker, I demand the regular order. There is no use in disclosing the secrets of our organization here. [Laughter.]

The SPEAKER. The regular order is demanded. The question is on the motion to postpone the consideration of this resolution until to-morrow.

The question was taken; and there were—ayes 23, noes 21.

So the motion to postpone was agreed to.

WITHDRAWAL OF PAPERS.

Mr. RYAN, by unanimous consent, obtained leave to withdraw from the files of the House papers relating to the bill (H. R. 777) to compensate Mrs. Sarah L. Larimer for important services rendered the military authorities in 1864 at Deer Creek Station, Wyoming, and for loss of property taken by Sioux Indians.

ORDER OF BUSINESS.

The SPEAKER. The hour for the consideration of bills reported from committees begins at fifteen minutes before 1 o'clock. The call rests with the Committee on Labor.

Mr. LANHAM. I move that the House adjourn.

The SPEAKER. The pending question, if the House should not adjourn, is upon the motion made by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PLUMB] that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole on the state of the Union.

The question being taken on the motion to adjourn, there were—ayes 29, noes 21.

Mr. DINGLEY. I call for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, 16 (more than one-fifth of the last vote) voting in favor thereof.

The question was taken; and it was decided in the negative—yeas 27, nays 31, not voting 266; as follows:

YEAS—27.

Breckinridge, Ky.	Howard,	Montgomery,	Sowden,
Campbell, Ohio	Hutton,	Oates,	Stone, Ky.
Clements,	Kilgore,	Penington,	Tillman,
Forney,	Lanham,	Richardson,	Turner, Ga.
Grimes,	Latham,	Rogers,	Walker,
Hall,	Mansur,	Rusk,	Wheeler.
Hooker,	McMillin,	Sayers,	

NAYS—31.

Abbott,	Farquhar,	Hopkins, N. Y.	Rockwell,
Bayne,	Fuller,	Jackson,	Ryan,
Bound,	Gest,	McRae,	Scull,
Bunnell,	Harmer,	Milliken,	Taylor, E. B., Ohio
Campbell, F., N. Y.	Haugen,	Morrill,	Vandever,
Conger,	Henderson, Iowa	Nelson,	Warner,
Dingley,	Hermann,	Nutting,	White, N. Y.
Dougherty,	Hiestand,	Plumb,	

NOT VOTING—266.

Adams,	Crouse,	Kennedy,	Rayner,
Allen, Mass.	Culberson,	Kerr,	Reed,
Allen, Mich.	Cummings,	Ketcham,	Rice,
Allen, Miss.	Cutcheon,	Laffoon,	Robertson,
Anderson, Iowa	Dalzell,	La Follette,	Romeis,
Anderson, Miss.	Dargan,	Lagan,	Rowell,
Anderson, Ill.	Darlington,	Laidlaw,	Rowland,
Anderson, Kans.	Davenport,	Laird,	Russell, Conn.
Arnold,	Davidson, Ala.	Landes,	Russell, Mass.
Atkinson,	Davidson, Fla.	Lane,	Sawyer,
Bacon,	Davis,	Lawler,	Scott,
Baker, N. Y.	De Lano,	Lee,	Seney,
Baker, Ill.	Dibble,	Lehlbach,	Seymour,
Bankhead,	Dockery,	Lind,	Shaw,
Barnes,	Dorsey,	Lodge	Sherman,
Barry,	Dunham,	Long,	Shively,
Belden,	Dunn,	Lyman,	Simmons,
Belmont,	Elliott,	Lynch,	Smith,
Biggs,	Enloe,	Macdonald,	Snyder,
Bingham,	Ermentrout,	Maffett,	Spinola,
Blanchard,	Felton,	Mahoney,	Spooner,
Bland,	Finley,	Maish,	Springer,
Bliss,	Fisher,	Martin,	Stahlnecker,
Blount,	Fitch,	Mason,	Steele,
Boothman,	Flood,	Matson,	Stephenson,
Boutelle,	Foran,	McAdoo,	Stewart, Tex.
Bowden,	Ford,	McClammy,	Stewart, Ga.
Bowen,	French,	McComas,	Stewart, Vt.
Breckinridge, Ark.	Funston,	McCormick,	Stockdale,
Brewer,	Gaines,	McCreary,	Stone, Mo.
Brower,	Gallinger,	McCullogh,	Struble,
Browne, T. H. B., Va.	Gay,	McKenna,	Symes,
Browne, Ind.	Gear,	McKinley,	Tarsney,
Brown, Ohio	Gibson,	McKinney,	Taulbee,
Brown, J. R., Va.	Glass,	McShane,	Taylor, J. D., Ohio
Brumm,	Glover,	Merriman,	Thomas, Ky.
Bryce,	Goff,	Mills,	Thomas, Ill.
Buchanan,	Granger,	Moffitt,	Thomas, Wis.
Buckalew,	Greenman,	Moore,	Thompson, Ohio
Burnes,	Grosvenor,	Morgan,	Thompson, Cal.
Burnett,	Grout,	Morrow,	Tracey,
Burrows,	Guenther,	Morse,	Townshend,
Butler,	Hare,	Neal,	Turner, Kans.
Butterworth,	Hatch,	Newton,	Vance,
Bynum,	Hayden,	Nichols,	Wade,
Campbell, T. J., N. Y.	Hayes,	Norwood,	Washington,
Candler,	Heard,	O'Donnell,	Weaver,
Cannon,	Hemphill,	O'Ferrall,	Weber,
Carlton,	Henderson, N. C.	O'Neall, Ind.	West,
Caruth,	Henderson, Ill.	O'Neill, Pa.	White, Ind.
Caswell,	Herbert,	O'Neill, Mo.	Whiting, Mich.
Catchings,	Hires,	Osborne,	Whiting, Mass.
Cheadle,	Hitt,	Outhwaite,	Whitthorne,
Chipman,	Hogg,	Owen,	Wickham,
Clardy,	Holman,	Parker,	Wilber,
Clark,	Holmes,	Patton,	Wilkins,
Cobb,	Hopkins, Ill.	Payson,	Wilkinson,
Cockran,	Hopkins, Va.	Peel,	Williams,
Cogswell,	Houk,	Perkins,	Wilson, Minn.
Collins,	Hovey,	Perry,	Wilson, W. Va.
Compton,	Hudd,	Peters,	Wise,
Cooper,	Hunter,	Phelan,	Woodburn,
Cothran,	Johnston, Ind.	Phelps,	Yardley,
Cowles,	Johnston, N. C.	Pidcock,	Yoder,
Cox,	Jones,	Post,	Yost.
Crain,	Kean,	Pugsley,	
Crisp,	Kelley,	Randall,	

So the House refused to adjourn.

Mr. LANHAM. I ask unanimous consent to dispense with the reading of the names.

There being no objection, it was ordered accordingly.

Mr. LANHAM. I ask unanimous consent that the pairs be inserted in the RECORD without being read by the Clerk.

There being no objection, it was ordered accordingly.

The following-named members were paired on all political questions until further notice:

Mr. DARGAN with Mr. GROUT.
Mr. TOWNSHEND with Mr. SPOONER.
Mr. HOLMAN with Mr. JOHNSTON, of Indiana.
Mr. COBB with Mr. ANDERSON, of Kansas.
Mr. CARLTON with Mr. FUNSTON.
Mr. MCCREARY with Mr. CROUSE.
Mr. CARUTH with Mr. HUNTER.
Mr. HAYES with Mr. KERR.
Mr. BLOUNT with Mr. RUSSELL, of Connecticut.
Mr. FORAN with Mr. HIESTAND.
Mr. MAISH with Mr. LEHLBACH.
Mr. NEAL with Mr. HAYDEN.
Mr. BRYCE with Mr. GAINES.
Mr. JONES with Mr. BOWDEN.
Mr. ELLIOTT with Mr. BINGHAM.
Mr. COLLINS with Mr. ALLEN, of Massachusetts.
Mr. BRECKINRIDGE, of Arkansas, with Mr. BROWNE, of Indiana.
Mr. SPRINGER with Mr. HENDERSON, of Illinois.
Mr. CAMPBELL, of Ohio, with Mr. KENNEDY.
Mr. COMPTON with Mr. GOFF.
Mr. OUTHWAITE with Mr. MCKINLEY.
Mr. HATCH with Mr. STEWART, of Vermont.
Mr. WILSON, of West Virginia, with Mr. MCCOMAS.
Mr. RANDALL with Mr. LODGE.
Mr. BLAND with Mr. BUTTERWORTH.
Mr. SCOTT with Mr. GROSVENOR.

Mr. McMILLIN with Mr. BURROWS.
Mr. CRISP with Mr. REED.
Mr. COX with Mr. CANNON.
Mr. MATSON with Mr. HOVEY.
Mr. WILKINS with Mr. LONG.
Mr. MILLS with Mr. KELLEY.
Mr. FRENCH with Mr. STEPHENSON.
Mr. O'NEALL, of Indiana, with Mr. FINLEY.
Mr. McCLAMMY with Mr. OSBORNE.
Mr. DAVIDSON, of Florida, with Mr. WEBER.
Mr. HENDERSON, of North Carolina, with Mr. FLOOD.
Mr. ENLOE with Mr. PUGSLEY.
Mr. STEWART, of Georgia, with Mr. HARMER.
Mr. WILSON, of Minnesota, with Mr. ATKINSON.
Mr. BOOTHMAN with Mr. McKINNEY.
Mr. CULBERSON with Mr. BAKER, of Illinois.
Mr. STONE, of Missouri, with Mr. WILLIAMS.
Mr. TAULBEE with Mr. FARQUHAR.
Mr. LAWLER with Mr. SEYMOUR.
Mr. DUNN with Mr. ROWELL.
Mr. ANDERSON, of Illinois, with Mr. DALZELL.
Mr. MACDONALD with Mr. JOHN R. BROWN.
Mr. O'NEILL, of Missouri, with Mr. CONGER.
Mr. CHIPMAN with Mr. ARNOLD.
Mr. LANDES with Mr. McCORMICK.
Mr. VANCE with Mr. MOFFITT.
Mr. MANSUR with Mr. SAWYER.
Mr. WILKINSON with Mr. NICHOLS.
Mr. FISHER with Mr. BROWER.
Mr. ERMENTROUT with Mr. GALLINGER.
Mr. RAYNER with Mr. DE LANO.
Mr. NORWOOD with Mr. PARKER.
Mr. GLOVER with Mr. COOPER.
Mr. DIBBLE with Mr. BELDEN
Mr. DOCKERY with Mr. WARNER.
Mr. COWLES with Mr. THOMPSON, of Ohio.
Mr. NEWTON with Mr. FELTON.
Mr. GLASS with Mr. KETCHAM.
Mr. LATHAM with Mr. GEST.
Mr. SHIVELY with Mr. OWEN.
Mr. McSHANE with Mr. LAIRD.
Mr. MAHONEY with Mr. BROWN, of Ohio.
Mr. McADOO with Mr. BRUMM.
Mr. LYNCH with Mr. YARDLEY.
Mr. WHITING, of Michigan, with Mr. HOUK.
Mr. RUSSELL, of Massachusetts, with Mr. COGSWELL.
Mr. PIDCOCK with Mr. PHELPS.
Mr. DARLINGTON with Mr. MOORE.
Mr. CUTCHEON with Mr. TARSNEY.
Mr. HOWARD with Mr. HOPKINS, of Illinois.
Mr. MORSE with Mr. WHITING, of Massachusetts.
Mr. BLANCHARD with Mr. THOMAS, of Illinois.
Mr. GRANGER with Mr. ROCKWELL.
Mr. BELMONT with Mr. DAVENPORT.
Mr. O'FERRALL with Mr. MASON.
Mr. BIGGS with Mr. MORROW.
Mr. CLARDY with Mr. WADE.
Mr. STEWART, of Texas, with Mr. DUNHAM.
Mr. FORD with Mr. GUENTHER.
Mr. SNYDER with Mr. YOST.
Mr. DAVIDSON, of Alabama, with Mr. PATTON.
Mr. RUSK with Mr. O'DONNELL.
Mr. GREENMAN with Mr. SHERMAN
Mr. BYNUM with Mr. STEELE.
Mr. CANDLER with Mr. BREWER.
Mr. BOUTELLE with Mr. WISE.
Mr. SPINOLA with Mr. THOMAS, of Wisconsin.
Mr. TIMOTHY J. CAMPBELL with Mr. WEST.
Mr. BACON with Mr. BAKER, of New York.
Mr. HOGG with Mr. POST.
Mr. SIMMONS with Mr. JOSEPH D. TAYLOR.

The SPEAKER. The House refuses to adjourn, there being—ayes 27, noes 31. No quorum has voted.

Mr. OATES. Having endeavored to induce the House to adjourn and having failed in that I now ask leave to adjourn myself; in other words, I ask leave of absence for the remainder of the session.

The SPEAKER. The Chair hears no objection, and it is so ordered.

Mr. LANHAM. I make a similar request for indefinite leave of absence after to-morrow.

Mr. WHEELER. I think all these gentlemen should make a speech on the Senate tariff bill before they go away.

Mr. DINGLEY. Gentlemen will not let us adjourn and yet they go away themselves.

Mr. OATES. I am in favor of adjournment myself.

The SPEAKER. The Chair hears no objection, and it is so ordered.

Mr. HOOKER. I ask, by unanimous consent, to substitute a joint resolution——

The SPEAKER. The record has just disclosed the fact that there is no quorum in the House, and no business can be transacted except to order a call of the House or to adjourn, and a motion to adjourn has just been voted down.

Mr. LANHAM. I move there be a call of the House.

The House divided; and there were—ayes 23, noes 17.

So the motion was agreed to.

Mr. McMILLIN. I move the House do now adjourn.

The House divided; and there were—ayes 30, noes 20.

Mr. JACKSON demanded the yeas and nays, and subsequently withdrew the demand.

So the motion was agreed to; and accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 11 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned.

PETITIONS, ETC.

The following petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk, under the rule, and referred as follows:

By Mr. BOWDEN: Petition of citizens of Clarke, Frederick, Warwick, and Dinwiddie Counties, Virginia, in favor of pure food, drugs, and lard—to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. FARQUHAR: Petition of citizens of North Barton and of Natural Bridge, N. Y., in favor of pure food and drugs—to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. LATHAM: Petition of citizens of Beaufort, Carteret, Bertie, and Craven Counties, North Carolina, in favor of pure food, drugs, and lard—to the Committee on Agriculture.

SENATE.

WEDNESDAY, *October* 17, 1888.

Prayer by Rev. HERMAN S. COOK, of Waynesborough, Pa.

The Journal of yesterday's proceedings was read and approved.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore* presented a petition of the Workingmen's League of America, urging consideration of the construction given by the Secretary of the Treasury to the act of March 3, 1881, relating to the surplus; which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented a petition of the Nineteenth Illinois Veteran Club, of Chicago, Ill., praying for the passage of the bill to retire General W. S. Rosecrans with his late rank of major-general in the Army; which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. ALLISON. I present the memorial of John Cowdon, of New Orleans, La., relating to the bridging of the Mississippi River.

I move that the memorial be referred to the Committee on the Improvement of the Mississippi River, and as it is brief, I ask unanimous consent that it may be inserted in the RECORD.

The memorial was referred to the Committee on the Improvement of the Mississippi River, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

To the honorable Senate and House of Representatives:

The present plans of bridges are too expensive. They retard the free outflow of water, causing greater overflows, and are great obstructions to the free navigation of all our rivers, greatly increasing the cost of transportation.

In the plans herewith presented will be found a remedy for all the above-named evils so detrimental to the people of the United States of America.

The material proposed to be used for the arches will give more than ten times the strength ever required.

The abutments will be as solid as rock, and will resist all the pressure that solid rock can resist.

The other and only remaining difficulty has been in raising the arches; but by the plans I shall adopt there will be no more difficulty on that point than have engineers had in raising spans 200 feet long and 50 feet high.

If desired, the arches for the 3,000 and 2,500 foot spans could be lowered 50 and 30 feet, respectively, as seen by lines A and B from the elevation as shown; but it would cost from $75,000 to $100,000 more, and the bridges would not be any stronger, when the cost of putting up the arches as proposed would not be $5,000 more than the spans 50 and 30 feet lower.

The estimates for the abutments and arches are ample, and will cover all that part of the expense, and will be fully two-thirds the entire cost. But should I be mistaken on the other part of the work (for I have no data on which to base an accurate estimate), and it should cost as much as the abutments and arches, then such bridges would not cost one-fifth as much as bridges of the same length of span now cost on any and every other plan now in use. The bridges are designed to have double railroad tracks with 30 feet space between for wagon-road and two footways.

In order to test this plan I intend to build a 3,000-foot span bridge, the railroad track to be 100 feet above high-water mark, across the Mississippi River, at Natchez, and at the second session of the Fiftieth Congress will ask for the authority to do so.

Respectfully submitted.

JOHN COWDON.

THEODORE LEWIS.

Mr. PUGH. I am instructed by the Committee on the Judiciary to report favorably, without amendment, the bill (H. R. 10735) for the removal of the political disabilities of Theodore Lewis, of Louisiana. I ask for the present consideration of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed—two-thirds of the Senators present voting in the affirmative.

BILL INTRODUCED.

Mr. WILSON, of Maryland (by request), introduced a bill (S. 3640) to amend sections 851, 856, 857, 858, 861, and 862 of the Revised Statutes of the United States relating to the District of Columbia; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

LEGAL REPRESENTATIVES OF ELIZA M. FERRIS.

Mr. SAWYER. I wish to withdraw a motion I entered yesterday to reconsider the bill (H. R. 1152) for the relief of the legal representatives of Eliza M. Ferris.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The Chair hears no objection, and the motion entered by the Senator from Wisconsin to reconsider the bill named by him will be withdrawn.

AWARDS UNDER MEXICAN TREATY.

Mr. MORGAN. I ask for the present consideration of the following resolution:

Resolved, That the Committee on Foreign Relations, or any subcommittee thereof charged with the investigation of the claim of La Abra Silver Mining Company against Mexico, have leave to sit in the recess of the Senate and conduct such investigation in Washington City or in the city of New York, and the powers given to said committee under existing resolutions of the Senate may be exercised in the recess of the Senate.

The Senate, by unanimous consent, proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. BROWN. I am a member of that subcommittee. I have no objection to the passage of the resolution, but I desire to give notice now that I can not attend its sittings during the recess.

Mr. MORGAN. Only formal sittings will be necessary.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

THE REVENUE LAWS.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. If there is no further morning business, that order is closed.

Mr. ALLISON. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House bill 9051.

Mr. DOLPH. I ask the Senator from Iowa to yield to me to call up a bill to grant the right of way over an Indian reservation, a House bill reported unanimously from the Committee on Indian Affairs by the senior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. SABIN], who left it with his colleague [Mr. DAVIS]. The junior Senator from Minnesota was watching for an opportunity all day yesterday to call up the bill, but had to leave, and he asked me to call it up for him. It will not take long.

Mr. ALLISON. Let the revenue bill be taken up first.

Mr. DOLPH. Very well.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The Senator from Iowa moves that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the unfinished business, being the bill (H. R. 9051) to reduce taxation and simplify the laws in relation to the collection of the revenue.

The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The Senator from Colorado [Mr. TELLER] is entitled to the floor on the unfinished business.

Mr. TELLER. I have no objection to yielding to the request of the Senator from Oregon, unless debate shall follow on the bill he wishes to call up.

Mr. DOLPH. If it does I shall not insist upon its consideration.

RIGHT OF WAY THROUGH SIOUX RESERVATION.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The title of the bill the consideration of which is requested by the Senator from Oregon [Mr. DOLPH] will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (H. R. 7964) granting to the Aberdeen, Bismarck and Northwestern Railway right of way across a portion of the Sioux reservation, in Dakota Territory.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The Senator from Oregon asks unanimous consent that the pending order, being the unfinished business, may be informally laid aside to enable him to ask for the consideration of the bill the title of which has been read. If there be no objection, the bill will be read at length for information, subject to objection.

The Chief Clerk read the bill.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

By unanimous consent, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED.

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. CLARK, its Clerk, announced that the Speaker of the House had signed the following enrolled bills and joint resolution; and they were thereupon signed by the President *pro tempore:*

A bill (S. 1482) granting a pension to Sarah C. Taylor;

A bill (S. 11139) to authorize the building of a bridge or bridges across the Mississippi River at La Crosse, Wis.;

A bill (H. R. 11262) to authorize the construction of bridges across the Kentucky River and its tributaries by the Richmond, Irvine and Beattyville Railroad Company; and

Joint resolution (S. R. 116) authorizing the Secretary of War to protect the Washington Aqueduct tunnel.

SELECT COMMITTEE ON BUSINESS OF EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENTS.

Mr. COCKRELL. I would thank the Senator from Colorado [Mr. TELLER] to yield until I can secure an order. The select committee appointed during the last Congress to examine the methods of conducting business in the Executive Departments may desire to obtain some reports from the Departments in regard to the methods of business and any changes or improvements made in them.

I therefore ask that the committee may be continued, with leave to sit, if necessary, in vacation, and to report at any time during the next session. There will be no expense of any kind connected with it. It is simply a leave to sit.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. It will be so ordered, if there be no objection.

STEAM-PRESSES IN BUREAU OF ENGRAVING AND PRINTING.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, with the leave of the Senator from Colorado, I desire to state that on Friday last I gave notice that on Monday morning I should move to take up the bill (H. R. 9623) to provide for printing Government securities in the highest style of art. I have been unable to obtain the floor on the two legislative days which have intervened since that notice. This morning I had a conference with the legislative committee of the Knights of Labor, who are pressing this bill. Owing to the thinness of the Senate, the fact that they have been informed that the opponents of the bill desire to take some further testimony, and their wish to have the bill fully and fairly considered upon its merits in a full Senate and after full investigation, as the result of the conference between myself and the legislative committee to which I have referred, and at their request, I now notify the Senate that I shall not make the motion which I gave notice that I would make.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

Mr. TELLER. Mr. President——

Mr. GEORGE. If the Senator will indulge me another moment, I should like to ask from the Senate from to-morrow leave of absence during the remainder of the session.

Mr. COCKRELL and others. No objection.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The Senator from Mississippi asks leave to absent himself from the service of the Senate after to-morrow. The Chair hears no objection. Leave is granted.

THE REVENUE LAWS.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the considerainon of the bill (H. R. 9051) to reduce taxation and simplify the laws ti relation to the collection of the revenue.

Mr. TELLER. Mr. President, at this hour of the session it may seem somewhat presumptuous to discuss what may be considered political questions in the Senate. I do not know that I should have felt constrained to detain the Senate with any remarks of mine but for the fact that the Secretary of the Treasury has seen fit in a recent public speech to make some statements that I think need contradiction—statements that Ithink are not supported by the record. He has made some explanations of the policy of the Administration that, I think, come from afterthought and after-consideration, and were not the moving cause at the time of the commission of the acts of which there has been considerable criticism.

The Secretary of the Treasury has fallen into a very general mistake, which has been made by others, when he addresses the brokers and bankers of Wall street, in supposing that what is their interest is the interest of the whole country, and that if the acts of the Administration are in accordance with their ideas and are commended by them they must necessarily be in the interest of the whole people. I noticed the other day that in speaking from the steps of the subtreasury building in New York the Secretary of the Treasury said "to the business men of New York:"

When I have the honor of thus addressing you I feel that I am speaking to the whole country, for you represent and are in touch with the business and business men of every part of the Union.

Later on he said:

I know that we are often told that your welfare is not the welfare of some parts of the country, but I have never been able to find reason to support this statement. Where is the dividing line? Where does your interest cease, and that other alleged interest begin? Good, economical government, prosperous business, safe currency, and low taxation are well for the whole country, are well for each and every part of the country. One part of it can not suffer in any of these respects without instant communication to every part.

Mr. President, I find no fault with the latter part of this statement, but I do find fault when the Secretary of the Treasury in addressing the bankers and brokers of New York, the non-producing element of that great city, asserts that he speaks to all the people of the United States and all of its varied interests by speaking to them. I deny his conclusion that their interests are the interests of the whole people of this country. On the contrary, I assert that their interests are not the interests of the whole country.

What I complain of now, and what I have complained of heretofore, is that this Administration has been conducted in its financial policy upon a Wall street basis, governed, controlled by Wall street influences and Wall street interests to the utter disregard of the great interests of the people.

Four years nearly of this Democratic Administration have passed, and I propose even at the risk of being somewhat tedious to the Senate to review its financial policy and its financial management, and to compare it with the management of the Republican party, so bitterly and severely criticised by the Democratic party at all times, not even excepting this present time. Even the Secretary of the Treasury finds time to cast some reflections upon the past management of public affairs under Republican administrations.

When the Administration came into power the first movement with regard to the management of the finances was to put a bank president at the head of the Treasury Department. I do not contend that he was incompetent because he was a bank president. I do not contend that because a man has spent his time in casting up accounts and poring over the ledgers of a national bank he is unfit and unsuitable to occupy the position of Secretary of the Treasury, but I do say that bank presidents as a general thing know very much more of the rates of interest and discount of bankable and non-bankable paper than they know of the great questions of finance which must be met and settled in a public office like that of the Secretary of the Treasury of the United States.

Not only was a bank officer put at the head of the financial department of the Government, but the Treasurer of the United States, second in importance in that great Department, was also selected from a bank in New York, and these two officers came here thoroughly imbued with the ideas of Wall street. Neither of them ever had an idea in common with the masses of the people, with the business interests of the West or the South or the North or the East, save and except those who have large fixed incomes and who deal in securities. They had no interest in the great masses, and I can say here that they do not represent the sentiments of the Democratic party in this body. Not 5 per cent. of the Democrats of this body were in accord with them; and yet to-day upon every occasion can be found men who were in utter antagonism with them when they came into power, ready on this floor to defend every act of omission or of commission, and to resent any criticism that may be made as to the administration of the finances of the nation.

With a Democratic majority in the other House committed to diverse views from those of the Secretary of the Treasury and the Chief Executive of the nation, why is it that they have stifled all these complaints? Why is it that nobody on the other side of this Chamber has been found to find fault with that which they complained of under other administrations when performed in a lesser degree? Is it because of the desire to sustain a partisan administration? Is it because the interest of the country is less than the interest of the party? Whatever may be the reason, there is one thing certain, that it would have been condemned if it had occurred under Republican administration, in the severest terms, by every member on the other side of the Chamber, and yet, with two or three exceptions, it is to-day accepted as a proper administration of public affairs. In supporting this Administration for re-election, they, as do their associates everywhere, know that it means another four years of Wall-street domination in the financial affairs of this Government.

When the present President was about to assume the duties of the Chief Executive of the nation, in an unusual manner he addressed members of the other House with a request for legislation. I need not now, and will not now, criticise the impropriety, to say the least of it, of an incoming President, with millions of money in the way of patronage at his command, addressing an outgoing House of Congress in accord with him and suggesting legislation of a financial character. His letter to members of the House of Representatives has been read again and again, in which he urged the suspension of the coinage of silver dollars upon the theory that if their coinage was not suspended disaster and ruin would come to the business of the country.

When he was inaugurated and came into power the very first official act which we received from him, save his inaugural address, teemed with attacks upon the financial system that Congress had indorsed in 1878, and that the people, with a unanimity which did not admit of any controversy anywhere, had approved. In his first message in December, 1885, he said:

> Nothing more important than the present condition of our currency and coinage can claim your attention.
>
> Since February, 1878, the Government has, under the compulsory provisions of law, purchased silver bullion and coined the same at the rate of more than $2,000,000 every month. By this process up to the present date 215,759,431 silver dollars have been coined.
>
> A reasonable appreciation of a delegation of power to the General Government would limit its exercise without express restrictive words to the people's needs and the requirements of the public welfare.
>
> Upon this theory, the authority to "coin money" given to Congress by the Constitution, if it permits the purchase by the Government of bullion for coinage in any event, does not justify such purchase and coinage to an extent beyond the amount needed for a sufficient circulating medium.

Congress had determined what was a sufficient circulating medium, but the President here attempted to determine that for himself, and decided that the amount Congress had determined was not the right sum. Before he had said this (and I read it in connection because the two go well together and show what was in the mind of the Chief Executive then, and it sustains a statement I made that this Administration was in all financial affairs in full accord with the extreme Wall-street idea) the President said:

> The very limited amount of circulating notes issued by our national banks compared with the amount the law permits them to issue, upon a deposit of bonds for their redemption, indicates that the volume of our circulating medium may be largely increased through this instrumentality.

He further in a very lengthy message complained of the coinage of silver, declaring that it threatened to put us on a silver basis, declaring that already the hoarding of gold had commenced in this country, and that if we continued to coin silver as we were coining it, for any considerable length of time, the country would be upon a silver basis, and all the gold would leave us. The last report of the financial officers of the Government shows that there are $650,000,000 of gold in this country to-day. It has rapidly increased since the President told us that hoarding had commenced and that gold would be scarce. Not only did the President take this view, but so did the Secretary of the Treasury and so did the Treasurer himself. Mr. Secretary Manning in his first report said:

> The disorders of our currency chiefly arise from the operation of two enactments:
>
> 1. The act of February 28, 1878, which has been construed as a permanent appropriation for perpetual Treasury purchases of at least $24,000,000 worth of silver per annum, although from causes mostly foreign that metal is now of mutable and falling value, which must be manufactured into coins of unlimited legal tender and issued to the people of the United States as equivalents of our monetary unit.

I call the attention of Democratic Senators to this language:

> 2. The act of May 31, 1878, which indefinitely postponed fulfillment of the solemn pledge (March 18, 1869) not only of "redemption" but also of "payment" of all the obligations of the United States not bearing interest, legalized as $346,000,000 paper money of unlimited legal tender, and required the post-redemption issue and reissue of these promises to pay dollars, as equivalents of our monetary unit.

Then he recommended not only the discontinuance of the coinage of the silver dollar, but he recommended also the retirement of the $346,000,000 of paper money called legal-tenders by the use of the surplus in the Treasury and such surplus as should arise in the Treasury for the purpose of paying off these notes.

The Treasurer of the United States, who was also as I said a bank officer in New York and came here imbued with Wall-street ideas, recommended the same thing. At the next session of Congress the Secretary of the Treasury sent us a further report upon this same question. He said, speaking of the coinage of the silver dollar:

> It is an expense and a taxation demonstrated by experience to be of no avail for any useful end. Needless as a tax, our silver purchase is also a disturbance in the Treasury, which threatens the currency without relieving the tax-payer. It is heaping up a heavy load of silver coin needing to be kept, but increasingly difficult to keep, in domestic commercial equivalence with our monetary unit.

Then he concluded that the only thing to do was to stop the purchase of silver. He said:

> IV. To stop the purchase of silver is our only choice, our duty, and our interest.
>
> It will stop a wasteful and injurious expense, and the taxation which defrays it.
>
> It will commence and promote reform in the sum and the methods of Federal taxation.
>
> It will recover to the United States an equality of position (non-coinage) with foreign powers, which will give us due influence in negotiation.

Then he concluded, after various recommendations:

> I respectfully recommend to the wisdom of Congress the unconditional repeal of the act of February 28, 1878, accompanied by such a declaration.

Such a declaration as he had suggested, which was a declaration that we would unite with the powers of Europe in adopting an international basis of coinage.

Passing from that, he went to the greenbacks, and said:

> Pay our unfunded debt of $346,681,016 with the present surplus, and the surplus which will accrue before the whole reduction of taxation can be made or take effect, and while no more funded debt can be paid except at a premium during the five years from now until 1891.
>
> * * * * * * *
>
> I therefore respectfully recommend:
>
> 1. Repeal of the clause in the act of February 28, 1878, making compulsory Treasury purchases of silver, for the reasons heretofore given and in order to reduce surplus and unnecessary taxation $24,000,000 a year.
>
> 2. Further reduction of surplus taxation, beginning in a manner which will be suggested below, close down to the necessities of the Government economically administered.
>
> 3. Repeal of the act of May 31, 1878, making compulsory, post-redemption issues and reissues of United States legal-tender notes, thus facilitating—
>
> 4. Gradual purchase and payment of $346,681,016 outstanding promissory notes of the United States with the present and accruing Treasury surplus, issuing silver certificates in their room, and gold certificates if need be, without contraction of the present circulating volume of the currency, these notes (called greenbacks) being now the only debt due and payable before 1891, except the 3 per cent. bonds, which are probably all to be called and paid early in the ensuing fiscal year.

Here were two conspicuous things in the financial policy of this Administration: First, the suspension of the coinage of the silver dollar; second, the retirement of the $346,000,000 of greenbacks which by the act of 1878 were not to be further retired.

Mr. PUGH. If it will not interrupt the Senator——

Mr. TELLER. Not a particle.

Mr. PUGH. I should like to ask him if the Republicans of Wall street did not concur with the President and the Secretary of the Treasury in those recommendations?

Mr. TELLER. I have no doubt that the Republicans of Wall street who are engaged in banking, who represent the great banking interest of that city, and who engage in brokerage, and I have not any doubt that the Republican importers also, fully concur with the financial policy of this Administration. I do not know of any considerable number of men in that great financial center who handle money who do not agree with the Administration.

Mr. PUGH. I will ask the Senator another question. Was it not the votes of Southern Democrats in Congress which prevented the suspension of the coinage of silver, and are not those Democrats now charged with being conspirators in a movement to destroy Northern industries?

Mr. TELLER. I have on more than one occasion given due praise to Democratic Senators for what I consider enlightened, advance statesmanship upon the silver question. I must confess that when I now see the same Senators supporting an administration that is directly and positively opposed to their former avowed policy on this question I am amazed; and that is as much I suppose as I have a right to say upon that subject. I know at all events that to-day the voices of those who were loudest in declaiming against the proposed suspension of the coinage of the silver dollar in this Chamber have been silenced—I do not say by Executive influence, for it would not be according to the rules of debate for me to say so. It is not for me to say why their voices are silent now.

I see the remarkable spectacle of a Democratic House allowing a bill that two-thirds of them were in entire accord upon to be suppressed by the Committee on Ways and Means and the bill not permitted to come before the House where a vote could be taken upon it. I have seen other remarkable exhibitions of Wall street influence that got beyond the Executive Departments of the Government through this Administration.

While I shall never fail myself to give the Southern Senators and Southern Members who voted with the Western Members and Senators upon the silver question their due praise, I must say that they were voting for their interest more than they were voting for ours; for although Colorado produces nearly one-quarter of the silver of the world, Alabama and Mississippi and Georgia have as much interest in the maintenance of the silver dollar as Colorado. It was not a question of local interest, as I have said before; it was a question in which all the people of this country and the world are interested; and when I see an Executive capable of using his influence in such a way as to stifle the voices from that section of the country in favor of the silver dollar, I apprehend that out of it may grow some future trouble.

But whatever may be now the sentiment of the Democratic Senators I am dealing with the administration of financial affairs in the executive department and not in the legislative; and will any Senator here deny what I have stated to be true, that in the very first message there was an attack upon silver, that there was an attack upon the greenback, and that it has been repeated in every message and every report from that day to this? Every public document that has emanated from the Treasury Department, whether it has had the *imprimatur* of Mr. Manning or Mr. Fairchild or Mr. Jordan, has been in sympathy and in accord with the men of Wall street whom I have heard denounced again and again from the other side of the Chamber as the robbers of the American people.

The President in his next message, of 1886, declared that he saw no reason why he should change his views on that subject. Then, too, Secretary Manning raised the question in his report, that there was no power to issue the legal-tender note. Perhaps the Senators would like to have that read. He said in his report:

> The power to force into the circulation an unfit representative of, a false equivalent of, a debt of, that monetary unit of value, as its namesake and equal in exchange, is a power to destroy men's faith in the honor of a Government and its laws. Their sense of betrayal, and their perception of the fact, are expressed by the non-equivalence in exchange often disclosed between the undebased coin and the debased coin, between the coin and the promise to pay converted into a legal tender, between the coin undepreciated and the depreciated coin, according as in any of these ways the monetary unit has been the instrument or the memorial of that duplicity. But such proceeding found no precedent, such opinions as are here controverted found no believer, no defender among the lawyers, statesmen, or people in the first seventy-two years of this Republic.
>
> Not until after 1861, when a great danger had beclouded most men's perceptions of financial as well as constitutional law, was a legal-tender money made out of the debts of the United States.
>
> Not until the infection spread was it ever deliberately argued that any representative of the unit of value could justly be suffered to be made, or to abide, in permanent depreciation and disparity therewith.
>
> But whether or not a non-equivalent of the coin dollar may be made a lawful dollar, and whether or not post-redemption issues and reissues of such promises can be lawfully made, after twenty-one years of peace have superseded any real or imagined exigency of war, certain it is that every argument of policy now forbids the continuance of that legalized injustice. Had it ever been conferred, the Federal Government should be stripped of so dangerous a power. No executive and no legislature is fit to be trusted with the control it involves over the earnings and the savings of the people. No earthly sovereign or servant is capable of a just exercise of such authority to impair and pervert the obligation of contracts.
>
> To apply the present and the unavoidably accruing proceeds of our surplus taxation during the next five years in payment of the only portion of the public debt beyond the vanishing 3 per cents, which is now due or will be payable, except at a high premium, before the 4½ percents of 1891 mature, besides being a large measure of currency reform, will also diminish and finally dissipate the objectionable and invidious influence of the Treasury upon the money market and upon the business of the country.

I commend that to the Democratic Senators who are lawyers. I commend that to the Democratic Senators who sustain the Supreme Court in the assertion that the Government has the power to make a legal-tender note. He continued—

> What surplus we expend in paying off the greenback debt will diminish by so much the immediate reduction of our tariff taxation; for, while the funded debt stands, certainly it is not wise to discard the taxes on whisky, tobacco, and beer.

So it was the purpose of this Administration, then, if they could, to get the consent of Congress to retire the greenbacks as well as to suspend the coinage of silver; and in his letter of February 1, 1887, Mr. Manning reiterated practically the same doctrine that he advanced in these former reports. I call attention to these extracts from that letter:

> That another species of our outstanding indebtedness, namely, the legal-tenders or greenbacks, known in law as United States notes, are, equally with what the law designates as Treasury notes, beyond any need or excuse for reissue; that temporary notes which are a debt of principal only, like notes which are a debt of principal and interest, should at once be cashed and canceled from abundant and superfluous coin in hand not now capable of being applied to any other use—this is so obvious a principle of sound finance, such as a prudent citizen would apply to his private affairs, that any Secretary of the Treasury would be subject to just reproach for departure therefrom by reissues, were it not that the act of May 31, 1878, seems to require of him that fiscal misstep. And I beg leave to submit to the House the question whether, among many other reasons for its repeal, the contraction of the currency sought to be averted by that act can now in any other and better way be prevented than by its repeal.
>
> * * * * * * *
>
> It is therefore necessary now, not only to reduce taxation in order to prevent surplus-tax-collecting from being currency-contracting again and again, but it is necessary also to employ our present and unavoidable tax surplus in the payment, not of funded, but of the unfunded debt.
>
> * * * * * * *
>
> Great extravagance of needless expense or serious monetary trouble can both so be avoided. The people's representatives, by action before adjournment, can relieve the Secretary of the Treasury from the bad choice between these now present alternatives.
>
> The surplus coin and bullion which will remain in the Treasury after all the bonds subject to call have been paid and before the Fiftieth Congress will assemble, together with the proceeds of surplus taxation which will flow into the Treasury before any possible reduction of taxes by the present Congress can take effect, constitute a sum which can well be got out of the Treasury into the hands of the people where it belongs, by the payment of the greenback debt. Coin certificates are a ready and superior paper money to the greenbacks. The substitution can be effected as a mere matter of the Treasury administration whenever two indispensable conditions are first fulfilled by Congress. Of these, the first is that the silver purchases should be stopped.
>
> * * * * * * *
>
> The repeal of the compulsory silver purchases (act of February 28, 1878) is the first and indispensable condition. The repeal of the compulsory post-redemption reissues of United States notes (act of May 31, 1878) is the next and only other condition.
>
> These two repeals are together necessary to prevent either on the one hand an extravagant expense or on the other hand a considerable contraction of the currency. I can see no other alternatives. As the evil is at our door, I can not conceive that the case admits of further delay.

It was the policy of this Administration to leave the funded debt, the interest-bearing debt of the Government to draw interest, and to pay off the unfunded debt, or the $346,000,000 of greenbacks. Mr. President, I wait to see whether there is any Senator on the other side of the Chamber who will announce himself in accord with that doctrine so repeatedly enunciated by the Chief Executive and his chief financial officer and never disclaimed to this hour.

Mr. Manning departed from the Treasury Department, and Mr. Fairchild, who so recently addressed the "business men of New York," became his successor, and in his report of last December, dealing with the silver question, speaking of its difficulties, and advising the suspension of the coinage of silver, as his predecessor had done, he said:

> Another plan, somewhat similar to that recommended by my predecessor in his last annual report, would be to provide that when the reserve was exceeded an amount of United States notes equal in value to such excess should be canceled, if enough of them were in the Treasury; but if not, then the purchase of bullion to cease until the maximum reserve should be reached. This would create a vacuum in the circulating medium which would be filled by silver. The amount of United States notes would be gradually reduced until the whole were extinguished.

Mr. President, I think I need not read any further from the published reports of the Government officers to show that my statement is unquestionable, can not be questioned, that the Treasury Department proposed instead of paying the public debt, which it had been the policy of the Republican party when in power, to do the other thing—keep the public debt alive, keep in existence the interest-bearing debt, and retire that which was costing the people nothing, that which was serving the people as money as no other money ever served any people in the world.

Why, let me ask, should we retire the greenback circulation, a money that is good wherever civilized men trade, although it is paper money; good wherever civilized men meet each other and exchange products; good in every corner of the world where men read and where they know the actual condition of their fellows in other parts of the world? It saves to the people the interest on $346,000,000 of money to have the greenbacks continued in existence; and in whose interest could it be to retire them save that of the holders of Government bonds, and theirs alone?

When the Republican party went out of power they left in the Treasury of the United States $100,000,000 set apart for the redemption of greenbacks, which had been set apart in the early days of resumption,

and which are now required by law to be so held, or at least public opinion had consented that they should be there held for the purpose of making good at any time in gold the greenback when it should be presented. How much more did they leave? About $25,000,000 of subsidiary coin, which this Administration has stricken from the available assets of the Government and declared to be of no practical benefit. Then they left in addition, not, as Mr. Fairchild says in his recent speech, $22,000,000, but $8,764,590.11.

Nobody can have forgotten that in 1884, during the political campaign, every Democratic orator, from the candidate for Vice-President down, declared again and again upon the public rostrums that we had accumulated a hundred millions of surplus in the Treasury over and above the $100,000,000 required for the redemption of greenbacks, and that that hundred millions ought to be applied to the payment of the public debt, and I am astonished to see in the public prints that that stupendous falsehood is being repeated now by prominent Democratic orators in the land.

A Democrat recently in one of the Western States, a candidate for a high office, declared that when they came into power they found one hundred millions of money in the Treasury not needed, which they, he said, at once proceeded to pay on the public debt. Now I propose to make a little examination of how they have paid the public debt. I read from the report of the late Secretary, Mr. Manning, and the same statement can be found in the report of the Treasurer:

Net balance—

This is December, 1885, showing the indebtedness of the United States on March 4, 1885, as to which he concludes:

The assets of the Treasury on the 4th of March, 1885, excluding fractional coin and other unavailable items, were as follows:

* * * * * * *

Net balance in Treasury, $8,764,590.11.

That was the available balance in the Treasury when the Republican party went out of power and when the Democratic party came in. During the portion of the fiscal year 1885 that had run when we went out of office we had paid out about $45,000,000 on the public debt. We had in the preceding fifteen months paid out $110,000,000 on the public debt, and we had paid out the year before that $99,000,000 on the public debt, and the year before still more, and the year before still more. As money came into the Treasury month by month the surplus was paid out until, as I said, when the Democrats took charge of the administration of public affairs all the money had been paid that it was prudent to pay on the public debt, and much more than they have since declared ought to have been paid. Instead of there being $100,000,000 there was practically no money left at all to be paid by them. There was an increasing surplus. It was more in May than it was in April, more in April than it was in March; and on the last of June, 1885, there was about $44,000,000 of surplus in the Treasury.

When the Democratic party came into power there was a trifle more than $194,000,000 of 3 per cent. bonds outstanding that were due and payable. These were the bonds that Republican Secretaries had been retiring as rapidly as the surplus would allow. What was the duty of the present Administration when they had ten, fifteen, or twenty millions of dollars in the Treasury which could have been paid upon these bonds? Every one of them could have been called if there was money. What did they do? Let us see.

On the 31st of July, 1885, the surplus had increased to $44,052,229. Not a dollar of the 3 percents or any other bonds had been paid. During the month of July there was added to that amount the sum of $5,663,643, making the surplus on the 1st day of August, 1885, $49,715,872 independent of fractional coin, independent of what they called the unavailable assets. Of the available assets there were practically $50,000,000 in round numbers in the Treasury, while 3 per cent. bonds to the extent of almost $200,000,000 were outstanding drawing nearly $500,000 a month of interest, and yet not a dollar was paid on the public debt. During the month of September, 1885, the increase of surplus was $14,186,534, coming into the Treasury at the rate of half a million dollars a day nearly, more than for every working day in the month; and the surplus on the last day of that month was $63,903,106, and still not a dollar had been paid on the public debt.

By December 31 of that year this amount had increased to $71,018,872; and by the 1st of January, 1886, to $79,689,862 of available assets, over and above what they termed unavailable assets, that had always in our accounting been treated as a part of the surplus moneys of the Treasury. Not a bond had yet been called in, and no effort had been made to pay the public debt or to reduce the burden of taxation upon the people. The whole $194,150,000 of unpaid 3 percents, when the Administration came in, were still unpaid, drawing, as I said, almost $6,000,000 a year out of the people of the United States, that went to the holders of those bonds.

Nobody who was a member of this body in the fall and winter of 1885 has forgotten the fierce attack made upon this policy by the senior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BECK]. I could hardly say myself in this Chamber the harsh things he said of the policy that would accumulate the people's money in the Treasury of the United States with the interest-bearing debt still due and unpaid. Yet since that time I do not know that I have heard anybody criticise the Administration that practically continued this same policy for more than eighteen months thereafter. So grievous had this policy of the Administration become to the people, so objectionable and so odious, that on the 23d of February, 1886, the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives submitted a resolution, known as the Morrison resolution, in which they asserted that there was $179,000,000 of available surplus that could be paid upon the public debt. The committee in their report state—

That on January 30, 1886, as shown by the official "statement of the assets and liabilities of the Treasury of the United States," there was in the Treasury and United States depositories, including amount held for the redemption of United States notes, and not including minor and fractional silver coin classed "as assets not available," the sum of $179,689,862.24 in excess of all other liabilities than the redemption of said United States notes.

It is believed that this sum is largely in excess of the sum required for the purpose for which it is held, and that a considerable part thereof should be applied to the payment of the interest-bearing debt of the United States now payable, to the end that public moneys shall be used to lighten public burdens and not unnecessarily held to lure the agents and representatives of the people on to improvident and wasteful expenditures.

Your committee therefore reports the accompanying joint resolution and recommends its adoption.

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives in Congress assembled, That whenever the surplus or balance in the Treasury, including amount held for redemption of United States notes, shall exceed the sum of $100,000,000, it shall be, and is hereby, made the duty of the Secretary of the Treasury to apply such excess in sums not less than ten millions per month during the existence of any such surplus or excess, to the payment of the interest-bearing indebtedness of the United States, payable at the option of the Government.

That resolution was passed by the House, came to this body, and was here amended upon the application of the Treasury Department, which declared that it was necessary that $20,000,000 should be retained in the Treasury over and above the one hundred millions for the redemption of greenbacks. It then went to the President. Mr. Jordan, who came before the Finance Committee of this body in regard to it, declared that $20,000,000 was not sufficient, that there should be at least $50,000,000 kept in the Treasury besides the one hundred millions for greenback redemption. In a few days after this Morrison resolution went to the President, Congress adjourned, and the President vetoed it by a pocket veto—the meanest and most contemptible, in my judgment, of all vetoes. As much as I have felt inclined to censure some of his vetoes, I think the most contemptible of all is when the President puts a bill in his pocket and thus lets it fail.

That resolution passed the House on the 14th of July, 1886. It came to this body, and as I said was amended, and it went to the President on the 30th of the same month, or at least it passed this body on the 30th of the same month. When the resolution passed the Senate there was a surplus in the Treasury of $80,000,000, $60,000,000 of which must by the terms of this resolution have been promptly paid upon the $194,000,000 of 3 per cent. bonds still unpaid. Rather than pay $60,000,000 on these bonds the President chose to disregard the legislative will, and to allow the resolution to die in his hands.

The first call was made on the 29th of December, 1885, for $10,000,000, to be paid February 1, 1886. At that time the surplus revenues were $71,018,872. The second call was made on the 29th day of January, 1886, for $10,000,000, and at that time the surplus was $79,689,862, or at least it was three days thereafter. The third call was made on the 20th of February, 1886, for $10,000,000, to be delivered on the 1st of April. On the 28th day of February, eight days after this call, the surplus was $72,298,202. The fourth call was made on the 22d of March, 1886, for $10,000,000, to be delivered May 1. On the 1st day of March the surplus was $76,381,099. The fifth call was made on the 20th of April, 1886, for $10,000,000, to be delivered on the 1st of June. On the 30th of April the surplus was $77,030,999.

Can anybody give any reasonable excuse, can anybody give any reason why these calls were made for $10,000,000 of bonds when there were seventy-five, seventy-eight, seventy-nine million of money in the Treasury, every dollar of which might have been paid out upon the public debt, and thus have reduced the interest-bearing debt to that extent? Nobody can explain it except upon the theory which I have advanced, that it was the policy of this Administration to keep the bonds out and not pay the public indebtedness bearing interest, but, if possible, to pay the indebtedness bearing no interest. In whose interest was this?

The sixth call was made on the 22d of May, 1886, and I desire to ask a little attention to this call. On the 22d of May the call was for $4,000,000, to be delivered on the 1st of July. When this call was made, the surplus was no less than $73,000,000, for nine days later, May 31, it was $76,142,611; and yet the call was for only $4,000,000 of 3 percents.

The seventh call was made on the 21st June, 1886, for a like sum of $4,000,000, to be delivered on the 1st of August. When this call was made the surplus could not have been less than $72,000,000, for at the end of the month it was $75,101,109.

On the 19th of July, 1886, five days after the Morrison joint resolution had passed the House, the eighth call was made for a like sum of $4,000,000, to be delivered on the 1st of September. At the time this call was made the surplus was not less than $75,000,000, for on the last day of July it was $80,206,325.

With $80,000,000, out of which was to come but $4,000,000, no fur-

ther calls were made until the 12th day of August, 1886, when a call was made for $10,000,000.

I have called attention to the surplus when these calls were made. I now desire to call the attention of the Senate to the surplus when these calls matured, when the time of payment arrived. When the first call, made on the 29th day of December, 1885, was payable, that is, the 1st of February, 1886, for ten millions, there were $79,689,862 in the Treasury, and the public indebtedness bearing 3 per cent. that might be paid was $194,150,000. When the next call matured there was $72,298,202, and the public indebtedness that was then payable was $184,000,000. Each of these calls I have stated in a table, which I will now put in:

Calls.	Date.	Redeemable.	Amount called.	Surplus.	Public debt payable.
First	Dec. 29, 1885	Feb. 1, 1886	$10,000,000	$79,689,862	$194,000,000
Second	Jan. 29, 1886	Mar. 1, 1886	10,000,000	72,298,202	184,000,000
Third	Feb. 20, 1886	April 1, 1886	10,000,000	76,381,099	174,000,000
Fourth	Mar. 22, 1886	May 1, 1886	10,000,000	77,030,999	164,000,000
Fifth	Apr. 20, 1886	June 1, 1886	10,000,000	76,142,611	154,000,000
Sixth	May 22, 1886	July 1, 1886	4,000,000	75,191,109	144,000,000
Seventh	June 21, 1886	Aug. 1, 1886	4,000,000	80,206,325	140,000,000
Eighth	July 19, 1886	Sept. 1, 1886	4,000,000	76,527,561	136,000,000

But I want to attract a little attention to the fact that when the $4,000,000 call due on the 1st of July was payable, there was $75,191,109 in the Treasury surplus money and $144,000,000 of unpaid 3 per cent. bonds still out. Why was only $4,000,000 called? Simply because Wall street did not want any of these bonds called, and because a pretense must be made in the interest of the people, a pretense that they were paying off the public debt; and those three calls of $4,000,000 each were made when the call ought to have been for $70,000,000 when the first call was made, when the bonds could have been practically paid off, half of them at least, by one single call; but the calls were strung out and the last of them was not paid until July 1, 1887, when they could have been all paid by the close of the fiscal year, 1886; or if not by June 30, at least within two months thereafter.

Mr. President, there was more than one period during the time I have recited when $75,000,000 would have paid half of the 3 per cent. bonds or more, and when that amount was in the Treasury applicable to that purpose. What excuse, what reason can be given for not having done it? I have never heard any given. I have never yet found any man living who was willing to stand up here and defend the conduct of the Administration in that particular. Much as Senators and Members and outside adherents may prate of its honesty and of its ability, none of them are willing to say that the management of the 3 per cent bonds is marked by anything but imbecility of the grossest character, to put it in no harsher terms.

How much money do you suppose we lost by this dallying? Remember that the interest on these 3 percents as I stated was almost $500,000 a month. Think of it! The President of the United States has arrogated to himself, or if he has not his friends have, a great deal of credit because he has stood between this body and the other, on the one side and the public Treasury on the other when we have been sending him pension bills involving $96 a year, or perhaps $144, for some lone widow and has met them with a veto, and the whole Democratic portion of the country has resounded with praise that he has stood between rapacious legislation and the Treasury! There have never been five days since this Administration came into power that they have not lost more money by their negligent management than it would have taken in any one year to pay all the vetoed pensions. A week ago I carefully examined every pension bill that the President had vetoed, and carefully estimated how much he has saved to the public Treasury; $28,116 is the total that he has saved per annum. Think of it! Five hundred thousand dollars a month was left in the hands of the bondholders of Wall street to accommodate them, and then he attempted to save it by wringing it out of the poor unfortunate defenders of our flag.

Suppose they could not prove that they had incurred their disabilities in the line of duty; suppose they could not show that they were practically and perfectly sound when they went into the Army, they have rendered to the Government of the United States a service for which they ought to be compensated, which can not be done in dollars and cents; and when we say that we will give the pittance of $12 a month to the widow of one of these men, or $8 a month to the crippled soldier, whether crippled in the service or not, the President in the interest of the revenue of the country steps up and vetoes the bill, and yet he allows a half a million a month of the money of the United States to go into the hands of bondholders of New York, and he does that for eleven months without an attempt to pay a dollar of the public debt! He has lost more money on the 3 per cent. bonds than would have paid every single vetoed pension bill for more than one hundred and fifty years, if the beneficiaries should have all lived that length of time. But it was in the interest of the bondholder, it was in the interest of the money-lender, it was in the interest of the money-grabber that this was done, and not in the interest of poor men.

There was $75,000,000 lying in the Treasury month in and month out for more than a year, and the interest on that would have been, at 3 per cent., two millions and a quarter of money. That nobody can deny; that proposition can not be gainsaid. It was stated by a prominent member of the Committee on Appropriations in the House of Representatives that the Government lost more than four millions on that single transaction of the 3 per cent. bonds.

The last of the 3 per cent. bonds were paid on the 1st day of July, 1887. There were at that time $244,000,000 of bonds bearing interest at the rate of 4½ per cent., $738,000,000 bearing interest at 4 per cent., and $64,000,000 bearing interest at 6 per cent. The 4½ per cent. bonds are due in September, 1891. The $738,000,000 of 4 per cent. bonds are due in 1907, and the $64,000,000 of sixes are due in 1895 and 1896. Here were more than a thousand million dollars of indebtedness bearing, some of it 4½ and some 6 per cent. interest. The interest charged on this is about $44,000,000 or $45,000,000 a year.

The President all this time had ample authority to buy these bonds. It was simply a matter of discretion; it was simply a matter whether the Government could make money by taking its surplus funds and buying these bonds, and there was not a bond then that could not have been bought—not one of any denomination that I have mentioned which could not have been got so as to save to the Government of the United States from 2½ to 2½ per cent. on every dollar that it invested in that purchase. Was it wisdom to allow the money to lie in the Treasury ($44,000,000 when the last 3 per cent. bond was bought), drawing no interest, and to allow these bonds to continue to draw interest? What was the practical and business-like method to deal with a surplus when there was no other method of disposing of it? To buy bonds at such figures as would net to the Government the greatest amount of interest upon the expenditure of its money. That is what ought to have been done; that is what the act of 1881 proposed should be done. That was why it was passed. That had been enacted by the Morrison resolution and by every act and by every movement of the legislative department of the Government, that the surplus money should go to retire the debt.

It is not worth while now for the Senators on the other side or the friends of the Administration to say there ought not to have been a surplus. That has nothing to do with the question. There was a surplus that they knew would continue. There had been a surplus of $80,000,000 or of $83,000,000 at one time, before they paid a dollar on the public debt. There was still a surplus and bonds were still to be had, I repeat, at a rate that would have saved to the Government from 2½ to 2½ per cent. per annum on its money.

Mr. PUGH. I should like to ask the Senator if the action of the Senate in the adoption of the Beck amendment to the resolution in relation to the power of the President, declaratory of that power to make the purchase of bonds, did not show that the Senate was opposed to the President's exercising the power to purchase bonds without supplying the deficiency made by the purchase on account of the withdrawal of national-bank notes by silver certificates or silver coin?

Mr. TELLER. I do not think it indicated anything of the kind.

Mr. PUGH. Why did the Senate, then, make that amendment to the House resolution?

Mr. TELLER. I will tell the Senator why the Senate made that amendment. We knew that these bonds had to be bought; we knew that no administration could live and continue to accumulate money in the public Treasury in that way; we knew that necessarily in buying these bonds there would be some reduction of the currency of the country, which we did not propose should occur; and so we said, "As you buy these bonds, when you buy the bonds of a bank that has issues of national-bank notes, and they by reason of disposing of their bonds retire their notes, you shall issue an additional amount of silver money equal to the circulation retired." There never was a suggestion in this Chamber that we should not buy the bonds. And I venture to say here that if that question had been submitted to this body there would never have been a single vote, and no man could have been found in this body who would have voted against the proposition that the Government should buy the bonds when they could be bought at a reasonable profit to the Government.

Mr. PUGH. I will ask the Senator, if that was so plain, so perfectly manifest, why did they leave it to the discretion of the President? Why did not the Senate make the authority mandatory to purchase these bonds?

Mr. TELLER. The Senator knows very well that it was contended that the act of 1881 was practically mandatory. The Senator knows very well that the Administration had sent here a statement that they wanted to buy bonds, but they did not know whether they could or not.

Mr. PUGH. Still the power was left discretionary.

Mr. TELLER. Certainly it was discretionary. You could not say how many they should buy, because if you did say that they should put every dollar of public money in bonds it would have been within the power of the men holding the bonds to unite and force the Government to pay an unreasonable sum. It was not reasonable to say they should buy bonds at any price. What we intended to say was, and what the House had said in the resolution that came to us was, "You have the authority." That was all. And that was all the Adminis-

tration asked, and that was what the Democratic House said it had the authority to do; and we said, "You have the authority," but we said, "In exercising that authority you may reduce the circulating medium of the country, and we do not want that done, and so you shall issue as many silver dollars as you contract national-bank notes." That is all there was of it, and the Administration understood that Congress intended that they should buy bonds, and they have been buying since in a limited and laggard way.

The Senator knows very well and everybody knows that in this body the authority of the Administration to buy bonds was never questioned. I do not believe there is a Senator in this Chamber who would have stood here and expressed a doubt upon that proposition. The Senator from Missouri [Mr. VEST] said the other day that it was the universal sentiment of the profession everywhere that that authority existed, that the lawyers of the country everywhere so believed, and there never could have been any doubt about it. There never was any doubt of it. It would not be proper for me to say that it was a pretense. It would not be proper for me to say that the President and the Secretary of the Treasury sent it here knowing that that was the law. It would hardly be the thing for me to say that. If I was not restrained by this place and this presence, I would say it. I do not believe that any man who had the capacity to be a justice of the peace in the United States doubted the authority to buy bonds under the act of 1881.

Mr. SAULSBURY. Will the Senator allow me a moment?

Mr. TELLER. Certainly.

Mr. SAULSBURY. I think the Senator from Colorado has not quoted the Senator from Missouri correctly. The Senator from Missouri said that he had no doubt about it, but that there were abler lawyers than he who had expressed doubts, and among the rest the Attorney-General.

Mr. TELLER. I have heard before that the Attorney-General had so decided. I do not know but that it is so; but I do know that the Attorney-General decided upon another proposition in an appropriation act and declared that if it was a general provision it stood like any other. If he did give the opinion now claimed, he has made two decisions, one contrary to the other. I shall believe that the Attorney-General has made the decision now referred to, when I see it. I believe it has not yet been incorporated in the published opinions of the Attorney-General, and I take this occasion to say that when that is again asserted I trust somebody will produce that opinion, so that we may see upon what theory and upon what ground it is based. I should like to see where the Attorney-General says that that is different from any other provision of an appropriation act. How can he distinguish that from the provision which says that the President of the United States shall receive $50,000 a year instead of $25,000? How can he distinguish that act from hundreds of others that have gone into the Revised Statutes that in the revision were taken out of appropriation bills?

I repeat again, Mr. President, that it could not have been a question amongst lawyers. It might have been a question amongst politicians; it might have been a question amongst bankers who did not want this power exercised; it might have been a question among the brokers of Wall street who were protesting against the paying of these bonds, who wanted to hold on to them, who wanted the money to accumulate in the Treasury; but it was not a question amongst men who are accustomed to construing statutes.

Mr. PUGH. If the Senator will indulge me a moment——

Mr. TELLER. Certainly, I am quite willing to yield.

Mr. PUGH. The Senator is aware that the act of 1881 conferred authority to make this purchase within the discretion of the President in reference to the 3 per cent. bonds. At the time that act was passed the bonds running to maturity had not the large premium that they afterwards had in the market, and the President stated that he doubted whether that authority extended to the purchase of bonds in advance of their maturity at high premiums. It was the premium that these bonds had in the market after this authority to make the purchase was given, that caused him to hesitate in the exercise of that discretionary power, and he asked Congress to reaffirm it or to declare that it existed in the face of this increase in the value of the bonds.

Mr. TELLER. Oh, Mr. President, the authority of the Executive to buy bonds does not depend upon the price of the bonds. That is his discretion. If he had the authority he could buy the bonds if they went to 500, though he might be blamable for doing it at that price.

Mr. PUGH. A great many claim that he ought not to buy at the present premium.

Mr. TELLER. That is not the question. The question is, did he have the power, not was it a wise exercise of the power. Did he have the power? We shall discuss the other question later. Whether it was a wise exercise of the power has nothing to do with it. Did he have the power? He asserts that he doubted his power, but he never gave any good or valid reason why he doubted the power. Let us see what the act was:

> That the Secretary of the Treasury may at any time apply the surplus money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, or so much thereof as he may consider proper, to the purchase or redemption of United States bonds: *Provided*, That the bonds so purchased or redeemed shall constitute no part of the sinking fund, but shall be canceled.

The 3 per cent. bonds were not purchased. The $194,000,000 of 3 per cent. bonds that were taken in were never purchased. They were redeemed. We do not purchase bonds that are due. The Senator knows that. Here was authority to use the money in the Treasury to redeem the bonds due or to purchase bonds. To purchase bonds means to take any bonds not due. That is a matter, then, of contract between the Government and the holder of the bond; at least that is the construction given to the law in the Treasury Department. I myself have never had any question, and I do not have any now, that it is in the power of any sovereign state to call in its securities and pay them off whenever it sees fit. I do not believe that any government in the world ought to abdicate that power. But another construction has been put on it, and I do not propose to quarrel with it, because I would have the Government always keep what the people believe to be faith with them. The people have been led to believe that the Government had no right to pay these debts until the time fixed for their maturity; and because of that I am willing the Government should pay them according to the public opinion, for it is better that the Government of the United States should sink millions of money than that it should discredit itself in the minds of the people of the United States.

So I was willing and am willing now that the Government should purchase these bonds and pay the premium, and any premium, I do not care how great it is, provided that it is cheaper for the Government to pay the premium; that is, that the Government would be the gainer by doing that instead of allowing the money to lie idle in the Treasury. I am not now dealing with the question whether it is wise to accumulate a surplus. That has nothing to do with this point. It is going to be there, and it will be there in spite of everything that can be done at this session, and the administration officials knew it was going to be there then. What the Government should have done was to buy the bonds at such figures as would net the Government the greatest possible revenue.

After the redemption of the 3 per cent. bonds the money continued to accumulate in the Treasury until on the last day of November, 1887, a few days prior to the President's famous free-trade message, there was in the Treasury $55,258,701 beyond what was needed to carry out the provisions of the sinking fund.

The Secretary of the Treasury on the 3d day of August, 1887, gave notice that he would receive proposals for the delivery of 4½ per cent. bonds on the 10th of August, and every Wednesday following, to carry out the provisions of the sinking-fund statutes. On the 22d of September the Secretary gave a further notice that he would purchase 4½ per cent. bonds at 108.4 until the 1st of October, and the 4 per cent. bonds at 125 until the 1st of October, and at 124 from that date until the 8th of October, the aggregate not to exceed, however, $14,000,000. That was supposed to be the necessary sum for the sinking fund to comply with the provisions of the statutes.

At this time the surplus was about $45,000,000, and after the purchase up to the 8th of October, of which I will speak later, it was still more than $40,000,000. Under the circular of August 3 the Secretary purchased of the 4½ per cent. bonds $11,505,300. Under the circular of September 22 the Secretary purchased $7,780,100 of 4½ per cent. bonds, for which he paid, of course, 108.4 because that was the price that he had fixed, making a total of the 4½ percents of $19,455,400, and a total of both classes of bonds of $24,844,050 at a cost of $27,842,237.

These transactions were closed on the 8th of October, 1887, and this amount was passed to the sinking fund. On the last day of that month the surplus was $56,758,704. Why did not the Secretary of the Treasury continue to buy bonds? He rejected a very large number of bids for 4 percents, as I will show in a few moments, at 125. He rejected a great number of 4½ per cent. bond bids at less than 108. Why did he not buy all the bonds that were then offered to him? I have here a statement of the Treasury Department showing the amount of bonds offered.

After the purchase, which was closed on October 8, 1887, no further bonds were bought until 1888. The House of Representatives on the 7th of February, 1888, passed a resolution inquiring why the Secretary was not purchasing bonds in these words:

> Whereas it appears from a letter of the honorable Secretary of the Treasury, dated January 13, 1888, addressed to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and printed in Executive Document No. 78, first session, Fiftieth Congress, that an additional appropriation of $2,000 is made necessary to meet an anticipated deficiency in telegraphic expenses of the Treasury Department caused by the regulations recently adopted relating to deposits of Government funds in national-bank depositories; and
>
> Whereas the Secretary of the Treasury, in his annual report to Congress, says: "The Government has purchased some bonds during the present fiscal year for the sinking fund, and has been obliged to pay such a price for them that the annual saving in interest upon the purchases is only about 2½ per cent.; that the price of the same class of bonds has materially advanced since these purchases, and that the premium paid on said purchases amounted to $2,852,015.88;" and
>
> Whereas the policy of purchasing bonds with surplus money in the Treasury, as aforesaid, has ceased, and the policy of depositing the public funds in a large number of national banks has been substituted in lieu thereof; and
>
> Whereas the statute authorizing the Secretary of the Treasury to designate national banks as United States depositories provides that the Secretary shall prescribe the regulations by which said depositories of public funds shall be governed: Therefore,
>
> *Resolved*, That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and is hereby, directed to re-

port to this House at the earliest possible moment all the facts bearing upon the following inquiries:

First. At what dates were the propositions made by the Treasury Department to buy said bonds, and if any person or association was employed to purchase said bonds, and give name of said person or persons or association; give dates of purchase, name of seller, kinds of bonds purchased, amounts paid, and current rates at which said bonds were quoted at the time the proposition to purchase was made by the Department.

Second. State when the policy relating to deposits in national-bank depositories was adopted which created the deficiency spoken of in the letter aforesaid of the Secretary of the Treasury, and whether after the purchase of bonds spoken of on the eleventh page of the annual report of the Secretary of the Treasury for the year 1887; give also reasons for changing policy first adopted, to wit, the purchase of bonds.

Third. State if the deficiency spoken of in the aforesaid letter of the Secretary was caused by the large increase in the number of national-bank depositories. Append to your answer a statement showing the per cent. of deposits on bonds deposited to secure the same under present regulations of the Treasury Department; also append copy of said regulations. State what per cent. of deposits has been allowed by the Department on United States bonds deposited for this purpose for the past twelve years, and whether the rate has been uniform, and whether below or above the par value of the bonds previous to the adoption of the present policy, and what was the rate percentage at the date of change of policy.

Fourth. Has said new policy of the Department concerning United States depositaries, the number thereof, and the increased percentage of deposits allowed, had any effect to either increase or diminish the circulation of national-bank notes, and to what extent, and whether said policy has resulted in the increase or diminution of the money supply of the country?

Fifth. State the number of national banks which have been designated as depositaries of public funds since the adoption of the present policy, the number formerly designated that have availed themselves of the increased rate, and where said banks have been designated since the adoption of the present policy and rate of deposits; state when the bonds deposited in the Treasury by said designated depositories were transferred to said associations, and by whom.

After the passage of this resolution the Secretary of the Treasury commenced the purchase of bonds, not for the sinking fund, but for the purpose of reducing the surplus. I find that on the 17th of April the Secretary issued a circular inviting offers of bonds, and he received offers down to the 15th of June, according to the last detailed statement that has been furnished, of $47,505,250 of the 4 per cent. bonds, of which he had accepted $15,669,450, leaving the sum rejected $31,835,800. This is what I referred to when I asked why he had not bought all the bonds that were offered. When the Secretary of the Treasury began to buy these bonds, which was on the 23d day of April, 1888, the first bid was for $20,000 4 per cent. bonds at 125. These were taken. The next bid was for $100,000 at 125½, which he rejected. The same day, also, he rejected a bid for $200,000 at 125½. He received a bid for $250,000 at 125⅝. He rejected $250,000 in lots at 126¼ and 126½, and $250,000 in lots at 126½, and various other lots, including one lot of $1,000,000, on the 28th of that month, at 126⅝.

In May large offers were rejected at 126⅝. A million and a quarter bid was rejected at 127, and a long list was rejected from 126⅝ to 127.

Again, on the 8th, 9th, and 10th of May, large lots of $100,000, $2,000,000, $375,000, $50,000, $1,500,000, $2,750,000, $40,000, etc., were rejected at from 127 to 127¼ and 127½, and one lot at 126¼. On the 15th of the same month a million was rejected at 127¼. Large amounts were rejected at sums ranging from that up to 127⅜.

On the 22d of May a million and a half were rejected at 128. Large sums were rejected at 127 and a fraction near to 128.

The total of these rejections shows more than $20,000,000 rejected below 128; very large offers were rejected at 127 and later in the month taken in at the same price, and the later transactions of the Department show that it has bought a large amount of these bonds within the last few weeks at 128 and a fraction, and some of them almost to 129. Rumor says that within the last ten or fifteen days 130 has been paid for these bonds. I have myself been unable to get anything but the average, and that does not go very far from 129.

Not only is this so in regard to the fours, but of the two-and-a-halfs. Large offers have been rejected, amounting to $21,000,000, and since then large sums have been bought at a price exceeding that at which these offers were rejected. It is said by the friends of the Administration, and the Secretary himself in his speech in New York claimed that in making these purchases bonds necessarily went up. When he fixed the price at 125 and said, "I will take these 4 per cent. bonds at 125 from all who bring them," the holders brought the bonds and he had no trouble with them. When he said, "I will take them, the next day, for a limited period of eight days at 124," they still brought them and sold them, and if the Secretary of the Treasury had said, as he ought to have said, "I will give you 126 and a fraction," which would have left the Government a very handsome sum on its money invested, he could have bought all the bonds that the surplus money of the United States would have paid for. Even if he had bought them at 128 he would have saved to the Government more than 2 per cent. per annum on the money invested, but the Secretary did not choose to do that; he preferred to use the money in another direction.

Of these $31,835,800 of 4 percents that were rejected, some were offered at 127, some at 127¼, some at 127½, and some at 127⅞, at which last price some lots were purchased. These bonds can not now be purchased for any such sum. The same may be said of the others, although the 4½ percents may be bought now at a less price than the Secretary paid for them when he commenced buying them.

I come now to one other transaction and then I shall not detain further the Senate on this subject. It is said by the Secretary of the Treasury in his New York speech that the purchase of these bonds would have a tendency to increase their price. I want to tell the Senate and the country what in my judgment has enhanced the price of these bonds. The bonds had a value as an interest-bearing security, drawing a large and valuable interest, 4 per cent. on some and 4½ per cent. on others. The 4½ percents must certainly be redeemed in 1891; the 4 percents are as certainly redeemable in 1907, or nineteen years from this time. What were they worth? They were worth whatever a man could buy them for; so that he could get them at rates which would pay him 3 per cent. on his money, or even 2½ per cent., he might be satisfied with that. What did the Secretary do? He gave to these bonds a character and a power that they never had before possessed, and what was that? A power, I assert, that no government security anywhere in the world ever possessed, and I am not aware that any other securities of ours ever possessed—the power to borrow not simply small sums, but more than their face of the public money without interest.

When the Secretary of the Treasury adopted the policy of putting the Treasury money into the national banks and holding as security for it these bonds, of course he enhanced the value of the bonds. If they had been his own bonds and he had been intrusted with a scheme to make them valuable, there was no other method by which he could have made them so valuable, unless it was to have extended the time of their payment, which he did not have the power to do. When he said, "Your bond has got the power to draw its 4 or 4½ per cent. and I will put into your banks $110 of every $100 of bonds, and on that you may draw $6.60 more," he gave them an interest power, instead of $40 a thousand on the fours and $45 on the four-and-a-halfs, of 100 per cent. and more, and is it strange that when these bonds could be hypothecated and money borrowed on them for which they paid no interest at all, they should have gone up? Is it strange that the man who had theretofore been drawing his $40 on his $1,000, when he found that he could draw $105 on it, should hold on to the bonds and that he should decline to put them in the market. If the Secretary of the Treasury had taken the advice of the men who held these bonds and had followed their advice he could not have made them so valuable as he made them in any other way than the way he did. No other system would have given them the value in the eyes of the investing public that he gave them by putting $60,000,000 of the money of the people in the national banks without a cent of interest, and that, too, when every dollar of it would have netted the Government from 2½ to 2½ per cent. by the purchase of Government bonds.

We were told by the Senator from Missouri [Mr. VEST] the other night that great amounts of money had been put in the banks by the predecessors of the present Secretary of the Treasury. Mr. President, it is not true that any considerable sums of public money had been put in the banks save and except for the convenience and accommodation of the Treasury of the United States in its refunding operations. Of course when we refunded several hundred million dollars of debt these transactions went through the banks and there was nominally a large amount of money that went out of the national Treasury; it was not money that was transmitted from the Treasury at Washington or the subtreasuries to the banks; and that is what we complain of.

The Secretary says that the people who have the money can not afford to go out and buy bonds at these figures, and then he figures that on $1,000,000 a man will only make, who takes a Government deposit, $5,600. These people did not buy these bonds to make money on. They were the holders and the owners of these bonds. They were then in possession of them, drawing the interest on them, and the Government was wanting to buy them, and the Government said all at once, "We will not buy them, but we will let you bring us your bonds, and for every $100 that you put into the Treasury we will give you $110;" and thus the banks holding the securities drew in their currency and contracted the circulation! Why should they not? On every million dollars held as security for their issue of notes they could issue $900,000 of national-bank notes. When they had retired their national-bank notes they could borrow $200,000 more on the same amount of bonds. Who pretends that the banks could not make from 3 to 6 per cent. on these bonds in New York City? Who pretends that they were not put there for the interest of the bankers? The Secretary says that it has not been profitable. He says they are returning them. Very few of them appear to have been returned, for the last statement makes the amount hard on to $60,000,000 yet, as I understand.

The Secretary said in his speech in New York that this is a little more than the amount the banks have heretofore held. When the Democrats came into power there was deposited in all the national banks of the United States, for the convenience of the United States and nothing else, $10,150,036. June 30, 1885, the sum was $12,928,264.47; and when the November report was made by the Secretary of the Treasury the deposits were $13,595,550. In November, 1886, the deposits were $16,266,639. I find in looking over the reports that the deposits in national banks that year were $122,098,651. I might stand up here and insist that there was over $122,000,000 of Government money deposited; but I understand that to mean that in the course of the business transactions $122,000,000 passed through the banks properly and legitimately, and upon that I have no criticism whatever to

make. That explains the condition when we were refunding, how it happened that $200,000,000 at one time was found in the banks, and in a few days it was all out and in the Treasury.

What we complain of is that for a year now these banks have been carrying from $40,000,000 to $60,000,000 of the people's money without interest. What is more, it is dangerous to the public interest to have this money there. The Government must some day call for it. When it calls for it, it will compel the banks to contract their loans for a very large amount of money. There is not any Secretary of the Treasury who dares to call for it promptly. It would be better to let it lie there and waste the interest on it for a time than to call for it suddenly and thus disrupt and break up all the business of the country.

What right has the Secretary of the Treasury to put that money in the banks and thus take upon himself the power to disturb the great interests of this country by either calling for it or refusing to call for it? No more money should be put into the national banks than could be put there properly and profitably for the interest of the Government. If it is necessary to get the money out, buy bonds with it as long as it will save the Government 2 per cent., or 1 per cent., or one-half per cent., or a quarter per cent. interest, rather than let it be in the banks. Is it not better that the Government should get 2 per cent. than that the banks should get it? If this had been done under a Republican administration there would have been no end to the complaint; there would have been no end to the denunciation of the administration that would thus build up these great banks.

I have heard a great deal of talk about robbing the people of the United States through the tariff. What do the Senators say about robbing the public of their interest money through the national banks? Are they any better than the manufacturers? Have they any more souls? Are they any kinder to the poor? Have they done as much for the interests of the country as the men who produce? The men who count money and who only count money, who handle money and handle money alone, are useful and valuable in society, but they are not the chief agents in progress; they are not the moving agencies to move the business of the country. It is another class than the great corporations which have piled up their millions of money, as the Senator from Missouri told us the other day. He need not have singled out one bank. There are other banks which have made as much money as that bank has made. There are other banks which sell their stock at higher prices than the stock of that bank sells for. There has been a new bank comparatively recently started in New York which holds a million dollars of the Government money. I want to call the attention of the Senate to how this money got into the bank. We can not have forgotten that the Western National Bank of New York was organized in New York by the late Secretary of the Treasury, now dead, and Mr. Jordan, formerly Treasurer of the United States. I find this letter, written on the 8th day of October, 1887, dated at Washington and directed to the Treasurer of the United States:

SIR: The Western National Bank of New York City has been designated a United States depository, and the security fixed for the present at $1,000,000 of United States 4 per cent. bonds. In order to avoid the usual delay in obtaining a balance by accumulating revenue deposits, I will thank you, when the bonds are received, to cause to be transferred to said bank from national-bank depositories other than those in New York City such amounts as may be deposited therein to the credit of your general account in excess of their authorized balances, until the sum of $1,100,000 is reached, which amount the Western National Bank will be authorized to hold as a fixed balance.

Respectfully, yours,

C. S. FAIRCHILD, *Secretary.*

A fixed balance. How long is it to be held? If that had occurred under a Republican administration it would have been said that that was a pet bank. You draw the money out of the bank outside of New York City, disturb the business of the country, take it out of a bank that has Government deposits and is as much entitled to them as this Western bank; you take out its deposits for the purpose of putting them in this bank at New York City, dominated and controlled by late officials of the Treasury Department.

Yet we are told that there has been no favoritism in this transaction; that all the banks of the country have fared alike. Whether that is true or false is immaterial in this discussion. The question is, has the Treasury Department managed the finances of the country with economy and with skill?

A careful analysis of the several extracts I have gone over to-day will show without a question that the Treasury Department has lost to the Government since it went into power of money, that should have been saved, not less than $10,000,000. It is a vast sum of money to take out of the tax-payers of this country for the benefit of the national banks and national bondholders; men who do but little towards encouraging the industrial pursuits of the country; men who do not, it is believed by a great majority of the people of this country, bear their due proportion of the public burdens. Why should they be picked out to lend money to? Why, on the contrary, should we not go to work and pay off the public debt, and reduce the surplus, and reduce the taxation by way of interest?

Mr. President, the close of this Administration is at hand. If there was time I do not know but that I should be inclined to compare the financial management of this Administration and its general management with the administration that preceded it or the administration preceding that. But before I leave this question I desire to insert as part of my remarks a statement that I find in the New York Sun criticising the action of the Treasury Department:

Secretary Fairchild has raised his limit for the purchase of United States 4 per cent. bonds to 130, and at that figure has just bought $6,340,350 of them. In January last the Secretary could have purchased these bonds at from 125 to 126. In the same month of January he deposited with certain favored national banks $30,000,000 and upward of public money free of interest, with which he could have bought $24,000,000 of bonds. Adding to the 130 he is now paying for them the 2 per cent. interest paid since January brings their cost to the Government up to 132, as against say 126, which the cost would have been if he had bought them in January. Here is a dead loss to the national Treasury of 6 per cent. on $24,000,000, or $1,440,000, and a corresponding profit to the banks which bought the bonds and pledged them to the Treasury. This might have been avoided, and could have been avoided by the exercise of a little common sense. What says the President?

I also submit the following table showing the surplus in the Treasury:

Net cash (surplus in Treasury) on dates stated, as shown by public-debt statements from July 31, 1885, to August 31, 1888.

March 4, 1885, commencement of Cleveland's Administration (Finance Report, 1885, pages 12, 13)	$8,764,590.11	November 30, 1886	$40,093,556.22
July 31, 1885	44,052,929.35	December 31, 1886	42,196,632.77
August 31, 1885	49,716,572.69	January 31, 1887	27,780,050.87
September 30, 1885	63,903,106.30	February 28, 1887	19,148,975.45
October 31, 1885	66,818,292.38	March 31, 1887	2,859,983.51
November 30, 1885	61,950,595.34	April 30, 1887	34,886,038.20
December 31, 1885	71,018,872.23	May 31, 1887	23,951,692.44
January 31, 1886	79,689,862.24	June 30, 1887	40,883,369.28
February 28, 1886	72,298,202.92	July 31, 1887	45,698,594.15
March 31, 1886	76,381,099.54	August 31, 1887	44,760,908.86
April 30, 1886	77,030,999.35	September 30, 1887	48,269,665.15
May 31, 1886	76,142,611.33	October 31, 1887	56,758,704.83
June 30, 1886	75,191,109.95	November 30, 1887	55,258,701.19
July 31, 1886	80,206,325.98	December 31, 1887	69,842,879.11
August 31, 1886	76,527,561.24	January 31, 1888	85,230,746.09
September 30, 1886	67,896,321.01	February 29, 1888	92,987,796.82
October 31, 1887	52,783,199.98	March 31, 1888	104,573,930.34
		April 30, 1888	110,244,969.60
		May 31, 1888	94,706,617.08
		June 30, 1888	103,220,464.71
		August 31, 1888	107,673,329.92

Mr. President, since I have been a member of the Senate I have been exceedingly careful to say nothing harsh, nothing not supported by the evidence, in regard to public officials. I do not now desire to say anything harsh of the present or past administration of the Treasury Department. I have submitted these facts. I have submitted them for the benefit of those who profess to believe that there has been a wise, economical administration of the finances of this country. I have submitted them for the benefit of the people who are about to vote upon the succession of the Administration, and who are to determine whether they want the silver dollars destroyed. I want them to understand that that is a cardinal feature of the faith of this Administration. I want them to understand that it is a further idea to destroy the greenbacks. I want them to understand that this Administration has paid out with laggard steps the surplus money on the public debt only when compelled by resolutions of the House and Senate and by public opinion that would no longer be stayed. They have been compelled to pay, and have paid, as I said before, with laggard steps, with delay and hesitation the money of the people on the public debt.

The Senator from Alabama [Mr. PUGH] asked me if the Southern Senators had not stood up for silver, and if they were not now charged with having attempted to destroy the industrial interests of the North. I do not mean to say here or anywhere else that they have willfully and intentionally gone into a scheme to destroy the industrial interests of this country. I know the charge has been made. I could not make it here properly, if I believed it. I should be loath to believe that there was so much of the old venom and rancor left in Senators from the Southern States that they would willfully inflict upon the Northern people an injury. I am bound in honesty of mind to believe that it is owing to their faulty education, that it is owing to the surroundings and to the false teachings of which the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. PLATT] spoke so vigorously a few days since. The fact is that the Southern people have been brought up in a different political school from ours. They have inherited different political ideas, and strange as it may seem, with the great prosperity of the North before them, with all the examples held up to them in the North and in the East and in the West of unexampled prosperity under the protective system, they are unable to see them, and instead of applying them to their own region of country, and getting some of the benefits of this wonderful progress and wonderful prosperity, they on the contrary say that they would return to the old ideas, that they would have no manufactures, or but few; that they would be agriculturists, and they would put us upon a free-trade basis.

I will admit that within a few days it has been denied that they would put us upon a free-trade basis. The Senator from Missouri [Mr. COCKRELL] disclaimed yesterday that he was a free-trader; other Senators have declared that they were not free-traders; but no Democratic Senator save one has stood on this floor and declared that he was a protectionist. I believe perhaps one or two others, if they had expressed themselves, would have been compelled to say they were protectionists; but not exceeding three men on that side of the Chamber will rise here

and say they are in favor of the doctrine of protection. When it was asserted that that doctrine had not been supported or advanced on the Democratic side of the House, a prominent Democrat replied, "No, and you will not find it." The Democratic party is not a protection party except just a few days before an election. It has been a free-trade party since 1856, when it declared in its national platform that the time had come for progressive free trade. There has not been an argument adduced on this floor or in the other House by a Democrat which has not been in favor of free trade. They have used all the Cobden Club arguments, they have used all the free-trade arguments, and they have held up to us as an example to follow, Great Britain, with its wonderful prosperity, as they say.

The prosperity of Great Britain was fully explained and shown up by the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. SPOONER] yesterday. There is poverty, distress over all that land, and stagnation of business. The markets of the world are open to them; they have cheap labor, intelligent labor; capital is cheaper there than in any other country on the face of the earth; and yet they are suffering in every department of life, and are fleeing to this country at a rate unexampled and unparalleled in the history of that remarkable country. If the people of the United States want free trade they do not want it because of the prosperity that it has brought to Great Britain. Great Britain is many times poorer than she was fifty years ago. The laborers of Great Britain are in a worse condition now than they were twenty years ago. The Senator from Wisconsin called attention to some statistics that I had handed him. Ninety-two million dollars a year for the poor of Great Britain, $27,000,000 a year for education, science, and art; a million and a quarter people who are called paupers; seven million people in Great Britain who have received assistance from the public authorities. As one of their distinguished men said, every fifth man in the kingdom is toeing the line of pauperism. Is that the kind of a feast to which we are inviting the American people? Oh, no, Mr. President, the economic management and the economic principles of this Democratic Administration do not commend themselves to the American people.

I should like to submit a few extracts that I have here from different speeches made by members of the Democratic party in Congress and out, to show the free-trade tendency of the Democratic party. I will first call attention to the declaration of the Democracy in their platform of 1856:

Resolved, That the time has come for the people of the United States to declare themselves in favor of progressive free trade throughout the world.

Henry George, in a recent number of the Standard, said:

I spent the latter part of last week in Washington. Mr. Cleveland has the reputation of being even a stronger free-trader than his message would indicate—and that is strong enough for all practical purposes. The message, as originally written, is said to have been more radical even than as finally sent in, being modified somewhat at the suggestion of free-trade Democrats, who feared it might be too strong for the party in its demoralized condition on the tariff question.

Mr. Cleveland has burned his ships; he stands before the country a champion of free trade against protection; and he must make, as he has ample power to do, the weak and treacherous politicians of New York and other doubtful States accept that position or go into opposition; else in spite of the splendid courage he has heretofore shown, they will involve him in the fate that in affairs of great moment befalls the timid.

The way to win is to silence apologists, send skulkers and cowards to the rear, and face the music. If Mr. Cleveland is re-elected, as with courage I believe he will be, protection will have received its death-blow.

The London Daily News of July 6, 1888, has the following editorial on this subject:

President Cleveland's speech is more to the point. He discusses the principles at issue in the struggle and shows that he is the free-trade candidate in everything but name. The reservation is an important one for American party purposes. The President feels compelled to characterize the attempt to brand him as a free-trader as deception, but for all that the electoral conflict now in progress is a conflict between free trade and protection, and nothing less. This is a very good conflict as things go, and, like warfare between good and evil, it threatens to be perpetual. Mr. Cleveland may find a more formidable antagonist in General Harrison than we have been led to suspect.

The Philadelphia Press displayed in its editorial columns the following editorial from the London Globe:

As a rule, the Presidential contest has very little interest for the Old World. On the present occasion, however, an issue is involved which very closely concerns Europe, more particularly Great Britain. Mr. Cleveland has taken his stand on free trade, and although his party managers have considerably pinned down his platform, he is universally recognized in the States as pledged to initiate a new departure in fiscal policy, nor can there be any doubt that he would act up to this understanding were he elected. The central issue of the contest lies between the maintenance of the present fiscal system intact and its modification in the direction of free trade. And on that broad question Mr. Cleveland's candidature naturally and necessarily carries English sympathy.

[London Times of July 6, 1888.]

It would hardly be possible to put the free-trade case more clearly or more strongly, and yet such is the force of words, President Cleveland shrinks from the use of the term "free trade," and in fact declares that those who taunt him with being a free-trader are deceiving the country. "Free trade" appears to be equivalent, in the language of American political controversy, to "enemy of the workingmen and of industrial enterprises."

That it should be so is one of the curiosities of politics, and an extraordinary instance of the power of a phrase even over minds which are commonly shrewd and reasonable; for it is certain that the arguments which President Cleveland urges are those which Cobden used to employ forty-five years ago, and which any English free-trader would employ now. Such propositions as that taxation ought to be strictly limited by the needs of the country; that it is unjust to tax the whole community for the benefit of special classes; that import duties stifle production and limit the area of a country's markets, are purely free-trade arguments. As such we are very glad to see President Cleveland using them, though we are sorry for the popular infatuation which makes it dangerous to give them their right name.

[London Iron and Steel Trades Journal, July 7, 1888.]

There can be no doubt that President Cleveland is one of the most sound economists of the day, and his speeches display the most thorough grasp of commercial questions. The recent remarks in which he stated that it is the clear right of the people to demand that the cost of government should be limited by frugality and its burden of expenditure by actual needs are worthy of J. S. Mill himself.

[Speech of Hon. C. R. Breckinridge, of Arkansas, in House of Representatives, May 17, 1888.]

Of course any reduction of excessive rates of tariff taxation is in the direction of free trade. I do not seek to conceal my own belief in the wisdom of the greatest possible freedom of trade from all hindrance and restrictions.

[Speech of Hon. John H. O'Neall, of Indiana, in House of Representatives, May 14, 1888.]

As a free-trader—and I claim to be one—I protest against making the tariff so high as to destroy competition from abroad.

[Speech of Hon. R. P. Bland, of Missouri, in House of Representatives, July 19, 1888.]

I am not here for the purpose of voting for a tariff on lead, or a tariff on flax, or a tariff on anything, but I am here to get the tariff off everything I can. I am in a combine for the purpose of reducing taxes, and I will vote for a bill with free lead, or free anything else in it to accomplish that purpose.

[Speech of Hon. S. S. Cox, of New York, in House of Representatives, May 18, 1888.]

There was no warrant in England, there is no warrant here, either by natural laws or State laws, or constitutional requirement, to restrict such freedom of exchange for the personal or class interests of any one, any more than there is a warrant for a State religion or the abridgment of speech, press, and suffrage. * * * Freedom, not only to work as we please, but to dispose of the product of our work as we please; freedom to spend our money where we can get the most for it, and freedom to make that money without the ignominy of enslaving statutes.

[Speech of Hon. Silas Hare, of Texas, in House of Representatives, May 12, 1888.]

I believe that a tariff for protection is the foundation and principal cause of all the complaints and unrest that have either threatened or actually disturbed the public peace and quiet for years. * * * If we did not require money to defray the expenses of Government, I would be an absolute and uncompromising free-trader.

[Speech of Hon. Peter T. Glass, of Tennessee, in House of Representatives, April 26, 1888.]

I am in favor of putting all the raw materials of manufacture on the free-list, including salt, coal, iron ore, copper, timber, and lumber, together with every article now on the free-list.

[Speech of Hon. L. F. McKinney, of New Hampshire, in House of Representatives, May 4, 1888.]

Give us a free and open market with the world, break down the barriers that a false system has built around us, go back once more to the principles of true Democracy. As an abstract question of right, who is there who dares to say, with his hand upon his heart, looking to God, "I have not the right, the God-given, inalienable right, to buy what I may need or require wherever I can buy it most cheaply?" Not one.

[Speech of Hon. J. B. McCreary, of Kentucky, in House of Representatives, May 2, 1888.]

I am glad to be a member of a Congress to which a President sent an annual message entirely on tax reform, and which is true to the principles and teachings of the Democratic party from its organization by Jefferson at the beginning of this century to the present time.

[Speech of Hon. W. J. Stone, of Kentucky, in House of Representatives, May 16, 1888.]

The North yet worships the shrine of protection, but the handwriting is on the wall and that idea is doomed to pass out of the list of American idols.

[Speech of Hon. Isidor Rayner, of Maryland, in House of Representatives, May 1, 1888.]

But, Mr. Chairman, I appeal to the Democracy here to stand true to their colors. [Applause on the Democratic side.] I appeal to them to stand up to the traditions of our party. A tariff for anything else than revenue is outside the traditions and principles of our party, and at war with its pledges and history. It is foreign to our platform. We have given to the people the assurances of our intention to do this. Let us prove our faith by our works. [Applause on the Democratic side.] Let us engrave upon the imperishable tablets of the law the truth of the doctrine we have proclaimed. A man can not, at this time, upon this floor, be a Democrat and be in favor of the continuance of the present system.

[Speech of Hon. Edward Lane, of Illinois, in House of Representatives, May 12, 1888.]

Free trade is the natural right of commerce. * * * Protection is forever a cheat and delusion. * * * Protection is not right. * * * It should be an inherent right in every American citizen to sell his labor and his wares where he can get the best price, and to buy where he can buy the cheapest. * * * The protective system is un-American, and is a perversion of the laws of nature, of God, and man.

[Speech of Hon. Charles T. O'Ferrall, of Virginia, in House of Representatives, May 2, 1888.]

"Tariff for revenue" is the motto which I have tacked to the masthead, and if I shall fall, I shall fall with my face to the enemy still crying aloud against the oppression of my people. I intend to stand by, uphold, and defend, as far as God has given me the ability, the underlying principles of Democracy upon this question. I may be a weak defender of the right, but I will at least be a bold one. The flag of tariff for revenue will soon float in triumph, and when victory is once inscribed upon it, the child has not been born that will ever see defeat written over it. * * * Sir, I believe commerce between nations should be relieved, as far as possible, of all fetters and all restraints.

[Speech of Hon. Edward Lane, of Illinois, in House of Representatives, July 16, 1888.]

I am for free and unrestricted interchange of commodities with the whole world (with a tariff for revenue only). If this is free trade, then I am a free-

trader from the topmost hair of my head to the lowest extremity of my feet, in every nerve and fiber of my being, and I will not be driven from it by the taunts of any set of men or party.

[Senator Coke.]

I will just say to the Senator that if there is any one thing in this world the average Texan would go any number of miles out of his way to kick and kill and destroy it is a protective tariff.

[Roger Q. Mills's speech at East St. Louis, Ill., September 25, 1888.]

If Grover Cleveland is re-elected President of the United States—as he will be [a voice: "He will that"]; if another Democratic House of Representatives is chosen, and if we can get our Republican friends out of the other end of the Capitol and get Democrats in place of them, then we will pass a tariff bill that puts raw materials all on the free-list, and then we will put our own intelligent and skillful and productive labor in this country upon a plane of equality with the laborers of all other countries.

I call attention, also, to an extract from the Memphis Appeal, one of the leading Democratic papers published in the South, in which it says:

We lay down concisely, and we trust clearly, the Democratic doctrine of free trade, which is as old as the birth of the party. The Democratic party was always known as the party that strictly construed the Constitution, and was therefore opposed to the levy or collection of a tax for any other purpose than the support of the Government, and was equally as rigidly opposed to the appropriation of public moneys for any other purpose, its motive in its first and most notable campaign being "free trade and sailors' rights." The doubtful States have long been familiar with the fact that the Democratic party is the free-trade party, and they know that any attempt to reconcile it to protection in any form, shape, character, or degree would be an abandonment of principle that would and of right ought to cover it with obloquy and disgrace.

I have here an extract from the letter of the Senator from Missouri [Mr. VEST]. I had made the extract before I heard his explanation of the letter. His statement was that—

We are entering upon a most fearful Presidential contest, the most important since that of 1860. Mr. Cleveland, by his message, for which I sincerely honor him, has challenged the protected industries of the country to a fight of extermination.

I understand the Senator to simply say that he wrote this in a private letter; I do not understand that the Senator now disavows the sentiments that are there expressed. I do not understand that the Senator indicates that he is in favor of protection under any system or any form whatever, but on the contrary, that protection is as odious to him as to all others of his party.

Mr. President, I do not believe that I can conclude my remarks any better than by calling the attention of the country to the remarks made by the great German, Bismarck, on the question of protection in America. Our remarkable success, our wonderful progress, unequaled in the annals of history, that has astonished the world, as it has astonished ourselves, he attributes to the protective tariff, and advises Germany, who follows readily his advice, to adopt the same system, and the result shows that the labor wages of Germany, which were very low and very much depressed under free trade, have gradually risen under the system of protection, and they will rise ultimately undoubtedly until they reach a rate equal to our own. I admit that a tariff does not make wages higher except that it produces and provides employment, furnishes opportunity for men, and thus it does make wages higher.

On the 14th of May, 1882, Bismarck, in a speech before the German Reichstag, said:

The success of the United States in material development is the most illustrious of modern time. The American nation has not only successfully borne and suppressed the most gigantic and expensive war of all history, but immediately afterwards disbanded its army, found employment for all its soldiers and marines, paid off most of its debt, gave labor and homes to all the unemployed of Europe as fast as they could arrive within its territory, and still by a system of taxation so indirect as not to be perceived, much less felt. Because it is my deliberate judgment that the prosperity of America is mainly due to its system of protective laws, I urge that Germany has now reached that point where it is necessary to imitate the tariff system of the United States.

Mr. MORGAN obtained the floor.

PROPOSED RECESS—FINAL ADJOURNMENT.

Mr. ALLISON. If the Senator from Alabama will yield to me, I desire to offer at this time a concurrent resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. DOLPH in the chair). The resolution will be read.

The Secretary read as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That at 1 o'clock p. m. on Saturday, the 20th day of October, instant, the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives adjourn their respective Houses, to meet on Monday, the 19th day of November next, at 12 o'clock m.

Mr. ALLISON. I will say in offering this resolution, as I stated the day before yesterday to the Senator from Georgia [Mr. BROWN], that I am satisfied we can make but little further progress with the revenue bill now. I propose this recess for the reason that it will give us two weeks before the beginning of the regular session in which to go on with the bill and make it absolutely certain, as far as the Senate is concerned, that it can be passed before the 1st of January. That is the only motive I have in suggesting a recess.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Iowa ask for the present consideration of the resolution?

Mr. ALLISON. I ask unanimous consent that it may be considered.

Mr. COCKRELL. I desire to suggest to the Senator from Iowa that it would be better to refer the resolution, to-day at least, to a select committee of, say, five Senators. It would be hardly fair to refer it to the Committee on Finance or the Committee on Appropriations.

In regard to the propriety of the recess suggested, I have very serious doubts. The Senator admits frankly that nothing can be done during the remaining days between this time and the election. That being the fact, I do not think final action upon the bill will be hastened by bringing Congress back here on the 19th day of November. If Congress were to take a recess until that time, it would be exceedingly inconvenient for the members of the other House to come here and practically have nothing to do. It is very doubtful whether there would be a full Senate at that time, and it would be only two weeks before the beginning of the regular session. That would only give us twelve days after the election.

I suggest to the Senator that it would be better, in the interest of the early passage of the bill, to have an adjournment until the regular session, and then let the Senator give notice that on the second day of that regular session he will call the bill up for action, and that he will press it, and will oppose any adjournment for the Christmas holidays. In that way he would secure the passage of the bill just as early as by having Congress meet on the 19th day of November. For one, I will pledge myself in advance, if that is done, that I shall oppose any regular recess during the holidays, except simply an adjournment over from one day to another, or two or three days before Christmas, and the same way at New Year's. So we should have all the time to devote to the bill, and I think with that understanding members of the Senate and House would all come here with that expectation, and there would be no calculation of the ordinary adjournment for the Christmas holidays, which ought never to be done, I will say, at a short session of Congress.

There is a reason why a long holiday recess is taken at the beginning of a regular Congress. It is a rare thing after the Speaker is elected and the officers of the House chosen that the committees are formed and ready to be announced until after the 1st of January. Therefore very little can be done before the holidays are over. In the Senate we organize our committees at the beginning of a regular Congress and arrange all the business, which takes some time, and when that has been done it is usually time to take the recess. But I say that the habit of Congress taking a long recess in the short session is pernicious and injurious to the public business, and we ought to break it up, and there is no better time in the world to put a stop to it than this year.

I think that it would be in the interest of the promotion of final action upon the bill if instead of taking a recess until the 19th of November we should substitute an adjournment until the regular session.

Mr. HOAR. The course which the Senator suggests was taken in the short session in 1883, when the large reduction in the tariff duties and extension of the free-list was made.

Mr. COCKRELL. I remember; and that course ought to be followed at every short session.

Mr. ALLISON. My only object in saving the two weeks prior to the regular session is that the Senate may go on and consider the revenue bill. Whether we meet on the 19th of November or on the first Monday in December, it is my purpose, and so far as I know, the purpose of this side of the Chamber, to press the bill to the exclusion of all other business. Of course in a matter of this importance we should consider the convenience of Senators and the probability of securing a full attendance, because I think Senators will all agree that in a matter of this moment there should be a full attendance in the Senate. Senators very well know that the Senate has been thin for some days. There has not been that full attendance in the Senate which there ought to be in the consideration of so important a bill as this.

Mr. BROWN. Will the Senator from Iowa allow me to ask him a question?

Mr. ALLISON. Yes, sir.

Mr. BROWN. After the Senate has been ten and a half months in session, when Senators can not at most have more than a month and ten days, say, of vacation, does the Senator believe that he could get a quorum of the two Houses, or anything like a full Senate or House, to return here on the 19th of November?

Mr. ALLISON. I hoped that could be done. The time fixed is two weeks after the election. Senators would be gathering in, I should think.

Mr. BROWN. Does the Senator think it reasonably probable that it could be done?

Mr. ALLISON. I think so.

Mr. REAGAN. Mr. President, it is apparent that we are not going to make any progress during the remainder of this session in the investigation of the bill before the Senate. Congress has been in session nearly eleven months. The individual convenience of members, of course, is not to be very largely considered. I have not seen my home in more than eleven months. I do not feel, for one, that I can well return here by the 19th of November.

I concur with the Senator from Missouri. If Congress can be adjourned until the regular meeting, I will unite with those who desire to prevent a holiday recess and to urge the consideration of the revenue bill until it is disposed of. I feel that that is necessary; that the interests of the country require it. If the bill is to be disposed of, it

ought to be disposed of so that the business interests of the country may not continue to be disturbed by keeping the tariff question open. I believe the bill ought to be disposed of, and I am sorry that we are not able to dispose of it at this session. If Congress can be adjourned, I say in advance that I will assist in retaining the Senate in session during the time usually spent in holidays and in urging the consideration of this bill until it is disposed of.

I think a good deal of inconvenience in many respects would result from taking a recess now. From now until election day, the 6th of November, very little opportunity will be allowed to Senators to attend to any of their own business, which has been neglected now for nearly a year. Between the election and the 19th, less the time required to get back here, scarcely any time would be allowed to Senators to look after their affairs at home. It seems to me that Senators ought to have three or four weeks to look after the condition of their business at home.

I hope it may be agreeable to the Senate to adjourn with the understanding that in order to facilitate action upon the tariff bill we shall avoid the usual holiday recess and go on with the consideration of the bill until it is disposed of.

Mr. COCKRELL. I think that the Senator from Iowa will see at once the propriety of changing the resolution as I have indicated. While as a matter of course we know there are not Senators enough here personally to make any binding obligation, I am satisfied that all on this side of the Chamber who are here will concur in the statement that we will oppose any of the ordinary motions for a recess during the Christmas holidays, and will join with the Senator from Iowa in securing continued consideration of the bill from the day of the regular meeting of Congress until final action is had upon it, as my friends here suggest, sitting on Fridays and Saturdays. In other words, we will devote the time assiduously to the consideration of the bill, and the Senator from Iowa may rest assured there will be no opposition to final action upon the bill on this side of the Chamber. There will be no attempt to delay action at all. Action will be facilitated by the course I suggest.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. Does the Senator from Iowa ask for the present consideration of the resolution?

Mr. ALLISON. I ask for its present consideration.

Mr. COCKRELL. I move that the resolution be referred to a select committee to be appointed by the Chair, to consist of five Senators. I think that course would be better.

Mr. HALE. I suggest to the Senator from Iowa, in order to bring this matter to a head, that there is a great deal of force in the suggestions which have been made by the Senator from Missouri and other Senators upon that side of the Chamber. To come here at any time in the middle of November or soon afterwards would be a matter of great inconvenience, and it would be doubtful whether many Senators could be got here.

In view of the earnest, and so far as we have seen, unanimous, expression upon the other side in favor of an adjournment rather than a recess, and in view of what has been said by the Senator from Texas as to what would be his course in pushing forward the revenue bill at the regular session, I suggest to the Senator from Iowa whether it would not be wise, rather than to delay action or send the resolution to any committee, to substitute for his resolution for a recess one that shall provide for an adjournment instead, in accordance with the suggestions which have been made upon the other side.

Mr. SAULSBURY. Mr. President, I concur in the propriety of the suggestion made by the Senator from Missouri and the Senator from Maine. Personally I have no special objection to coming here on the 19th of November, but I am satisfied that we should not have a majority here. I think it has been apparent to the country for the last several weeks that no tariff bill would be passed at the present session. The attempt to pass one on the part of the Senate has been in the estimation of the country but a farce, as it was very apparent that no bill could be passed at the present session. I do not care to continue any longer what in the judgment of the country is a farce.

If we are going to adjourn, let us adjourn to the regular term. We all know if we come back here in November there will be no tariff bill passed during the present session, and we might just as well adjourn at once; and we could have adjourned six weeks ago with just as much propriety as we can to-day, in my judgment. I have been ready myself, whenever a proper resolution should come, to vote for an adjournment.

Mr. ALLISON. Yesterday the Senator from Missouri [Mr. COCKRELL] during the course of his remarks took occasion to say that the Senate substitute was a mere temporary arrangement, that so far as the Senate was concerned it was a play, and the venerable Senator from Delaware [Mr. SAULSBURY] now intimates the same thing.

Mr. President, I want to test the sense of the Senate, and both sides of it, as to whether it is our purpose to pass a tariff bill or not. My object in proposing a recess instead of an adjournment is that if it is necessary that we should pass a tariff bill, we shall go and do it. I have not the slightest doubt that there will be a full quorum of the Senate on this side on the 19th of November, no matter what happens. That is what I believe, and it is for that reason that I propose this recess. I know the views of Senators on both sides of the Chamber as respects this question. I will say frankly to both sides of the Chamber (because there is on this side a desire to adjourn as well as upon that) that—I see that the Senator from Alabama smiles when I make these remarks.

Mr. MORGAN. I was merely smiling at the hole some of our friends have dropped into. That was all. [Laughter.]

Mr. ALLISON. Mr. President, I shall test the sense of the Senate on my resolution.

Mr. BROWN. Does the Senator mean that he will pass it by a majority without a constitutional quorum?

Mr. ALLISON. I mean to say that I shall take the sense of the Senate upon it.

Mr. MORGAN. I object to the consideration of the resolution this morning.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The resolution goes over under the rules until to-morrow, and will be printed.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. CLARK, its Clerk, announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 8074) to provide for allotment of land in severalty to United Peorias and Miamies in Indian Territory.

The message also returned to the Senate, in compliance with its request, the bill (H. R. 1152) for the relief of the legal representatives of Eliza M. Ferris.

The message further announced that the House had passed a bill (H. R. 11599) to authorize the Postmaster-General to rent a suitable building in the city of Washington to be used as a mail-bag repair-shop, and for other purposes; in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED.

The message also announced that the Speaker of the House had signed the enrolled bill (H. R. 1152) for the relief of the legal representatives of Eliza M. Ferris; and it was thereupon signed by the President *pro tempore*.

THE REVENUE LAWS.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 9051) to reduce taxation and simplify the laws in relation to the collection of the revenue.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. President, the resolution just now offered by the Senator from Iowa in charge of this bill [Mr. ALLISON], to take a recess until the 19th of November, alters the apparent situation, but not the real situation, as to legislating upon tariff taxation. The general in command orders the bugles to sound a retreat instead of a surrender, but his army disappears all the same. The fifteen days in November set apart for the discussion of this measure, made to take the place of twenty days between this and the 6th of November—the election day—had just as well be utilized now in debating and voting upon this bill.

I must be pardoned for still doubting as to the real motive of this movement. It seems to me that it is only a *finesse* by which to escape the disclosure of serious disagreement among Republican Senators as to the items of this almost inscrutable bill.

If the Republican majority in the Senate desire that the people shall pass upon the new issue they seek to inject into this campaign—differing widely from the issue presented by the Chicago convention, and still more widely from the platform that General Harrison has been building for his personal use—they should prove their faith by their works. They should stay in this Chamber and vote on this bill, and then the people, in their voting, would better understand who and what they are expected to vote for.

This Chamber has been deserted by the majority, who claim to be the earnest, enlightened, and only capable tariff reformers. They fled from their own bill; they have so managed that no vote on it is possible until the Senators are summoned back by the remnant who linger here to their post of duty, and the resolution just read is intended to excuse them from returning here to vote on this measure.

How long will it be assumed by the Senate that the people can be deceived by the thin varnish of appearances? None of the empty declarations of a purpose to relieve the country from a pressing and dangerous emergency that now echo through this deserted Chamber will strike the public ear with any other than a sense of their insincerity.

The Senate cannot afford to play at this farce in the face of an anxious people.

The people want to know if the subsidized class of monopolists who have so long grown rich upon their toil, through excessive and unjust taxation, are still to throttle them, and whether a day of relief will ever come.

The people have the power now, in this Chamber and in the other House, to get some relief under the Senate bill and greater relief under the House bill. Why not give it to them? Why do we wait until

after the elections to relieve the people unless the majority in the Senate hope that the elections may be construed into an excuse from performing a great duty to the country which the Senate bill confesses and the report of the Committee on Finance emphasizes.

Is the Senate waiting for an excuse to relapse into that state of inaction that has permitted bondholders, money kings, and subsidized parasites to fix their grasp on the taxing power as a means of money-making? The situation of the country was never more dangerous than it is at this hour. Fortunes ranging from $270,000,000 down to the common grade of $1,000,000 each have been amassed within the last twenty years by men who have produced not one dollar of wealth added to the common stock. Nothing but the state of our laws could have given such advantages to such men.

The money contributed to the campaign fund to perpetuate monopoly, under the name of protection, by the subsidized manufacturers, which the Senator from Missouri [Mr. COCKRELL] proved in his speech yesterday, may fasten on this country the perpetuation of this era of the domination of money over the moral power of a free people. If this is to be the result of this movement of the Senate to escape a plain and acknowledged duty, as it is confessed in the bill now before this body, we shall find that a fearful responsibility has been incurred.

November 19 is appointed in this resolve as the day of the expected death of the Senate bill. Unless the people speak out and demand relief in terms that will admit of no denial, they will not escape from the calamity. I say now that they need not expect relief for many years to come, unless in the November election they shall constrain the majority of the Senate at last to obey their often-expressed will.

Turning to the measure before the Senate, I find that the statement of the Senator from Iowa [Mr. ALLISON], first made by him, is that the Senate bill proposes to reduce the revenue an amount ranging from sixty-five to seventy-three million dollars. "We agreed (he says) that from sixty to seventy million reduction would be safe."

His next statement is, "That for the current year (1888–'89) upon the estimate made by the Secretary of the Treasury * * * there will be a surplus of but $19,000,000 in round numbers."

And that estimate of the revenue income, he alleges, is too large.

These statements present us a very urgent inquiry. Why should the Senate Committee on Finance be willing to create a deficit of $46,000,000 in the Treasury? The pressure on them surely must be very great to force them to such desperate legislation.

The reductions made in the Senate bill are stated as follows:

Sugar	$27,759,783.95
Tobacco	24,371,460.98
Whisky	7,000,000.00
Free-list	6,428,095.56
Total	65,559,340.49

Another estimate based on reduced importation of other merchandise puts the total reduction under the Senate bill at $73,668,994.30. This would leave $8,109,653.81 of reduction on all other dutiable imports than those I have just stated. What does this large reduction of revenue imply?

The answers are obvious:

First. That the existing taxes are too large by that amount ($73,668,994.30) and are an injustice to the people.

Second. That it endangers the financial condition of the country to gather such excessive sums into the Treasury.

Third. That it is the consumer and not the foreign producer who pays this tax.

These simple facts, presented in the Senate bill, as a substitute for the House bill, speak volumes as to the earnest progress the people are making and are forcing the majority in the Senate to make both in the reduction of high taxes and high protection.

In the Senate bill there is a very ingenious arrangement to save the grand aggregate of profits to the capitalists by shifting the protection, as it is called, from some classes of articles that now are heavily taxed to others on which it imposes still heavier duties; but there is cause for congratulation to the country that at last the united and consolidated array of all the tax-nurtured classes, as one man, or rather one corporation, against all the consumers of their productions, has been compelled to disintegrate. This bill selects some of them for slaughter, and, without mercy, offers them as a sacrifice to appease the hot indignation of the people.

The House and the Senate committee agree that excessive taxation exists, and they both agree with the President that "excessive taxation is unjust taxation." This agreement with the President goes still further. It is a distinct admission not only that the aggregate of taxation is excessive and unjust, but that the taxes are excessive on several articles of leading importance, such as sugar, rice, and jute. This agreement with the President both by the House and the Senate committee goes still further. They all agree that the financial condition of the country is seriously imperiled by the annual locking up of $120,000,000 in the Treasury, there to remain useless to the country; to tempt Congress to indulge in extravagant and corrupting expenditures in order to get it back again into circulation, and to prevent the starvation of enterprise and industry, from which it is was abstracted.

So anxious are the Senate committees as to the dangers that attend this piling up of money in the Treasury through excessive taxation that they turn aside from the discussion of the remedy for this great evil to berate the President for permitting any of it to remain in the banks where the people can have some chance to use it in moving their crops to market, alleging that such proceeding is unsafe as to the security of the fund. They and their candidate for the Presidency point out that it is even better to buy in our bonds at 129 cents on the dollar, an operation that is expensive and unjust thus to permit the people to have any access to their own money to be used in their daily business.

Remembering that the Republican party made our bonds payable only at the date of maturity, and that the Government could not force their redemption at an earlier date; remembering that the interest to be paid was changed from United States currency to gold, to favor the bondholder; that silver was demonetized by the Republican party, so that this payment of the principal of our bonds should only be made in gold; remembering that the custom-house receipts were pledged for the payment of the interest on our bonds, and that the Republican party has all the time refused to allow the tariff dues to be paid in United States legal-tender notes or in national-bank notes, all for the benefit of the bondholders, it is not to be expected that all the motives for continuing these extraordinary favors to that class have ceased.

Mr. ALDRICH. Will the Senator allow me to interrupt him?

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. Does the Senator from Alabama yield?

Mr. MORGAN. Yes, sir.

Mr. ALDRICH. Do I understand the Senator to say that the customs authorities refuse to receive legal-tender notes in the payment of customs duties?

Mr. MORGAN. No; I did not say that. I said you refused to pass a law to authorize it to be done.

Mr. ALDRICH. It is done now.

Mr. MORGAN. I know it is done. We have asked you time and again on this floor to pass such a law, and you would not do it because you were afraid.

Mr. ALDRICH. What is the occasion of passing it?

Mr. MORGAN. There is occasion always to have a sworn officer obey the law.

Mr. ALDRICH. Nobody has ever questioned the authority of the Secretary.

Mr. MORGAN. There is occasion for having a sworn officer of the Government obey the law, and if the law is such——

Mr. ALDRICH. Does the Senator mean to say that the present Secretary of the Treasury is violating the law by receiving legal tender notes?

Mr. MORGAN. I do not propose to be diverted from this little enterprise now by side-bar questions such as the Senator from Rhode Island desires to put to me.

Mr. HOAR. May I ask the Senator a question?

Mr. MORGAN. No, I beg pardon. I do not wish to be interrupted.

That this favoritism to the bondholders has not ceased is manifest from the declarations of General Harrison, re-enforced by the report of the Senate Committee on Finance, that bonds should be bought in at 128 cents on the dollar, or at whatever price they may reach in the market, and that taxation should be maintained for that purpose. This is a very dangerous avowal of policy.

Is it not as easy to corner the market on the remnant of 4 percents due in October, 1891, as it was for "Old Hutch," as some person is affectionately styled in Chicago, to corner the wheat market and add the tears of the poor as a sauce to make bitter the bread they must eat sparingly to make him richer? Only declare the policy General Harrison has so recklessly avowed, that the surplus revenues must be used in buying our bonds not yet due at whatever is the market premium on them, and it is altogether easy to put up the rate to 130 or 135 if a few capitalists will organize a "trust" for that purpose. All the bondholders, whether in the "trust" or not, would share the benefits of such an opportunity.

In the double duty of buying in the bonds and avoiding the creation of an excited and advancing market, the Secretary of the Treasury has been compelled to demonstrate to the bondholders that they were not the only channel through which the people could still have some benefit from the money that the cruel tariff now in force dragged from their pockets and locked up in the Treasury. He has done this in a way that the laws enacted by the Republican party justified, and has saved the country from the rapacious greed of the bondholders and their friends in Congress.

One of three alternatives was forced upon the Secretary of the Treasury by the existing state of the laws, which the Democratic party have been unable to change, and he has chosen that which was least favorable to the "coupon clippers" and most favorable to the people. He was compelled to leave the surplus money in the vaults of the Treasury, where it was dead, or pay it out to bondholders at enormous premiums, or else leave it in the national depositories—the banks—where it is held under the ample security of our bonds, and could still be in reach of the demands of the people for means to carry on their business.

It is claimed that the Government saves something in the final interest account—in the long run—by paying this enormous premium to the bondholder. If that is true in a final balance-sheet, how does the result compare with the losses now being sustained by the people in having $128,000,000 taken from their business to-day in order to pay that sum, ten years or twenty years in advance of its maturity?

Whether or not the Government loses money by this operation, the people not only lose it at a fearful rate in their business, but they lose it in that hardest of all impositions upon commerce and industry which compels an encroachment upon the capital needed to carry on any form of trade by compelling them to pay the principal and interest to-day on debts that fall due twenty years after date. No legitimate business can stand such depletions. High taxation to compel the people to raise money to-day to pay the principal and interest of a public debt to mature twenty years hence is the least justifiable, the most oppressive, and the most cruel tyranny that was ever practiced in the name and under color of the laws. And to do this, to put money in the pockets of a legalized monopoly, or to enrich one class at the expense of another is an abuse of the taxing power for which there can be no excuse.

Notwithstanding the fact that General Harrison and the Chicago convention regard this as an inconvenient time to stop the raid of the bondholders and the subsidized classes upon the earnings of the people, and have no quarrel with the annual excessive taxation of $120,000,000, because the bondholders can so profitably absorb it at 29 per cent. premium on their bonds, and because the protected capitalists can realize from it much larger percentages in their profits, the country will welcome these eleventh-hour comers into the vineyard, the Senate committee, with their pruning-hooks and leather aprons, prepared to cut off this parasitical excrescence. They come very late, and angrily threatening to cut the tendrils of the true vine; but since the Democracy have at last forced them to work for the country instead of the lords of the vineyard, we will have a care that they shall do no serious harm.

They come protesting that their labors are all for the benefit of foreign capital and foreign pauper labor, who, they allege, are the real taxpayers, but they feel that this is an error which they have not yet the courage to recant in words.

In their speeches they cling to this error, but they abandon it in their bill and come squarely abreast with the President in declaring that unnecessary taxation is an unjust taxation, and that this excess of $73,668,999.30 is an unjust tax and must be pruned off, leaving the true vine to grow and bear fruit. The logic of their speeches is in deadly conflict with the logic of this Senate bill.

The Secretary of the Treasury, in a speech in New York last week, has so clearly stated the manner in which this Administration has used the surplus revenue that the present unjust and dangerous tariff has poured into the Treasury that I gladly avail of this opportunity to present it to the Senate. It is an answer to statements and questions put in the Senate by the Senator from Iowa [Mr. ALLISON], which, I trust, will convince him that he has not fully comprehended all the reasons that dictated this wise policy.

> The present Administration upon coming into power found many difficult problems to deal with. My predecessor was confronted at the outset by a general alarm as to the future of our circulating medium. This alarm was, as would now appear, premature, but it was very real, and threatened disaster. He met it by various devices, which averted the danger and allayed fear. Among these devices was the suspension of bond calls until such a state of things was reached that every kind of our money was received with confidence by our people in every part of the Union. On March 31, 1885, there was a surplus in the Treasury of $22,256,025.76. This surplus increased until on January 31, 1886, it was $79,689,862.24. The ownership of silver dollars by the Government also increased from $43,878,256 to $93,959,880. Thus the surplus formed a reservoir which caught and held that kind of money which the people did not wish to hold themselves. This temporary accumulation in the Treasury the then Secretary believed would keep those silver dollars which the people still held as valuable as they were when paid to them by the Government. The result justified his belief.
>
> At this time confidence had then fairly well been restored, and bond calls began again, and were made in such amounts as to prevent any further accumulation of surplus until August, 1886, when I, then being Acting Secretary of the Treasury, deemed it prudent and wise to increase the amount of each call, the result of which was the reduction of the surplus on February 28, 1887, to $19,148,975.45, or $3,000,000 less than the Administration found it on assuming power two years before. When we began calling the bonds there were $194,190,500 of 3 percents subject to call. The last of these bonds was called in July 1, 1887, and at the end of that month we had a surplus of $45,698,594.15, to which the revenues were daily adding, and there were no bonds which could be called or bought, except on such terms as the holders thereof might demand. Money soon became in sharp demand, bank reserves were low, timid capital was seeking safety, business men became alarmed, and were pressing in their appeals to the Treasury Department to save the country from financial disaster; therefore all the remaining bonds needed for the sinking fund during the fiscal year ended June 30, 1888, were purchased between July 31 and October 1, 1887, at a total premium of $2,852,015.88, and thus the surplus was kept from increasing during those two months.
>
> After the sinking-fund requirements had been met, there was no indisputably lawful method left to avert surplus accumulation. An increase of Government deposits in national-bank depositories was the only certainly lawful means left to save the country from the evils which a rapid withdrawal of the circulating medium from the channels of business might cause, consequently the banks were urged to become depositors, and thus put at least a portion of the daily surplus of the Government where it might be available for trade. As a further inducement to do this the percentage of deposits to the par value of the United States bonds, which were in all instances taken as security, was somewhat raised, but always was kept within the limits of absolute safety. In fact, the money thus deposited was and is far more amply secured than the money in the subtreasuries; there is no possibility of the loss of a dollar of these deposits. The banks, particularly in this city, at first were reluctant to take deposits, and for a time I feared that this resource might fail, but gradually more and more banks applied, until about $40,000,000 above what would have been the normal deposits under proper conditions was thus placed and made available for the country's business. I need not add that there was absolutely no favoritism in this matter; the banks were designated and deposits made in the order of the applications; political and personal friends and foes were treated exactly alike, the widest possible distribution was sought, until almost every State and Territory had one or more depositories, and could use some of the money which rightfully belonged to their business.
>
> Our critics say: But you ought to have bought bonds; the law gave you ample power; you could have saved interest on the bonds bought. In reply, I say that considering the large sums of money which we knew that we must invest in bonds, and which we have since invested in them, I believe that had we attempted to spend $40,000,000 in the purchase of bonds between October 1 and December 31, 1887, the price of the bonds would have advanced much more than it did, and that the net result now would be a much greater outlay in premiums than the interest which would have been saved had the bonds been bought. I say further that many good authorities doubted the lawful power to pay premiums for any but sinking-fund purposes; the purchase was not absolutely necessary; and consequently we deemed it best to adopt the conservative course and keep within unquestioned law and await the advice of Congress, then to meet within two months. The question involved was the use of the public money in the payment of high premiums on the debt not yet due. I am accused of overcaution in doing this, of anxiety, to be sure, that it had the sanction of the law-making power; if this be a crime in an executive officer, then I am guilty.
>
> * * * * * * * *
>
> Mr. Blaine says that a deposit of $1,000,000 is worth to the depository $50,000 a year. Let us see how this is. A deposit of $1,000,000 would require $910,000 in 4 per cent. bonds as the security, which, at 125, would have cost $1,137,500. This money loaned at 5 per cent. would have given the bank $56,875, if the bank had not become a depository, but, being a depository, it must keep 25 per cent. of the deposit as a reserve; so it can loan but $750,000, which produces $37,500 interest. Now add the interest on the United States bonds, which Mr. Blaine with horror says that the banks are allowed to collect. Four per cent. on $910,000 is $36,000, and you have $73,500 received by the depository; but from this should be deducted 1½ per cent., the yearly proportion of the 25 per cent. premium which the owner of the bonds must lose when the bonds are paid at maturity, twenty years from date of purchase, and there is left $62,525, the difference between which and $56,875 is $5,650, not $50,000, as stated by Mr. Blaine, as the reward to the bank for serving as the medium to put a million of dollars where it could be useful at a time of dire necessity.

The report of the Senate Committee on Finance is both a confession and a demonstration of the fallacy that the taxes on imports, sold in our markets, is a tax on the foreign producer and not on the consumer. No other subject but tax-fed monopoly would ever find logicians ready to uphold so bold and misleading an error as this. I rejoice that this committee has marched over the débris of this absurd proposition that has so long done service to injustice and wrong. If the existing revenues from taxation are too large by the sum of $73,668,999.30 annually collected, how do we give any relief to our people by reducing the tax; if it is true that it is the foreign producer and not the home consumer, who pays this tax? It can not possibly hurt our people to have high taxation on any imported goods if those taxes are, in fact, paid by the foreign producer. This committee solemnly declares, when it brings in this bill, the absurdity of this assertion. They explode it.

They give up this unnecessary tax because it is a burden on our people, for which there is no plea or excuse, and which they are aware that the people will no longer endure.

If it is true that high taxes make low prices by increasing home competition in home production, and if low taxes increase prices, why does this committee lower the taxes on any imported products unless they desire thereby to increase the price of that product. If a high tax lowers prices by increasing competition a low tax must raise them for the same reason. And yet this committee boasts of decreasing some taxes while it deplores increasing others. The proposition that the existing taxes are too high for the good of the people is admitted by this Senate bill just as it is by the House bill, and they both adopt the same rule of measuring the excess of taxation, namely, the sum that the revenue exceeds the utmost probable limit of the needs of the Government.

Both Houses also agree that a reduction of revenue from tariff taxation is a public necessity, and the Senate committee makes a boast of the reduction of tax rates on sugar, jute, and other crude materials in the following sympathetic and gratulatory statements:

> The high rates of duty which have been levied upon this important article of food have not successfully developed the sugar-producing industry of the United States. The great natural advantages which the producers of cane sugars in the tropical islands have over those of the United States preclude domestic competition upon equal terms. If it were not for the fact that parties interested in the production of sugar from sorghum or beets are confident of the rapid development of these industries in the United States the committee would recommend a still greater reduction in the rate of duty upon sugar, as the advantages of this reduction would be felt through a larger circle than any other which could be made in our tariff schedules.

The general drift, therefore, of both bills is towards lower rates of taxation. The ship is unmoored at last and floats with the current of popular feeling and of American policy. The ice nip in which it was frozen has thawed in the warm breath of an indignant people, and the Republican committee of the Senate are coming in "out of the cold."

The Republican minority of the House Committee on Ways and Means could neither be driven nor induced to formulate a bill to reduce taxes.

In debate they could not deny the necessity for such reduction, but the winter was still upon them. It was too early in the contest for them to feel sensibly that the country was growing hot for a relaxa-

tion of excessive taxation, and they flattered themselves that they could still defeat the progress of the people towards justice and equal rights under the laws, by debate, protestation, and inaction. They resolved to "hold the fort" as long as its walls would stand, and to refuse any line of action that would expose them and their "infant-industry" protégés to a contest in the open fields. It is well known to the country that the obstruction and delay of tariff reform, which began in 1880, was kept up through all the years to 1888, by the Republicans in the House, as a body, and that in the proceedings during this Congress on the tariff bill this delay has taken the form of obstinate resistance to any tax reform.

The Republicans of the House declined to act upon this great public duty which the Republicans of the Senate declare to be incumbent on them and too imperative to be neglected. They offered no relief to the country, they suggested no remedy; they only opposed all progress in that direction by objections to any plan the Democrats could suggest, and by compelling all the delay that was possible in the passage of the bill.

When the "Mills bill" reached the Senate, more than two months ago, there was anxious conference in the Republican circle. It was found that the pledges of Republican national conventions, the recommendations of Republican Presidents, and the findings and recommendations of a Republican tariff commission, and the speeches of Republican Senators were such solemn committals to the people of the country that the tariff taxes should be reformed and the revenue reduced, that the Senate could not afford to follow the lead of the Republicans in the House, and was forced, yes, literally forced, to take a step in the direction of tariff reform.

It is true that they never intended, and do not now intend, at this session of Congress, to go another inch in that direction beyond the presentation of this bill and its general discussion as a whole. They do not intend to pass this bill as it is now or hereafter. They do not intend to have it read now by sections for amendment, for that proceeding would disclose the cunning of the Republican right hand now supposed to be concealed from its left hand, in putting on the stage this masquerade of monopoly, disguised in the innocent appearance of fair dealing and justice to the country.

But this bill brought in by the Republican majority of the Senate is a great and notable triumph for the Democracy, because it is a broad and conclusive admission that the people need and demand the relaxation of high taxes and some concession from the favored classes. The Democracy have forced the Republican party to take position in favor of the people's right to make this demand.

We have forced them to declare their purpose (which I admit they do not intend shall be carried out) to reduce the revenues $73,000,000. How can we suppose that they intend to cut off $73,000,000 of revenue when they declare that the excess of revenues for the current year will only amount to $19,000,000? Such a declaration, made under such circumstances, has the appearance of being made under the duress of abject fear of the people. Such a conclusion would be inevitable if it was intended to pass this bill—the substitute—but for the fact that it is so easy and so just to the people, by changing another statute, to omit from the current annual expenses $50,000,000 now gathered from them to be put in the sinking fund for the redemption of our bonds. This $50,000,000 added to the $19,000,000 of surplus that the Senator from Iowa [Mr. ALLISON] admits will be found in the Treasury on June 30, 1889, makes $69,000,000, a sum within a small fraction of the estimated reduction of the revenue to be secured by the Senate bill.

It would never do for the Republicans, at this time, to take from the shoulders of the people this useless and cruel tax of $50,000,000 a year, which is the alleged security for the redemption of bonds originally bought for 50 cents, or less, on the dollar and now held firmly at $1.28. Their nurslings, the bondholders, would kick out of the party traces and refuse the money to keep the procession moving, if the credit of their bonds should be lowered somewhat to the neighborhood of their par value.

Moreover, this neat excuse for unnecessary taxation carries with it as much, annually, as $2,000,000 of profits to monopolist classes, and would furnish about the most conclusive plea that can be stated why the unnecessary taxation of the people should cease. Why, then, should the Republican party create a plain necessity for the reduction of taxation $50,000,000 annually, by repealing the sinking-fund act? That would be too costly an experiment, so far as votes are concerned, in those vast areas of political influence over which the bondholders have almost undisputed sway.

They reason thus: "This sinking fund ought to cease; it is a useless, expensive, and dangerous law. But to cut it down now would increase the surplus in the Treasury by $50,000,000 each year, and would lose our friends, the bondholders, 2 or 3 cents on their premium of 28 cents on their bonds. They are too proud to pocket such a loss." They reason further: "If we find that our bill runs the revenue down to, or below, the sum of the annual surplus, then we can demand of the bondholders that they shall give up the pretended security of $50,000,000 they hold in the sinking fund and look to the security afforded by the good faith of 65,000,000 people for the redemption of the few bonds as yet unpaid."

The adroitness of the Republican committee in holding the repeal of the sinking fund in reserve as a door of escape from any trouble that may come to them, and in counting this now as one of the current necessary expenses of the Government in order to find that large excuse for high taxation, shows a very high order of financial ability, of the sort that misleads with false appearances, and substitutes them for facts.

Why should we deceive the people with the pretense that $50,000,000 a year is taxed out of them to meet an obligation of honor, when its only effect is to "gild the refined gold" of our credit by placing a mortgage on our revenues to raise this vast sum yearly to pay to the holders of our bonds and increase the premiums on them? Is this done to furnish excuses to 65,000,000 of people why they should each pay nearly a dollar per annum on this account alone of excessive taxation?

If there were no selected classes to receive this subsidy thus forced from the tax-paying people through our tariff laws no sane man could imagine an excuse for this needless tax upon the people.

If this Senate bill could become a law, and if the surplus should be reduced to $19,000,000, and if there should be $16,000,000 of deficit in June, 1889, the sinking-fund tax will not live a day longer than the Finance Committee of the Senate can get its head under the ax. But until this is demonstrated and until the November storm has cleared the atmosphere the Republican party will fail and refuse to see that the $50,000,000 annual taxes to supply the sinking fund is unnecessary taxation upon this generation; that it takes from the capital invested in their business that enormous sum annually, and makes hard lines for them, and in unpleasant places, merely to enrich capitalists.

Passing from this general view of the situation—of which I have only time to give the faintest outline—every Democrat in the Senate would welcome the opportunity to enter with the Republican majority here into an examination and vote upon the items of this Senate bill as it is reported. But the majority here do not intend to have this discussion in time to inform the country as to the real merits of the bill so that they can consider it in the November elections.

This is a bold policy for such a majority to adopt—a majority of one in the Senate, of whom as many as three represent States that vote against the prohibitive subsidy features of all tariff taxation—a majority of one in the Senate that is already reversed, as to that one Senator, by the elections in a sovereign State of other Senators who are opposed to excessive taxation, to class legislation, and to monopoly in tariff laws.

This majority of one increases and intensifies the monopoly and subsidy of the present tariff laws by the most masterly ingenuity in reclassifying the schedules, in the Senate bill, and thus endeavors to appease General Harrison, who declares that he will not permit a single step to be taken in the direction of reducing the bounty to capital, that he is pleased to christen as the protection of labor. He declares that no part of the protection under the existing tariff shall be given up, and no step in that direction shall be taken if he is President. He may be satisfied, however, with the reduction of protection on sugar, rice, and jute, as it is merely transferred to and increased on wool and woolens, cotton goods, and metals.

This majority of one openly rebukes the Chicago convention for its string of vapid platitudes, and resorts at once to the destruction of all taxes on tobacco, and to the shipwreck of the system of whisky taxation, which that convention had decided to hold amongst the reserved forces to sustain the advanced line of the high protection phalanx. The convention ordered that this tax should not be resorted to unless for the purpose of relieving the attack on that part of the line. The Finance Committee at once cut down these taxes, which no man pays except to gratify a taste or fancy, and that is purely voluntary, and put the burden on the articles of necessity that rich and poor, healthy and sick, prosperous and miserable, must all have to maintain life, health, and comfort.

This majority of one in the Senate even dares to speak harshly of trusts and combines, although Mr. Blaine has said that they are private matters, not within the domain of proper legislation, and much more innocent than people generally suppose them to be.

But this majority of one, after bringing in a bill that is original in almost every line, and is intended to originate a complete system of tax laws in the Senate, disperse to the country and ascend the stumps to address "the jury," as the Senator from Connecticut declares. They leave us without a quorum to do business; they desert the forum where the jury of Senators should be found, to discuss before the masses, where no records are made, the intricacies of a tariff bill upon which the Senate can not act intelligently without full explanation. Not one Senator on this floor, not a member of the Committee on Finance, would venture to assert that he could explain the tangle of rates, classifications, and compound duties that this bill presents, so as to tell the country what will be their effect on the cost of goods imported or made at home, without patient research and free discussion of the items found in these nineteen general classifications.

A shepherd who has watched the stars every night of his life could as well be expected to give us a distinct idea of the individual stars of the Milky Way as that which a tax-paying farmer could gather in reference to the provisions of this bill from the confused blaze of light and

wisdom reflected upon the canvas just for a moment from the magic-lantern of the majority of the Senate Committee on Finance and is then turned away to flash again upon the political meetings.

If there had been at any time any expectation that the Senate would be permitted to vote on this bill before November, this absence of Senators would be a grave matter, and the country would take note of the situation. It is the Republican party that has required this delay in considering this bill, and not the individuals who comprise that party.

This expedient for longer maintaining the present unjust and ruinous tariff is of a piece with all the party tactics that have been resorted to by the Republican party for years.

Whatever their party platforms, Presidential candidates, Congressmen, and leading papers may say, or may have said, even in the form of solemn pledges to the people in favor of tariff reform, results only in broken promises.

When, in 1880 to 1883, the people demanded tariff reduction and reform, the demand was evaded by providing a Republican commission to investigate the subject of Federal taxation, and to report their recommendations to Congress. They were all the friends of a protective tariff as contradistinguished from a revenue tariff.

They were of that class who are now claimed to be the only people fit to consider a tariff bill—the friends of high protection. This startling arrogance on the part of the advocates of monopoly, that only protectionists should be permitted to deal with protection, found its supposed exclusive privilege to doctor the tariff in the appointment of that commission. In their report this vainglorious demand was fully complied with, and high protectionists were formed into a commission to reform the tariff. That commission could not defiantly shame the truth. They could not witness with indifference the real sufferings of the people. They reported a tariff measure far more moderate than the Mills bill, and urged its adoption for the following reasons, among others:

Early in its deliberations the commission became convinced that a substantial reduction of tariff duties is demanded not by a mere indiscriminate popular clamor, but by the best conservative opinion of the country, including that which has in former times been most strenuous for the preservation of our national industrial defenses. Such a reduction of the existing tariff the commission regards not only as a due recognition of public sentiment and a measure of justice to consumers, but one conducive to the general industrial prosperity, and which, though it may be temporarily inconvenient, will be ultimately beneficial to the special interests affected by such reduction. No rates of defensive duties, except for the establishment of new industries, which more than equalize the conditions of labor and capital with those of foreign competitors, can be justified. Excessive duties, or those above such standard of equalization, are positively injurious to the interest which they are supposed to benefit. They encourage the investment of capital in manufacturing enterprises by rash and unskilled speculators, to be followed by disaster to the adventurers and their employés and a plethora of commodities, which deranges the operations of skilled and prudent enterprise.

Numerous examples of such disasters and derangements occurred during and shortly after the excessively protective period of the late war, when tariff duties were enhanced by the rates of foreign exchange and premiums upon gold. Excessive duties generally, or exceptionally high duties in particular cases, discredit our whole national economic system and furnish plausible arguments for its complete subversion. They serve to increase uncertainty on the part of industrial enterprise, whether it shall enlarge or contract its operations, and take from commerce, as well as production, the sense of stability required for extended undertakings. It would seem that the rates of duties under the existing tariff—fixed, for the most part during the war under the evident necessity at that time of stimulating to its utmost extent all domestic production—might be adapted, through reduction, to the present condition of peace requiring no such extraordinary stimulus. And in the mechanical and manufacturing industries, especially those which have been long established, it would seem that the improvements in machinery and processes made within the last twenty years, and the high scale of productiveness which has become a characteristic of their establishments, would permit our manufacturers to compete with their foreign rivals under a substantial reduction of existing duties.

Entertaining these views, the commission has sought to present a scheme of tariff duties in which substantial reduction should be the distinguishing feature. The average reduction in rates, including that from the enlargement of the free-list, and the abolition of the duties on charges and commissions at which the commission has aimed, is not less on the average than 20 per cent., and it is the opinion of the commission that the reduction will reach 25 per cent.

The Republican party resisted legislation in both Houses to carry out the views of this commission. Finally, in 1883, when driven to the wall, they passed the law as it stands now, in which there is legislation by a conference committee against the express votes of both Houses, and that legislation was all in the interest of high duties, of which the highest were on articles of prime necessity.

With constant effort since that time the Democracy have been unable to get the subject considered in the House, and the tariff of 1883 has remained intact. It is a sunken rock in the sea. Waves of popular indignation roll across it, but there it remains, immovable. Until the people have again spoken on this subject, in terms that will warn monopoly, conspiracy, trusts, and combines that they are no longer the disposers of their rights and the regulators of their industries, these favored classes will never yield any of their advantages, and will never consent to a tariff revision in the interests of the toiling masses. When the people elected Tilden they expressed their confidence in a statesman who went as far as Mr. Cleveland has ever gone in his efforts to reduce the taxation of the people. Mr. Garfield, a member of the Cobden Club, went as far as Mr. Cleveland in the same direction. Mr. Arthur urged his party to reform the tariff and reduce taxation, and Mr. EVARTS, while a Cabinet minister of the Hayes administration, under his responsibility, made a report to the first session of the Forty-sixth Congress, in which he said:

There is something in the Republic which gives an individuality to the people of the United States possessed by no other people to such a degree. Our inventive genius in mechanical appliances is original, and at least twenty-five years ahead of Europe. Our people accept innovation; are prepared for it by anticipation. Europeans do not. One workman in the United States, as will be seen from the foregoing extracts, does as much as two workmen in most of the countries of Europe; even the immigrant from Europe attains this progressive spirit by a few years' association with American workmen. We have no oppressed and stupid peasantry, little more intelligent than the tools they handle. All are self-thinking, self-acting, and self-supporting.

Within the last fifteen years we have demonstrated our ability by the brilliant development of our own resources to exclude by honest competition foreign manufactures, to a large extent, from our shores. The question which now peremptorily challenges all thinking minds is how to create a foreign demand for those manufactures which are left a ter supplying our home demands. We can not stand still, for the momentum of increase will soon become so great that it will push us outward anyway; to push us safely and profitably is of so much importance as to almost overtop all other questions of the hour.

The question appeals equally to the selfishness and patriotism of all our citizens, but to the laborer it appeals with tenfold force; for without work he can not live, and unless we can extend the markets for our manufacturers he can not expec steady work, and unless our manufacturers can undersell foreign manufacturers we can not enlarge our foreign market.

The first great truth to be learned by the manufacturers and workingmen is that the days of sudden fortunes and double wages are gone. We must realize the fact that ocean steam communication has annihilated distance and brought the nations face to face. This drawing together of the nations means equalization in trade, profits, wages, etc., the advantage being with those who soonest accept the situation, and show the most sensible continuity in the new paths of success.

But so firm is the grip of protected monopoly upon the power of taxation that nothing, it seems, can cause it to relax, and so imperious are their demands for the ownership of what they call the home market that they require that the tariff shall yield no revenue to the Government when its operations admit the products of any foreign country into competition with them. Not a step of progress in that direction has been made in reality since 1867, although in 1883, under the pretense of reducing the revenue, the increase caused by that act has endangered the country to a frightful degree.

It is the fixed purpose of the monopolists to stand by the tariff of 1883 with all its dangerous consequences, and this bill and its history prove the fact. This Chamber would not be deserted by the high-tax Senators to give them an opportunity to endeavor to control the people in their votes if they did not intend that excessive taxation should still continue to pour into the Treasury more than $100,000,000 a year of surplus revenue and more than $300,000,000 a year into the coffers of the protected capitalists.

The present tariff in all its essential features is intended to be permanent. If the surplus is reduced $73,000,000 a year, it will be done only on the condition that this sum shall be multiplied by three in its advantages to the protected capitalists, and at the expense of a suffering people, so far as the Republican side of this Chamber can control legislation.

In any European state a surplus revenue of $120,000,000 annually, as a fixed income, would breed wars of conquest and aggrandizement that would destroy the people. When our bonded debt is extinguished, or even while we are waiting for its maturity, what will we do with this constantly increasing store of money?

What more dangerous thing could exist in our country than the fixed certainty of the yield of this vast sum to the Treasury every year, taxed from all consumers to pay a few producers for engaging in pursuits that yield naturally large returns for skilled labor?

Already the laborers clamor and strike for a larger dividend in the tax-bonus that was alleged to be raised to pay for their toil. The owners of the labor-saving machines claim five parts out of six for what they contribute to the production. They differ; the labor ceases until want has compelled a resumption of work. In the mean time the high tariff has forced out competition, and the scarcity of supply has forced the home market up many points. The strike has starved the workingmen into submission, while the capitalist, the owner of the machines, has greatly increased his wealth by waiting for a higher market.

How often has it turned out that strikes have been provoked by the owners of plants and machinery in order to produce this very result? Let our laboring men answer.

It is easier, safer, more respectable to have the operatives desert a factory where "their room is good company" than it is to lock them out when they are working contentedly for subsistence. If all the money that has been made by capitalists in the rise of prices for their productions, in consequence of strikes and lock-outs, could have been distributed to their employés, millions of hungry men, women, and children would shout for joy.

If the laborer could receive his fair share of the bounty given to the capitalists by unequal tax laws, the men who suffer most from the unjust exaction would feel compensated, in great measure, for the wrongs they suffer. The people understand all this. They know the causes that breed discontent amongst operatives of all classes in this land, where all others are contented and live in peace.

It is a reproach to a free government that such troubles should exist and that they should be, as they are, beyond the powers of the civil authorities to control them. They could not exist if a rankling sense

of injustice did not goad the sufferers into resistance, and if the temptations to speculation in human labor did not cause that injustice. These evils and many others quite as great are the fruits of the tariff of 1883. Yet the Republicans in this body make concerted effort to delay the reformation of a system that has produced those results every day it has existed, and the still more dangerous result to the people at large of a Treasury loaded to congestion with money that is the life-blood of all industry, the dangerous fruit of unjust taxation.

My wish on this occasion is for thorough examination and enlightened votes on the items of this bill. In one great matter the avowed purpose of both sides of the Chamber is the same. We agree that the inflow of surplus revenues must be stopped. That one object is of sufficient importance to the country to demand the earnest and unceasing labors of every representative of every State on this floor, as it did gain the untiring labors of the representatives of every Congressional district in the other House of Congress.

Why should we not, at least, make one effort to agree on some plan that will remove this threatening evil from our financial situation? But the field of labor and progress towards a remedy is abandoned in the hunt for political power, and the ground so dearly won in the House must be lost to the people. Nothing of the promised discussion and action upon Federal taxation remains in reach of the Senate but the criticisms of the House bill and of the Senate bill, and of the Democratic party and the Republican party, all intended as mere stump speeches to affect the pending elections. The country may, in the enthusiasm of party rivalry, forgive us for this indifference to a great and pressing duty, but I can not repress the conviction that the majority, at least, should be here to press this measure to a vote, if they intend to pass it, and let the other House consider the question whether we can come to an agreement in conference.

We can not plead the excuse for our delay that the people will in November settle the question as between the Mills bill or the Senate bill. Their vote will not change any vote in the Senate, not that the Senate does not respond as readily as the House to the will of the people, but for the reason that the Senate bill has never received a party indorsement outside of this Chamber; and it is notoriously a radical departure from the Chicago platform of the Republican party. If Mr. Cleveland is re-elected this point will be made by every Republican Senator against the Mills bill and in favor of the Senate bill.

The people are not settling the controversy for the Senate between the Mills bill and the Senate bill. That subject will be as open for discussion in December as it is now, and I can see no reason why the discussion should not proceed now as well as then.

I will not assume that I am so informed in the details of values, prices, qualities, classifications, and all the varied information relating to imported goods, and goods that compete with them, as to enable me to expound the occult mysteries of the Senate bill. I doubt if any one Senator on the Committee on Finance knows all these things. They examined interested people, who are experts, to get the facts on which these taxes are based. That evidence is still in the hands of the printers, so we must decide first and hear the evidence afterwards as to whether this is, as is alleged, the best first draught of a tariff bill that ever came before the American Senate.

The Senate will agree with me that the absence of the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BECK] from the Senate is a deplorable loss, as is the absence of the Senator from Vermont [Mr. MORRILL]. Mr. BECK's views on this question are stated by him in a way that precludes any efforts to improve them, or to make his arguments more powerful or convincing. His contribution to the report of the minority enables us to survey a field with comparative ease that would be otherwise crowded with difficulties. He had not seen the bill, I think, when his report was written, but he was informed as to its general tenor and provisions.

I have felt that we could not add much to the weight of his argument until we could enter upon a consideration of the bill, item by item, and then we could only give specific application of the facts and doctrines he has stated in a general way to the provisions of the bill in detail. The tables prepared by Mr. Switzler and submitted by the Senator from Missouri [Mr. VEST] are upon the best expert authority to which we could resort. They do not give the comparative taxation of separate articles of the respective classes of goods, but are sufficiently in detail to enable us to understand the general drift and purpose of the authors of the Senate bill.

The first and most distinctive feature in both the House and Senate bills is the free-list. Amongst all the absurdities that are uttered in the discussion of our tariff system among the grossest of them is that which imputes to the Democratic plan of taxation the epithet (for such it is intended to be) that it is a free-trade plan.

Equally absurd is the notion that the Republican plan is for protection throughout, and contains no elements of free trade. A mere phrase can not be invented that will fully describe the plan of taxation of either party. As near an approach to it as I can make would describe the Democratic plan as giving equal justice in the tariff laws to every American industry, while the Republican plan seeks to confer upon certain selected industries, in certain favored sections, peculiar advantages in money-making at the expense of all other industries and of consumers of the subsidized productions.

As to free trade, it is a part of every tariff law that was ever enacted by Congress. No tariff law has been without a free-list—not articles omitted from taxation by inadvertence, but a list of articles put on the free-list by the force of the statute prohibiting their taxation. The man who would put every imported article of foreign production on the free-list is a free-trader, and nobody else is a free-trader in theory or practice. As to the manner of supporting the Government by taxation, the free-trader and the prohibitionist of importations of foreign goods stand on the same ground precisely. Neither of them wants any revenue collected on imports, and both are, therefore, thrown back upon direct or internal taxation for the money to support the Government. Thus do we see, again, in the circuit of political movements, that "extremes meet." To the extent that any Senator recommends and votes for placing any imported article of foreign production on the free-list that Senator is a free-trader.

The free-list under the present tariff comprises many hundreds of articles classed in section 2503 of the Revised Statutes under 332 general classifications. Of these many hundreds of articles as to which free trade is compelled under existing laws, more than two-thirds of them are either grown or manufactured in the United States, or else we have in our own country other articles of like kind that are quite as useful.

Will any Republican Senator claim for his party that it is not responsible for this immense movement towards free trade by which we give up all revenue on imported goods that were valued during the last fiscal year at more than $300,000,000? Will any such Senator pretend that under the Republican treaty of 1871 with Great Britain, and the Republican act of Congress of 1873, we do not yield to Canada every year $20,000,000 of taxation by the free-trade plan of letting her goods pass to and fro through our country, free of all duty, for the benefit of a few railroad corporations?

Did not the Republican President and Senate ratify a treaty with Mexico, which the Democratic House of Representatives, I am pained to admit, has failed to put in force, by which not less than $50,000,000 of Mexican productions, now heavily taxed, would come in free of duty? Have we not yielded more than $10,000,000 a year of duties to Hawaii, in order to get her sugar and other productions free of duty? With all this history of the tremendous strides towards free trade which the Republican party have made in treaties and in legislation, when the Democrats had scarcely a voice in Congress, how can their leaders expect to blind the people so that they can not discover their inconsistencies by standing in the fog they have created and ringing their alarm bells to warn the country against the Democracy as a malign conspiracy of free-traders?

And this present Committee of Finance "cry aloud and spare not" against the Democratic party and the Mills bill as the evil machinators of free trade, while they quietly add to the existing free-list under the present tariff forty-two classifications of articles which embrace many hundreds of distinctive items. The following is the free-trade side of the Senate bill:

ADDITIONS TO FREE-LIST, SENATE SUBSTITUTE.

Acorns, raw, dried or undried, but unground.
Baryta, sulphate of, or barytes, unmanufactured.
* Bees-wax.
* Books and pamphlets, printed exclusively in languages other than English.
* Braids, plats, flats, laces, etc., for ornamenting hats, etc.
* Bristles, raw or unmanufactured.
* Bulbs and bulbous roots, not edible.
Chicory root, raw, dried or undried, but unground.
* Coal, slack or culm.

The chairman of the committee said that was a mistake, not a clerical mistake; no, not clerical; that is to say, it was a mistake of judgment on the part of the committee putting that in there. As soon as they heard from West Virginia and that the hair was rising on the heads of some of their Republican friends out there, they took it back and apologized for it, calling it a mistake.

Mr. GEORGE. What is it?

Mr. MORGAN. "Coal-slack or culm" on the free-list. That was a mistake, but it was a mistake not of the printer but of the men who wrote the article that the printer was to set up. I continue the addition to the free-list:

* Coal-tar, crude.
Curling-stone handles.
* Currants, Zante or other, dried.
* Dandelion roots, raw, dried, or undried, but unground.
* Eggs' yolks.
* Feathers and downs of all kinds, crude and unmanufactured.
Jute.
Jute butts.
Manila.
* Ramie.
Sisal-grass.
Sunn.
* All other textile grasses or fibrous substances, unmanufactured or undressed.
* Floor matting, Chinese, known as.
* Grease and oils, used commonly in soap-making or wire-drawing.
* Human hair, raw or uncleaned, and not drawn.
* Mineral waters, not specially enumerated.
* Molasses, testing not above fifty-six degrees.

* Olive oil, for manufacturing or mechanical purposes.
* Nut oil, or oil of nuts.
Opium, crude or unmanufactured.

I believe that was a mistake; that was in the report, but was not in the bill; that was a change of opinion of course, unless the bill was written before the report was—a change of opinion anyway.

Mr. ALDRICH. It is in both the bill and report.

Mr. MORGAN. Opium, crude or unmanufactured?

Mr. ALDRICH. Yes, sir.

Mr. MORGAN. I beg pardon; I thought it was stated the other day that it was not, in reply to a remark of the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. VANCE].

Mr. ALDRICH. The Senator mistakes.

Mr. MORGAN. The list continues:

* Potash, crude carbonate.
* Potash, caustic or hydrate.
* Potash, nitrate of.
* Potash, sulphate of.
* Potash, chlorate.
* Rags, all not enumerated.
* Hemp seed.
* Rape seed.
* Sponges.
* Sand.
* Tar and pitch, of wood.
* Turpentine, spirits of.

Let us look at this free-trade schedule of the Committee of Finance and see whether it was intended to apply to articles not grown or manufactured in the United States.

I have referred to these articles by a star in front of each. What about spirits of turpentine? What country makes more than we do?

Mr. ALLISON. No country.

Mr. MORGAN. What about bees-wax? Why put bees-wax on the free-list when every old lady in the United States who has a few bee-hives can melt out a little bit of wax and take it to the country store and buy a few spools of thread to sew up the cloth that she spins on her spinning-wheel and weaves on her home-made loom? Bees-wax is useful in many manufactures, and yet it is the most domestic of all domestic industries that I know anything of, and when you put that on the free-list you strike at the income of almost every poor old lady in the South, to say the least of it, and I expect a great many in the North.

This measure has very little consideration for that class of people. They are not known to exist in the world, so far as this bill is concerned, and Providence might just as well have omitted the unnecessary act of creating them, for, after all, they have got to take care of themselves and support everybody else. The toils that they perform every day around their households they are to get no benefit from, and they are discriminated against in favor of wealthy men like Jay Gould and Vanderbilt, who never planted a grain of corn or of wheat in the world, and yet they have run their fortunes up until Jay Gould's is said to be $277,000,000, and God knows how much Vanderbilt's is, for they have got the practice now of hiding how rich they are.

If George Washington or Thomas Jefferson had supposed that the Republic of which they were laying the foundation could be so far abused in the warping of the Constitution of the country as to open the seams through which this vast flood of money could pour into the pockets of single individuals they would have shut the door on them and have tried some other plan. It was entirely unexpected and unanticipated that in a country of freedom and equality of privileges and of rights and immunities of every kind, the law could be framed in such a manner, through the pressure of a political party whose chief aim it is to make their friends rich, as that one man in this country, without ever laboring or toiling or contributing anything whatsoever to the general good of mankind, could amass a fortune according to law of $277,000,000.

I look upon it, as I think this world must, with utter amazement. There is not a crowned monarchy in this world that can confer upon one of its subjects by all the monopolies it can put within his reach and by all the exclusive privileges and honors it can confer, the opportunity or the ability to do that which this Republican party have provided in favor of men like Jay Gould and Vanderbilt through their system of the abuse of the Constitution of the country.

Mr. GEORGE. They subscribe to the campaign fund.

Mr. ALDRICH. Which campaign fund?

Mr. MORGAN. It does not make any difference to me which. I am here not to deal with political parties or political partisans or that celebrated gang of upstarts who are called political leaders, but I am here as an embassador from the State of Alabama for the purpose of trying to rectify the laws so that these men can not use this power and can not find it to be used for these corrupting political ends, and so that every man in the United States shall have an equal, a fair, and a just opportunity to rise under the smiles of Providence to the true dignity of his manhood and to the enjoyment of the benefactions that He has provided for us all.

I do not ask which party they subscribe to. The Senator from Rhode Island may want to know. I do not. It makes no difference in what party these things appear. If, in looking upon the statute-books of my country, I find that the laws as they exist are capable of bringing about such results as these, it is my duty not to desert this Chamber and go off to make speeches in aid of these subscriptions of fat fried out of protected manufacturers, but it is my duty to stand here in this Senate and look these laws over night and day, and Sunday, if need be, until we have brought relief to a suffering people. That is my duty, and that is what I am trying to perform.

This committee, however, of free-traders—for what is a free-trader but a man who wants goods imported without duty?—add forty-two classifications of imported articles to the three hundred and thirty-two already admitted free of duty by Republicans in Congress, and to all the goods of Canada and nearly all coming from Hawaii, amounting in value annually to more than $293,000,000, while all dutiable imports amount to $450,325,321.

Largely more than half of the goods imported from foreign countries into the United States are admitted free of duty under the Republican law of 1883, and this committee adds hundreds of articles under forty-two classifications to that list, and yet they have the assurance to rise in this Chamber, man after man, and denounce this side of the Senate as being free-traders.

I will read an extract on that subject from their report on page 28:

A free-trade country may be properly described as one which does not impose protective duties upon importations. Lord Salisbury lately defined a free-trader as one who is opposed to protection. Mr. David A. Wells recently said, "Free trade, as an economic principle or politico-commercial system, is the direct opposite to the so-called principle or system of protection." If these definitions are correct the promoters of this bill are self-confessed free-traders, and the denial that they are engaged in a "crusade of free trade" comes too late, for the American people are not likely to forget the lessons of 1844 and the political rallying cry of "Polk, Dallas, and the tariff of '42."

I can imagine what must be the feelings of a man who has pocketed a fifty-dollar bill that belongs to somebody else and is going off with it, and as he passes out of view he meets a friend whom he reproaches as being a thief. The friend points to the fact, "You have got $50 of stolen money in your pocket; why do you call me a thief?" "Because if you had had the opportunity you would have stolen $100." Here is this committee carrying this enormous free trade in foreign goods making no objection to it, or very slight, and adding forty-two classifications of articles to it, turning around in their report and engaging in new definitions of what a free-trader is; something that they put up that they think will fit our side in order to get the chance to apply to us what they believe to be an unpopular epithet, and yet they are passing through the Senate here and through history as the champions of a system that brings in more than $293,000,000 of values a year without the imposition of a single cent of duty.

And when Mr. Cleveland asked them to reinstate the tariff upon Canadian goods, and the House passed a bill that it should be done, amounting to not less than $20,000,000 a year, and when that would seem to be necessary as a measure of reaction or retaliation against Canada on account of ill-treatment to us under an alleged existing provision of the treaty of Washington, the House passed the bill and it came over here and went to the Committee on Foreign Relations, of which I happen to be a member, and there it sleeps the sleep of death. Why? There are two reasons for it. Twenty million dollars a year would have added too much to the surplus revenue, which would have made a necessity for cutting it down a little more, and the blessed railroad corporations, that have got so much fat to be fried out of them yet for the benefit of campaign purposes, would have lost money! That is a plain statement, but it is nevertheless absolutely true.

Why did the committee add anything to the free-list unless the people needed the relief they give them, small as it is, and partial, until it sickens the sense of justice? Why did they not propose to repeal the existing free-list, so far as it includes any articles that are produced in the United States, or for which we can produce a good substitute, if they intend to protect American industries simply because they yield home productions? Hides, tan-bark, tannin, charcoal, horns and hoofs of cattle, indigo, lemon and lime juice, asbestus, sulphur, drugs, aluminium, cotton, eggs, fire-wood, fresh fish, goat-skins, logs, railroad ties, and great number of articles are on the free-list of 1883 and are produced in our country.

Not only are these left on the free-list by these avowed enemies of free trade, but they add to the list forty-two classifications of articles, all of which but seven are produced in the United States. Driven into this corner by their substituted tariff bill, they resort to new definitions of what they call free trade, and attempt to convict us of political heresy for practicing what they preach. It is a vain thing to attempt to convict the Democracy of evil intentions when our accusers do precisely what we are doing, except that we are trying to distribute and adjust taxation so as to save the people and they are trying to increase the riches of the capitalists at the expense of the people.

It is with much satisfaction that I present the list of articles free of duty which the Mills bill proposes to add to the existing free-list in a table that shows the present rate of duty on each article. In that list is found the highest merit of the Mills bill. That is taxation remitted, and every human being in the United States shares in the relief just given. I will put this table as an appendix to my remarks. Under this

list duties to the amount of $22,189,505.48 are cut off. They are not merely transferred by increased duties to other articles.

Three-fourths of this sum was paid by manufacturers on wool and tin-plate, two articles that are of prime necessity to working people and their families. Wool is produced everywhere in the farming and grazing districts of the United States, and a very large proportion of it is grown in the sheep ranges of the South and West, and at no cost to the wool-growers for grazing, except the care of the shepherds. Tin-plate is used in every household throughout the country, and in canning goods, fish, meats of every variety, and in all our climates. No other articles could have been selected which, in their growth and production, are less sectional than these, although they are much more necessary for general use in the North than they are in the South.

Raiment next to food, and the cooking of food next to both, are things that are elementary in the living of our population, and a reduction of taxes of $5,706,435.89 annually on tin-plates, of $5,899,816.63 on wool, and of $12,332,211.65 on woolen goods, is a blessing to the industrial classes of the country, the memory of which will not fade. Its enjoyment may be postponed or defeated, but it will come in the near future. The people will have this relief, while this large reduction will still leave wool and woolen fabrics under such shelter against foreign competition that their producers will still be amongst the most fortunate of the bounty-fed industries in the United States.

Until the discussion of this bill reaches the stage where the items are being separately considered it will not be practicable, within limits of debate that are reasonable, to point out fully the application of this bill to each particular branch of trade or industry.

We well understand that the discussion will not be permitted to reach this stage at this session of Congress, and I will reserve the expression of my views as to the separate items of the Senate bill until they are respectively called for the action of the Senate. But the summary of results I will now state will, for the present, show sufficiently the changes made by the Senate bill.

Tables carefully prepared by the Chief of the Bureau of Statistics give this comparison of the average ad valorem duties under the present law, and of those proposed by the House bill and Senate bill respectively, on the different classes of dutiable imports under each:

Chemicals: Present law, 32.83 per cent.; House bill, 29.11 per cent.; Senate bill, 28.72 per cent.
Earthen and glass ware: Present law, 59.56 per cent.; House bill, 53 per cent.; Senate bill, 57.82 per cent.
Metals: Present law, 40.77 per cent.; House bill, 41.12 per cent.; Senate bill, 41.12 per cent.
Woodenware: Present law, 18 per cent.; House bill, 29.32 per cent.; Senate bill, 18.88 per cent.
Sugar: Present law, 78.15 per cent.; House bill, 63.41 per cent.; Senate bill, 41.02 per cent.
Tobacco: Present law, 83.32 per cent.; House bill, 83.32 per cent.; Senate bill, 70.36 per cent.
Provisions: Present law, 24.33 per cent.; House bill, 23.34 per cent.; Senate bill, 23.58 per cent.
Liquors: Present law, 72.64 per cent.; House bill, 72.64 per cent.; Senate bill, 72.61 per cent.
Cottons: Present law, 39.99 per cent.; House bill, 33.07 per cent.; Senate bill, 40.74 per cent.
Hemp, flax, and jute: Present law, 28.09 per cent.; House bill, 24.81 per cent.; Senate bill, 35.47 per cent.
Wool and woolens: Present law, 58.80 per cent.; House bill, 40.08 per cent.; Senate bill, 66.12 per cent.
Silk goods: Present law, 49.71 per cent.; House bill, 49.71 per cent.; Senate bill, 50.67 per cent.
Books and papers: Present law, 22.14 per cent.; House bill, 22.07 per cent.; Senate bill, 23.54.
Sundries: Present law, 26.86 per cent.; House bill, 24.78 per cent.; Senate bill, 28.20 per cent.

But the House bill puts on the free-list merchandise valued at $70,443,012.64 on which duties are collected under the present law, and the Senate bill adds to the present free-list merchandise valued at $26,331,815.38, as follows:

Chemicals: House bill, $4,535,557.96; Senate bill, $2,873,972.27.
Earthen and glass wares: House bill, $30,789.97.
Metals: House bill, $18,323,612.91.
Woodenware: House bill, $6,679,262.12.
Sugar: House bill, $000.00; Senate bill, $5,336,364.15.
Provisions: House bill, $3,334,913.86; Senate bill, $1,232,695.
Cottons: House bill, $000.00; Senate bill, $172.00.
Hemp, flax, and jute: House bill, $14,490,501.40; Senate bill, $9,004,675.
Wool and woolens: House bill, $18,205,987.97; Senate, $000,000.
Sundries: House bill, $4,842,346.45; Senate bill, $7,884,026.98.

These facts easily enable us to discern the conclusion to which they all point, that the concessions made to the tax-payers in the cost of sugar, whisky, and tobacco are more than balanced by the increased exactions on other articles that are indispensable to human comfort and even to human life.

I am not disposed to make complaints because the section of country in which I live is denied a full share in the discriminating favors of the Government. With such resources as we have and with a world-wide monopoly in iron and coal, yellow-pine timber, and cotton, if we choose to use the blessings of Providence to extort money from other less favored sections, it is much the safer policy for us to hasten slowly through the natural growth of our wealth than it is to lift one great industry high above another by the artificial assistance of acts of Congress.

We have a basis of prosperity, laid by the hand of the Creator, that will never be taken from our country or decreased in its yield of income that enables us to grow rich and strong without being constantly appealing to Congress to tax other sections for our advantage. So that it is not the amount of money we are to lose that causes me to enter my protest against the discrimination against sugar, rice, and cotton-ties and cotton-bagging in the bill. The great body of Louisiana sugars rate in color below No. 13 Dutch standard.

Sugars under No. 13 Dutch standard, and testing 75 per cent. of saccharine matter under the polariscope, are now taxed $1.40 per 100 pounds. The Senate bill reduces the tariff on this class of sugars to 70 cents per 100 pounds, or one-half, and on sugars above No. 13 Dutch standard in color to $1.37½ per 100 pounds, just one-half. The refiner has nothing to do but to raise the color of the sugar we import to or above No. 13 Dutch standard, and make 100 per cent. on the duties he pays on his sugar without reference to its saccharine strength.

The sugar producer here is between the monopoly of the refiner on the one hand and the competition of the Cuban producer on the other, and the consumer who will always buy the cleanest looking sugar he can find at a price within his means will buy of the refiner and compel the producer to come down in his prices. An evil of the same sort is in the present law, but it is somewhat checked by the fact that it requires twice the sum to control the market for low-grade imported sugars under the existing law that would be required under the Senate bill. This is a terrible descent from the autocratic position assumed and carried out by the committee of conference in 1883, so well stated by the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BECK] in his minority report, in which he says:

Mr. MORRILL might very well observe in this interview that the restoration of these duties even in such a conference committee was an unpromising risk, because if Senators had known half of what had been done against their known wishes by their own conferees, instead of the bill being passed as it was, by a vote of 32 to 31, it would have been defeated by an overwhelming majority, and the condemnation of the conference would have been too pronounced even for them to have ventured into the newspapers to quarrel over their action. Perhaps the worst part of their conduct was not referred to by either of them, and that was in regard to the duties on sugar.

The House had never acted upon that schedule, as their bill shows, but the Senate had in the most emphatic manner determined that the tax on sugar between No. 13 and No. 16 Dutch standard should not exceed $2.40 per 100 pounds. It had fixed the tax on sugar under No. 13 Dutch standard at a satisfactory rate; but that class of sugar was simply raw material for the refiner, not being used in any form except by them, and $2.40 was, by a yea-and-nay vote of the Senate, as is shown by the RECORD, after full discussion, fixed as the proper tax upon sugar between 13 and 16 Dutch standard. Mr. MORRILL and others protested that it was too low, and that foreign competitors would interfere with domestic refiners.

Some of us who had strongly urged $2.40 as a proper rate, believing that it might possibly cripple our domestic refiners in their operations, agreed to $2.50, after being assured by Senators on the other side, especially by Senator MORRILL, that $2.50 per hundred would be entirely satisfactory. I hope the RECORD of that debate will be turned to. It will be found on pages 2548 to 2555 of the RECORD of that session. Yet the conference committee deliberately increased the rate of taxation upon imported sugar between 13 and 16 to $2.75 per hundred, thereby giving to the sugar refiner an absolute monopoly of the sugar-refining business. They thus laid the foundation for the trusts which have been so much and so justly complained of by the country against the domestic refiners of sugar. That act on the part of the Senate conference, which was not only wholly unjustifiable and unwarranted but in violation of pledges they had given, has cost the consumers of sugar in this country not less than $8,000,000, while the fact that they had made such a change in the conference committee was carefully concealed from the Senate, as the record will show.

If the Senator from Kentucky has made a true statement about this matter, Mr. President, we begin to understand the power of monopoly in its influence upon the Senate of the United States. When a tariff bill gets into conference between the two Houses and high protectionists in the Senate and in the House of Representatives, whether Democrats or Republicans, conclude that they will violate the express votes of both bodies, or of one body, and they conclude that they will violate the pledges that they have given to their brother Senators and raise sugar from $2.50 per hundred pounds to $2.75 per hundred pounds, and thereby make it possible for $8,000,000 to be leeched out of the common people of the United States, it is not worth while in the face of facts like these to deny that the Senate of the United States is the subordinate slave of the subsidized monopolies of the United States. I come to the center to make the declaration and sustain it by the facts stated in this report by the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. ALDRICH. Will the Senator from Alabama allow me to say a few words in response to the statement he has now made?

Mr. MORGAN. After I get through, yes.

Mr. ALDRICH. I should be glad to say a word now.

Mr. MORGAN. If it is in denial of anything I have stated here, of course the Senator is at liberty.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. Does the Senator from Alabama yield to the Senator from Rhode Island?

Mr. MORGAN. I expect I had better get through and let the Senator take his own time to reply.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The Senator from Alabama declines to yield.

Mr. ALDRICH. I want to enter a denial now.

Mr. MORGAN. Of the facts stated by the Senator from Kentucky?

Mr. ALDRICH. Yes, sir.

Mr. MORGAN. He is not here. God grant that he were here. When the life of that man shall have passed out, and there might have

been some apprehension awhile back that it was about to be demanded of him, the United States of America would not find among its own native-born sons one that it could not spare with less regret than this adopted Scotchman, who came to us a boy. His heart is with the people of this country. He takes the Democratic view of the Constitution of the United States, which gives to every man in this land an equal right to rise by his own energies and his own abilities.

While he is detained from the Chamber by sickness his nature chafes and frets at the thought that he is not able physically to be here to take a hand in this great battle between the people and the monopolies. His statements, sir, made in a written report will be received by the people of the United States until the itemized facts are produced and the witnesses appear who are to deny those statements, and when I repeat from him what he solemnly utters, I always feel that I have under my feet a foundation that is immovable.

The sugar monopoly is made easier by the Senate bill, and the consumer of nearly every pound that is made will pay the refiner in addition to his mercantile profit from 75 to 100 per cent. profit on all the duties he pays on imported sugars. The committee abandon the protection of sugar. Why they did not put it on the free-list is a question alone for the consumers to examine into since the producers are openly deserted by them. This is what the committee say on that subject, and it is a point of very considerable importance:

> The high rates of duty which have been levied upon this important article of food have not successfully developed the sugar-producing industry of the United States. The great natural advantages which the producers of cane sugars in the tropical islands have over those of the United States preclude domestic competition upon equal terms. If it were not for the fact that parties interested in the production of sugar from sorghum or beets are confident of the rapid development of these industries in the United States the committee would recommend a still greater reduction in the rate of duty upon sugar, as the advantages of this reduction would be felt through a larger circle than any other which could be made in our tariff schedules.

There is a clear abandonment on the part of this committee of any duty supposed to rest upon them heretofore to give any protection to sugar, because they say that they have tried it, and the production of sugar can not be improved by high rates of taxation. So that Southern agricultural production is dropped out of the scheme of protection entirely. I repeat, why is it that the consumers of sugar throughout the United States shall not demand that sugar shall be put on the free-list, the Republicans, who have professed heretofore to be the nursing mother of all protected industries, having abandoned this infant to the inclemency of the season? This is retaliation upon a Southern industry, so meant, so intended, and so avowed.

I can not more truly or more forcibly present the retaliation of the Senate bill upon the cotton-growers of the country than by quoting from the report of the minority of the committee:

> Cotton-ties also receive careful consideration by the majority. It is not enough that the most formidable and insolent trust which ever laid its hand upon the throat of honest labor, threatening every class, from the poor colored cotton-picker whose few pounds of crop he could not get to market for lack of means to wrap it, to the merchant and capitalist who had advanced the necessaries of life to sustain that labor through the season. To these come the proposed revision, not with helping hand, but other burdens, and the cotton-ties which their own friends had reduced to 35 per cent. in the tariff of 1883 (one of the bright oases in a desert of iniquity) they omit by name, but include in a new classification, so that instead of 35 per cent., it must pay according to the valuation of 1887 over 100 per cent., adding nearly a quarter million dollars tax on the imported ties alone, all of which is a loss to the cotton producer. Even with this they are not content, but still further tax the struggling agriculturist in this schedule by raising the duties on trace chains, and all other kinds less than three-eighths of an inch thick, from 2½ cents, which is equivalent to 44.37 per cent., to 3 cents per pound, equivalent to a rate of 53.57 per cent. Can ingenuity go further?

I say that the taxation of cotton-ties is a mere act of unjust retaliation for an alleged discrimination in favor of Southern producers, and to prove it I will read from the report of the majority their confession of this purpose:

> The removal of the duties from cotton-ties, burlaps to be used as cotton-bagging, machinery for making cotton-bagging, jute bags, etc., the retention of high duties on certain plantation products, such as sugar at 68 per cent. and rice at 100 per cent., the imposition of duties which would be protective on the coarser kinds of cotton and woolen fabrics manufactured in this section, all point to an attempt by the terms of the House bill to discriminate in favor of the planters of the cotton-growing States, an attempt made with the vain hope that it may be found possible to achieve the permanent prosperity of one section at the expense of another.
>
> The industries of this section are not disturbed. It is well known that a considerable number of interests in other sections are suffering from insufficient protection, and yet it is significant that the only article upon which the rate of duty is increased in the entire bill is uncleaned rice, which by a change in classification is advanced from 70 to 100 per cent. ad valorem. We submit herewith (Appendix E) a suggestive table, taken from the census reports, which shows the relative proportion of the various manufactured products upon which rates are removed or largely reduced by the House bill that were produced in 1880 in the eleven cotton States and in the other States. This table discloses the fact that the section which furnishes the bill and two-thirds of its effective supporters supplies but 2½ per cent. of the industries to be crippled or destroyed.

The House bill throughout is a measure for the reduction of taxation. The fact that the duty on uncleaned rice is increased does show an intent to foster the rice-growing industry by subsidy. I object to the principle involved in that feature of the bill, but when it is called to mind that rice is grown only in malarial districts where negro labor alone can be employed, that the area of the rice-growing districts is very small, that it is an agricultural pursuit apart from all others, requiring such peculiar knowledge of the art that a rice-grower is as distinct from other agriculturists in his skill as a fruit-grower is from a corn-grower, it claims the approval of philanthropy that we should encourage this industry. The negro who grows rice is the competitor of the Chinese cooly, of the Hindoo laborer, the Egyptian fellah, and is not in competition with any other laborer in the United States. In view of these facts the flimsy excuse for this legislative retaliation on the leading industries of more than half the arable portions of this country has no reasonable justification.

The bagging, forced by a tariff tax that gives shelter to conspiracy to extort from the cotton-grower enormous tribute, and the iron ties that are taxed in the Senate bill more than 100 per cent. on their cost, are a dead loss to the cotton-grower. The tare on every bale of cotton in Liverpool is 28 pounds, without reference to the weight of the bale. With cotton at 10 cents a pound it is $2.80 deducted from every 500-pound bale, worth $50. If the bale weighs less, say 400 pounds, it is worth $40 minus $2.80. This tare reduces the selling price of the 500 pound bale to $47.20, and of the 400-pound bale to $37.20. This is 5.60 per cent. on the value of the crop. On a crop of 6,000,000 bales, at 10 cents per pound, the loss to the cotton-growers is $16,800,000. This is all thrown away, for they are not even allowed to have the discarded iron hoops and the bagging stripped from the cotton bales by this arbitrary rule of the market.

Now, for us to add more than 100 per cent. to the cost of the cotton-ties and nearly as much to the cost of the cotton-bagging to increase our revenues that are already so grossly in excess that Congress is ready to resort to any measures to get rid of it, however dangerous to the country, is a species of legislative retaliation that no acrimony of party feeling and no exaggeration of sectional resentment can justify to the minds of a thoughtful, honest, and generous people. The cotton crop of the South is the permanent and irrevocable gift of Providence to this country as an incident of our climate. No richer gift was ever bestowed upon any land, and no other country can, by its productions, destroy its values. More than half the yield from this crop is produced by white labor, and 95 per cent. of those engaged in its subsequent manufacture are white people.

In the cotton-fields the father and mother, sons and daughters, are engaged first in the cultivation and then in the harvest, which must be gathered by hand labor. More of personal toil enters into this crop than in any other industry, even more than in rice and sugar. The product is $300,000,000 a year in ready cash, and that money is gold whenever it is demanded. In the exchanges of the United States it is the leading factor. Without this our balances of trade would shrink out of sight and be lost to hope. The Constitution compels us to ship it without the protection of an export duty. In cotton we must have compulsory free trade, and our market is with people who are daily styled paupers by our learned Senators. The home market could no more absorb our cotton crop than Alabama could consume all the wheat in the Northwest. With fivefold our present population we could not absorb the increase of production that will attend such an increase of our population.

Cotton clothing is the first lesson that impresses the savage and leads him up to civilization. The uses of cotton will extend and amplify with the increase of human population, which is the true mission of Christian philanthropy. The more people there are in the world, and the more they are enlightened and refined, the greater must be the demand for cotton.

That the Senate Committee on Finance should have forgotten these things when it declared a war of retaliation on cotton is a sad evidence of the extent to which the passing demands of a political campaign can tempt our justly distinguished statesmen to attack anything that seems to oppose their march to power and make open war upon an industry that is the whole living of their negro allies in the South.

Fully half of every bale of cotton raised by negro labor belongs to him the moment it is gathered. If negro labor produces 3,000,000 bales one-half the burdens I have stated falls upon the negro race, and this is a hard blow to be inflicted by the pretended friends of those people. I leave them to settle their own family quarrels. The white people of the South spend the cash proceeds of their cotton after large usury is paid for money borrowed to support the working people, for provisions and clothing. It is they and not the manufacturers of New England that furnish the great home market to the Northwest and New England.

If they had no other claim than this to some indulgence from excessive taxation, I should feel it a privilege to see them dealt justly with. Those who still desire to legislate for sections or against sections will still find followers who go where their prejudices lead them; but, if the Senate still desires the South to be made the subject of retaliatory legislation to gratify a prejudice, the resort to tax laws for this purpose is cruel to innocent people, especially so to the improvident negro population, and is not up to the standard of magnanimity or of courageous legislation which the American people expect to find in the Senate.

I will not attempt further to debate this bill until it is called for

action, by sections, which is a duty that the majority in this body can retire from if they choose, but which I will not assist them to evade.

APPENDIX.

Additions to free-list by H. R. 9051.

Articles.	Present rate.
Bristles	15 cents a pound.
Boracic acid (commercial)	4 cents a pound.
Boracic acid (pure)	5 cents a pound.
Alumina, alum, patent alum, alum substitute, sulphate alumina, aluminous cake, and alum in crystals or ground	⅝ cent a pound.
Antimony, as regulus or metal	10 per cent.
Bark for tanning, extract of; hemlock	20 per cent.
Bibles, books, and pamphlets printed in other than English, and all books and publications of foreign governments and societies for gratuitous distribution	
Borax (crude)	3 cents a pound.
Borax (refined)	5 cents a pound.
Coal tar, all preparations of, not colors or dyes, not specifically enumerated or provided for	20 per cent.
Copper, sulphate of	3 cents a pound.
Crysilic wash for sheep	20 per cent.
Glycerine, crude, brown, or yellow, of specific gravity of 125 or less at a temperature of 60 degrees, not purified by refining or distilling	2 cents a pound.
Indigo, and extract of	10 per cent.
Iodine	40 cents a pound.
Iron, sulphate of	⅝ cent a pound.
Logwood and other dye-woods, extracts, and decoctions	10 per cent.
Mineral waters, imitations of natural and artificial	30 per cent.
Opium, crude, containing 9 per cent. and over of morphia	$1 a pound.
Phosphorus	10 cents a pound.
Potash, carbonate of, or fused, and caustic	20 per cent.
Potash, chlorate of	3 cents a pound.
Potash, crude	20 per cent.
Potash, nitrate of (crude)	1 cent a pound.
Potash, sulphate of	20 per cent.
Soda, sulphate of (Glauber's-salts)	20 per cent.
Soda, sulphate of (salt cake, crude, or refined, or niter cake, crude or refined	20 per cent.
Sulphur, refined	$10 per ton.
Barks, beans, berries, balsams, buds, bulbs, and bulbous roots and excrescenses, such as nut-galls, forest-flowers, dried fibers, grains, gums, and gum-resins, herbs, leaves, lichens, mosses, nuts, roots, and stems, etc	10 per cent.
Chicory root	2 cents a pound.
Clay, unwrought or manufactured, not specially enumerated or provided for	$1.50 a ton.
Cocoa, prepared or manufactured	2 cents a pound.
Coffee, substitutes for, not specially enumerated or provided for	2 cents a pound.
Copper, ores, fine copper contained therein	2½ cents a pound.
Copper, regulus of, and black or coarse copper and copper cement, fine copper contained therein	3½ cents a pound.
Copper, fit only for remanufacture	3 cents a pound.
Brick, other than fire brick	20 per cent.
Canes and walking sticks, unfinished	20 per cent.
Feathers, ostrich and others, crude or not dressed, colored, or manufactured	25 per cent.
Flax, not hackled or dressed	$20 a ton.
Flax, straw	$5 ton.
Flax, tow of	$10 a ton.
Hemp	$25 a ton.
Hemp, tow of	$10 a ton.
Hemp, manila, and other like substitutes for, not specially enumerated or provided for	$25 a ton.
Sunn	$15
Jute	20 per cent.
Jute-butts	$5 a ton.
Sisal-grass	$15 a ton.
Other vegetable substances not specially enumerated or provided for	$15 a ton.
Burlaps of flax, jute, or hemp, or in which they are component material of chief value (except such as may be suitable for bagging for cotton), not over 60 inches wide	30 per cent.
Bags of jute for grain	40 per cent.
Currants, Zante or other	1 cent a pound.
Dates	1 cent a pound.
Figs	2 cents a pound.
Glass, German looking-glass plates of blown glass	45 per cent.
Glass, plates or disks, for spectacles	10 per cent.
Grease, not specially enumerated or provided for	25 per cent.
Hair, curled, except of hogs, used for beds or mattresses	20 per cent.
Hair, human, raw, unclean, and not drawn	15 per cent.
Iron, chromic ore	35 per cent.
Cotton-ties, or hoops for baling purposes	
Iron, sheets or plates, or taggers' iron, etc., known as tin-plates, terne-plates, and taggers' tin	1 cent a pound.
Machinery for the manufacture of jute	45 per cent.
Needles, sewing, darning, knitting, etc	25 per cent.
Lime, borate of	3 cents a pound.
Alcohol, 94 per cent. anhydrous alcohol	$2 a gallon.
Compounds or preparations of which distilled spirits are component part of chief value containing 50 per cent. anhydrous alcohol	$1 a gallon.
Stone, unmanufactured or undressed	$1 a ton.
Stones, grind	$1.75 a ton.
Metals, unwrought, not specially enumerated or provided for	20 per cent.
Quicksilver	10 per cent.
Minerals, non-dutiable, advanced in value or condition by refining or grinding, or by other process of manufacture, not specially enumerated or provided for	10 per cent.

Additions to free-list by H. R. 9051—Continued.

Articles.	Present rate.
Mineral substances in a crude state, not specially enumerated or provided for	20 per cent.
Oil, neat's-foot, seal, whale, and fish, not elsewhere specified, and all other animal oils and combinations of	20 per cent.
Oil, naphtha, benzine, etc	20 per cent.
Oil, petroleum, crude	10 per cent.
Oil, cotton-seed	25 per cent.
Oil, croton	50 cents a gallon.
Oil, hemp-seed and rape-seed	10 cents a gallon.
Oil, olive, and salad other than olive	25 per cent.
Baryta, unmanufactured	10 per cent.
Ocher, dry	¼ cent a pound.
Sienna and sienna earths, dry	¼ cent a pound.
Umber and umber earths, dry	¼ cent a pound.
Powders, finishing	35 per cent.
Meats, game, and poultry, not elsewhere specified, dressed or undressed, but not otherwise prepared	10 per cent.
Tallow	10 per cent.
Milk, fresh	10 per cent.
Egg yelks	20 per cent.
Rags, not specially enumerated or provided for	10 per cent.
Salt, in bags, sacks, barrels, or packages	12 cents per 100 lbs.
Salt, in bulk	8 cents per 100 lbs.
Bulbs and bulbous roots, not medicinal, not specially enumerated or provided for	20 per cent.
Seeds, garden, except of the sugar-beet	20 per cent.
Seed, hemp, rape, and other of like character	¼ cent pound.
Soap, hard and soft, not specially enumerated or provided for	20 per cent.
Strings, of cat-gut, etc., other than strings for musical instruments	25 per cent.
Tar, pitch of	20 per cent.
Tar, of coal, and tar and pitch of wood	10 per cent.
Turpentine, spirits of	20 cents a gallon.
Beans and pease, not for seed	10 per cent.
Pease, split	10 per cent.
Waste, all not specially enumerated or provided for	10 per cent.
Bees-wax	20 per cent.
Bass-wood and other fiber, not otherwise provided for	10 per cent.
Brush, for crib work	10 per cent.
Wood, unmanufactured, not specially enumerated or provided for	20 per cent.
Timber, used for spars and building wharves	20 per cent.
Timber, hewn and sawed	20 per cent.
Timber, square or sided, not specially enumerated or provided for	1 cent cubic foot.
Lumber	From $1 per 1,000 feet to $3.50.
Clapboards, pine	$2 per 1,000.
Clapboards, spruce	$1.50 per 1,000.
Hubs for wheels, posts, lasts, wagon, oar, gun, etc., blocks, and all like blocks, rough-hewn or sawed only	20 per cent.
Laths	15 cents per 1,000.
Pickets and palings	20 per cent.
Shingles	35 cents per 1,000.
Shooks, sugar-box and packing boxes and packing-box shooks	30 per cent.
Staves of all kinds	10 per cent.
Ozier, or willow, prepared for basket-makers	25 per cent.
Osier and willow baskets, etc	20 per cent.
Rattans and reeds, manufactured, but not made up into completed articles	10 per cent.
Wools, unmanufactured	2½ to 36 cents.
Woolen rags	10 cents a pound.
Sacks, crates, boxes, etc	100 per cent.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The bill is before the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, and will be read at length.

Mr. COCKRELL. If the Senator from Iowa has no objection, I will move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The Secretary will proceed with the reading of the amendment reported by the Committee on Finance.

The SECRETARY. It is proposed to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert——

Mr. ALLISON. I want to say just a word in response to the Senator from Alabama [Mr. MORGAN] as respects cotton-ties and the injustice that has been done in regard to this necessary article for baling cotton. The Senator assumes that the rate of duty is added to the price, which, of course, it is not. Although he does not state that, I suppose his argument is based upon that idea. The present duty on cotton-ties is 35 per cent. ad valorem. The price of cotton-ties, according to the unit of value, is 1.2 cents per pound, the foreign value. It takes 9 pounds of hoop-iron to circle a bale of cotton, so that the foreign price of hoop-iron for a bale of cotton is nine times 1.2 cents. Cotton-ties now pay 35 per cent. duty. The Senate substitute increases it somewhat.

Mr. MORGAN. How much?

Mr. ALLISON. It increases it to the extent of 8 cents a bale on each bale of cotton, assuming that all the duty is paid by the consumer.

Mr. MORGAN. Is not that equivalent to 100 per cent. on the present duty?

Mr. ALLISON. It is nearly that on the present duty.

Mr. MORGAN. That is what I stated or meant to state.

Mr. ALLISON. But I am coming to the point of the injustice. It is perfectly well known that these cotton-ties will be made, can be made

in this country, in the Senator's own State. Assuming, however, what is claimed, that this duty will add one-quarter to the ties, it only makes, as the Senate substitute proposes, a difference of 2 cents a bale to every bale of cotton in the United States, which when sold in this country is paid for as cotton.

Mr. MORGAN. The Senator is mistaken about its being paid for as cotton in this country. It is not paid for as cotton. Tare affects the price here as it does in Liverpool.

Mr. ALLISON. That is a question of course of debate. What I mean to say is that when a bale of cotton is purchased in this country it is purchased with the cotton bagging and the iron hoops on it.

Mr. GEORGE. The tare is taken off.

Mr. ALDRICH. It is a question whether it is or not. The New England manufacturer buys 9 pounds of iron which cost the cotton planter 2 cents a pound and he pays 10 cents a pound for it. Upon whom the tax rests ultimately I do not say.

Mr. GEORGE. He gets it for nothing by its reducing the price of the cotton.

Mr. ALDRICH. It is a question of argument whether it does or not.

Mr. MORGAN. No, a bale of cotton that weighs 528 pounds is sold for 500 pounds.

Mr. ALDRICH. Not in this country.

Mr. MORGAN. Yes, sir.

Mr. ALDRICH. I beg the Senator's pardon. The manufacturer of New England who buys a bale of cotton weighing 528 pounds, iron hoops, bagging, and all, pays for 528 pounds without any allowance for tare whatever.

Mr. MORGAN. But you get your market rate at Liverpool.

Mr. ALDRICH. It is an open question whether you do.

Mr. MORGAN. And the market rate at Liverpool is fixed by the fact that 28 pounds are taken from every bale.

Mr. ALDRICH. The market rate in Liverpool is not the same always as the market rate in New England. It is a very complicated question.

Mr. ALLISON. I wish merely to state that this proposition as to cotton-ties makes a difference of 2 cents a bale on the cotton, and no more.

Mr. ALDRICH. I feel that I ought to say a word in regard to the statement made by the Senator from Alabama concerning the action of the conference committee on the tariff law of 1883.

Mr. MORGAN. I made no statement, if the Senator will allow me; I read from the report of the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BECK].

Mr. ALDRICH. The Senator reiterates the statement which the Senator from Kentucky makes in his minority report.

Mr. MORGAN. That has always been my conviction, however.

Mr. ALDRICH. I am the only Senator who was a member of that conference committee now in the city, and I should have hitherto paid some attention to the statement contained in the views of the minority submitted by the Senator from Kentucky had it not been for the enforced absence of that Senator—an absence the occasion of which I regret as much as the Senator from Alabama.

Many of the statements which the Senator from Kentucky makes as to the action and motives of members of the conference, based upon the allegations of others, are absolutely untrue, as can be demonstrated by the RECORD, and as will be shown whenever the Senator from Kentucky shall appear in his seat, which I hope may be very soon.

Mr. GEORGE. I hope the Senator from Rhode Island will allow us to believe the Senator from Kentucky, whom we all know to be a very accurate man, until his statement is shown by demonstration to be false.

Mr. ALDRICH. I have no doubt the Senator from Kentucky believed that his statements were true. I have as high respect and admiration for that Senator as any man upon this floor, and, as I have no doubt, he was misled. I believe that upon an examination of the record he will as quickly and as readily exonerate his colleagues on the Finance Committee and admit his error as any other Senator in the Chamber would.

Mr. EUSTIS. Will the Senator state what the inaccuracy is?

Mr. ALDRICH. It is too long a story to go into now, and I prefer to have the Senator from Kentucky as well as the chairman of the committee [Mr. MORRILL] and the Senator from Ohio [Mr. SHERMAN] here whenever the statement is made.

One word in regard to sugar. The Senator from Alabama says that the Senate substitute fixes a rate of duty upon raw sugars, testing 75 degrees of saccharine strength by the polariscope, at .70 cent per pound, and on the first grade of refined sugars, between Nos. 13 and 16, 1¾ cents per pound, or a difference of .67 cent per pound, or a duty on refined sugar nearly double the duty on raw sugars, for the benefit of the refiners.

The House bill fixes the rate of duty upon sugars testing 75 degrees of saccharine strength at 1.15 cents a pound, and upon refined sugars, between 13 and 16, at 2.20 cents per pound, showing a difference between raw and refined in the House bill of 1.5 cents per pound as against .67 cent per pound by the Senate bill, giving an additional benefit to the refiners by the House bill of .38 of a cent a pound, or an annual gratuity to the refiners upon all the sugars consumed in this country which pass through the refineries of $11,400,000. This bonus to the refiners, it should be borne in mind, is in addition to the protection which they receive under the Senate substitute. I think it due to the Senate that this statement should be made.

Mr. MORGAN. My reference to the sugar production was more particularly to the fact that the Senate bill does not change the relative rate of duty on unrefined and refined sugars, but the duty on grades below No. 13 Dutch standard.

Mr. ALDRICH. In that the Senator is very much mistaken.

Mr. MORGAN. I can not be, because it is put in a specific sum.

Mr. ALDRICH. I think I can convince the Senator of that by a single statement.

Under the existing law the duty upon sugars below No. 13 Dutch standard, the average being ninety degrees, is 2 cents per pound, and the duty on refined sugars between 13 and 16 is 2.75 cents, or a difference of seventy-five one-hundredths, or three-quarters of a cent per pound. By the Senate bill the average rate on raw sugars at ninety degrees is 1 cent a pound, while the duty upon No. 13 to 16 is 1¾ cents, or a difference of three-eighths of a cent a pound. We have then a difference of three-eighths of a cent a pound under the Senate bill between raw and refined as against three-quarters of a cent under existing law, or a reduction of three-eighths cent per pound of the protection afforded refiners.

Mr. MORGAN. Ninety degrees of saccharine strength as developed by the polariscope is not a fair test.

Mr. ALDRICH. I stated that ninety degrees was the average.

Mr. MORGAN. Then why do you put seventy-five degrees in the bill?

Mr. ALDRICH. We commence assessing the duties at seventy-five degrees.

Mr. MORGAN. The fair test is to take the extremes, the lowest on sugars below 13, and the lowest on sugars above 13.

Mr. ALDRICH. If the Senator takes that as a basis he will find a very much greater difference between the present law and the Senate substitute than the basis taken by me. For instance, at seventy-five degrees, under existing law, the duty is 1.4 cents a pound, and from 13 to 16 it is 2¾ cents per pound, making a difference of 1.35 cents per pound between seventy-five degrees and 13 to 16, while under the Senate bill this difference is but .67 cent. If the Senator takes that basis for his calculation he is worse off than before.

Mr. MORGAN. I have no right to complain of the Senate Finance Committee about this matter, because they have openly and avowedly and in a very frank way disclaimed any intention to protect sugar hereafter, so that it would be a heartless job; but what I complain of now, and what I complained of in 1883, was that the difference in duty between the grades below 13 and above 13 was very great. The Senate committee has held on to precisely the same relative differences in duty. Certainly it has to lower the grade of sugars at 75 degrees saccharine strength and those that are 13 by the Dutch standard or above it. If you put the duty at just one-half, exactly what it is under the act of 1883, you lower the grades.

Mr. ALLISON. Will the Senator allow me a moment?

Mr. MORGAN. Yes, I want to be corrected if I am mistaken about it.

Mr. ALLISON. All sugars under 13 Dutch standard must go into the refineries; that is to say, they are unfit for consumption, and therefore must go through the refineries. The protection to the refiner comes between 13 and 16 and above. The existing protection to the refiner is three-quarters of one cent per pound, and that is the gravamen of the contest made by the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BECK] in his strictures upon the act of 1883. The present protection to the refiner is three-quarters of a cent. Under the Senate substitute the protection is three-eighths of a cent. So we have reduced the relative protection to the refiner one-half, or from three-quarters of a cent to three-eighths of a cent a pound.

Mr. MORGAN. In reducing that you have given the refiner the opportunity of one-half the money to form his combination and control all the sugar under 13.

Mr. ALLISON. If the Senator will allow me one moment more, I ought to add that the House bill, which I suppose the Senator proposes to favor, gives to the refiners fifty-seven one-hundredths of a cent protection, as against thirty-seven and a half one-hundredths in the Senate bill, or, in other words, twenty one-hundredths of a cent per pound more than the Senate bill upon every pound of sugar that passes through the refineries. That is the entire production of foreign sugars. So the Senator can quarrel with the House bill, and not with the Senate bill in his criticism.

Mr. MORGAN. I have not quarreled with either the House bill or the Senate bill as yet, because I have not had an opportunity to find out precisely what they do. We are getting at it a little bit now upon sugar. I was felicitating the Senate and the country upon the fact that both the House and the Senate were making reductions in the existing rates of duties upon all commodities that were touched, and I thought it was a good occasion for us to get together and consider the

bill, and see if we could not agree about something that would relieve this country.

I am not by any means committed to the sugar tariff in the House bill. There are some other features of the House bill which do not meet my approval. I might take the House bill as a whole in preference to not taking any bill at all, as I might take the Senate bill as a whole in preference to not taking any bill at all. I want to have an opportunity to make a comparison between the propositions of the House and Senate upon these questions.

The objection that I was making about the sugar rate is the same that I made in 1883, that there was too wide a difference between sugars above 13 and sugars below 13; that that discriminated very decidedly against the American sugar producer, and also it discriminated very largely against the American sugar consumer, because, as I have said to-day in my remarks, every man will have the brightest, clearest, best-looking sugar he can get within reach, and the refiner will monopolize the market by the use of a small amount of money. While the producer gets but a very low protection of tariff duty upon his product, the refiner will take the matter into his own hands and compel the Louisiana producer to come to his terms. I think it is very unfortunate in this bill, or in any other bill, and certainly very unfortunate in the law as it stands now, that any set of men in the United States are given the opportunity by our legislation to monopolize this product of universal use, and tax the people enormously and unnecessarily in its consumption, and at the same time use it for the purpose of breaking down a domestic industry. That is my position.

Mr. ALLISON. That is precisely the position of the House bill, I will say to the Senator.

Mr. MORGAN. Now, let us go on and consider your bill. It may be that I shall vote for it.

Mr. ALLISON. In 1883 we discussed the sugar question, and the Senator participated in that discussion. As the Senator from Kentucky said, the first vote in this body was a vote giving the refiners .40 of a cent, and then afterwards it was changed to .50 of a cent. Now, the Senate bill is .02½ of a cent below anything that was suggested in this Chamber in 1883.

Mr. MORGAN. It may be a better bill than any we have had, and I may vote for that feature of it.

Mr. ALDRICH. My object in calling the attention of the Senator from Alabama to these facts, which I supposed he had overlooked, was this: I remembered that on a former occasion, in 1883, he, alone I think upon that side of the Chamber, voted with the Republican Senators in favor of a large reduction of duty upon sugar; and I believed that when his attention was called to the fact that upon the basis he had adopted that the House bill made a definite and positive discrimination of $11,400,000 a year in favor of the sugar trust, that his voice would be no longer heard in support of that measure.

Mr. MORGAN. Perhaps not in support of that feature of it.

Mr. GEORGE. I am a little surprised, Mr. President, to hear it asserted in this body that intelligent, true, commercial men will pay for 28 pounds of worthless stuff, as bagging and ties are after they are put on the bale, the same price that they pay for the cotton which is inclosed within the bale, without making any deduction from the price. I think I can state a fact or two very well known in commercial circles in the South which will remove all doubt upon that subject.

In the first place, the price of cotton in this country is fixed by the market in Liverpool. New Orleans is the great commercial mart of cotton in the South. Large amounts of cotton are brought to New Orleans for the purpose of shipment and sale to Liverpool. In Liverpool the tare is taken off. Can any sane man believe that the purchaser in New Orleans for shipment to Liverpool, buying by the Liverpool price (that is regulating the price in New Orleans by what the cotton can be sold for in Liverpool with a fair profit), will pay 8 or 10 cents a pound for 28 pounds of tare when as soon as its gets to Liverpool he will not get anything for it?

There are one or two other facts to which I will call the attention of Senators. A commercial bale of cotton in the South formerly was 450 pounds. I believe in late years it has risen to 500 pounds. It is a well-known fact, recognized in all the markets in the South where the tare, bagging, and ties are taken without making any special deduction, that if the bale of cotton offered for sale is a light bale, less than 400 pounds, then the price is reduced, simply because it is light and simply because the tare, the bagging, and ties which inclose the cotton and which have been adjusted in the price for a commercial bale would be unequal; and therefore a reduction is made.

I call the attention of Senators to another fact very well known in the South. Six or seven yards—I have forgotten which, and it is not material—of bagging are ordinarily put around a bale of cotton. If there be an excess over the number of pounds which is the regulation, then a deduction is made on that account. That shows that the tare is adjusted in the price. Six hoops or ties is the regulation number for a bale of cotton. If you put seven ties upon a bale of cotton, then there is a deduction for that.

These things show quite evidently to a thinking man that the tare, instead of being deducted specifically, is weighed with the bale and adjusted in the price which is paid.

Mr. ALDRICH. Just what regulates the price of cotton in New Orleans, Natchez, Memphis, or in any other Southern port, is a very complicated question, which depends upon many different elements. For instance, a certain grade of long staple cotton to be used in the manufacture of fine yarns, or some other particular grade of cotton for a special purpose might be in such demand in New Orleans at a particular time that the Liverpool price would have but little influence in regulating the price for the New England market. To what extent the New England price affects the Liverpool price, or the Liverpool price affects the New England price, is a very uncertain problem.

There is one fact, however, which invariably confronts the New England manufacturer; he has to pay 10 cents a pound for 28 or 30 pounds of cotton-bagging and iron hoops which costs the Southern planter 2 or 3 cents a pound. Whether he pays more or less than the Liverpool price is a question which he may not be able to ascertain. Nor do I imagine that any Senator upon this floor could tell with any degree of certainty how much was paid by the manufacturer, how much by the planter, and how much by the consumer.

Mr. GEORGE. If the New England manufacturer, with his eye open, actually pays the full value of cotton as cotton according to the markets of the world, and then pays 10 cents a pound in addition to that for 28 pounds of bagging and ties, I have only this to say about it, that he is a species of Yankee I never heard of before.

Mr. FRYE. Does not the Senator know that we buy bushels and bushels of sand, enough to make a small hill in the neighborhood of a large cotton-mill?

Mr. GEORGE. That is deducted.

Mr. FRYE. Oh, no; it is not deducted.

Mr. GEORGE. There is nothing better known in the commercial circles of the South than that dirty cotton sells for a less price per pound than clean cotton.

Mr. FRYE. We do not know it until we pick it.

Mr. GEORGE. If you have not found that out in New England, it is the first thing in New England you never did find out.

As to what regulates the price of cotton, Liverpool, as I understand, is not a manufacturing city. I understand that Manchester and some other places are the manufacturing towns. Liverpool is the great commercial mart of cotton in the world. If a manufacturer wants a certain kind of cotton, very fine or very low, he goes to Liverpool, if he is over in that country, because he knows he can find all kinds of cotton there. Liverpool does not sell any particular kind of cotton, but all kinds of cotton. In New Orleans, I admit, sometimes when a corner has been made on cotton, and when somebody is found short on sales, or something of that sort, cotton rises for a few days before settling time to a higher price than the normal price, and somebody is hurt; but taking the thing all the way through in the cotton season the price of cotton in every market in this country is fixed by the price in Liverpool.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The Secretary will proceed with the reading of the amendment proposed by the Committee on Finance.

Mr. ALLISON. I move that the Senate adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 15 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until to-morrow, Thursday, October 18, 1888, at 12 o'clock m.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

WEDNESDAY, *October* 17, 1888.

The House met at 12 o'clock m. Prayer by Rev. J. H. CUTHBERT, D. D.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT.

A message from the President of the United States, in writing, was communicated to the House by Mr. PRUDEN, one of his secretaries.

The message also announced as follows:

The following bill was approved by the President October 2, 1888:

An act (H. R. 10540) making appropriations for sundry civil expenses of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1889, and for other purposes.

The following bills and joint resolution were approved by the President October 12, 1888:

An act (H. R. 11101) to include Sapelo Sound, Sapelo River, and Sapelo Island in the Brunswick collection district in the State of Georgia;

An act (H. R. 9619) to authorize the construction of a bridge across the Missouri River at some accessible point within 1 mile north and 1 mile south and east of the mouth of the Kansas River;

An act (H. R. 10068) granting a pension to Lieut. Starkey R. Powell, of Black Hawk war;

An act (H. R. 10934) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to sell township maps or plats remaining on hand in his office;

An act (H. R. 7410) for the relief of settlers upon Old Camp Sheridan military reservation;

An act (H. R. 10060) prescribing the times for sales and for notice of sales of property in the District of Columbia for overdue taxes;

Joint resolution (H. Res. 210) authorizing the printing of the third annual report of the Commissioner of Labor;

An act (H. R. 2696) for the relief of John J. Crooke; and

An act (H. R. 5248) for the relief of the American Grocer Association of the city of New York.

The following bill was approved October 13, 1888:

An act (H. R. 1923) providing for the establishment of a life-saving station at the harbor of Kewaunee, Wis., and at other places herein named.

The following bills were approved October 15, 1888:

An act (H. R. 200) granting a pension to Walter O. Watson;

An act (H. R. 201) granting a pension to Edward Waters;

An act (H. R. 968) granting a pension to H. S. Sayre;

An act (H. R. 1085) granting a pension to Thomas Raines;

An act (H. R. 2139) granting a pension to George Rhody;

An act (H. R. 2471) granting a pension to Anna M. Noyes;

An act (H. R. 2474) granting a pension to Joseph Lincoln Young;

An act (H. R. 2716) granting a pension to J. W. Leight;

An act (H. R. 2788) granting a pension to Lieut. George T. Russell;

An act (H. R. 4039) granting a pension to Mary A. Pfeiffer;

An act (H. R. 5174) granting a pension to Statira Young;

An act (H. R. 5740) granting a pension to Anson Ward;

An act (H. R. 7185) granting a pension to Samuel Neikirk;

An act (H. R. 7485) granting a pension to Mrs. Susan V. Wilcox, mother of Martin V. Wilcox;

An act (H. R. 8200) granting a pension to Lydia Ann Wilber;

An act (H. R. 9182) granting a pension to Ransom Riley;

An act (H. R. 9341) granting a pension to Mrs. Dulcena Noel;

An act (H. R. 9862) granting a pension to Benjamin F. Bair;

An act (H. R. 9975) granting a pension to Joseph Welsh;

An act (H. R. 10017) granting a pension to Samuel Anderson;

An act (H. R. 10121) granting a pension to Sarah A. Mason;

An act (H. R. 10122) granting a pension to Margaret Quinton;

An act (H. R. 10629) granting a pension to Washington Ryan;

An act (H. R. 10705) granting a pension to Mary L. Tanner;

An act (H. R. 10824) granting a pension to Mary A. Van Buskirk;

An act (H. R. 10907) granting a pension to Henry Mitchell Youngblood;

An act (H. R. 11030) granting a pension to Susan E. Latture;

An act (H. R. 71243) granting a pension to Mary E. McQueen;

An act (H. R. 4038) granting a pension to Victor, Gertrude, Margaret, and Helen, minor children of Lieut. George R. McGuire;

An act (H. R. 9371) granting a pension to Betsy Williams, widow of William R. Williams, private Company C, Eighth Regiment Michigan Volunteers;

An act (H. R. 2073) granting an increase of pension to Daniel Willborg;

An act (H. R. 9358) to increase the pension of Rosalie O'Sullivan;

An act (H. R. 10210) granting an increase of pension to Philip Thomas;

An act (H. R. 10733) to increase the pension of George C. Quick;

An act (H. R. 2566) for the relief of Phillip Kopplin;

An act (H. R. 6449) for the relief of Perry R. Nye;

An act (H. R. 7912) for the relief of Frances P. Vernon;

An act (H. R. 9719) for the relief of Thomas Shackelford;

An act (H. R. 10007) for the relief of Henry Rose;

An act (H. R. 10827) for the relief of Catharine Teegardin;

An act (H. R. 11029) for the relief of Mary Vanbuskirk;

An act (H. R. 10241) increasing the pension of Richard Porter;

An act (H. R. 10106) to place the name of Matilda Spangler on the pension-roll;

An act (H. R. 10256) to place the name of Lucy Wagor, of Hillsdale, Mich., on the pension-roll;

An act (H. R. 10258) to place the name of Cyrus Millius, of Ogden Centre, Mich., on the pension-roll; and

An act (H. R. 10944) granting a pension to Victoria May.

The following bills were approved October 16, 1888:

An act (H. R. 508) granting a pension to Sarah F. Hawkins;

An act (H. R. 2120) granting a pension to Elizabeth Evans;

An act (H. R. 2689) granting a pension to Johanna Geyer, widow of Gustav W. Geyer;

An act (H. R. 3801) granting a pension to Nelson J. Crook;

An act (H. R. 7457) granting a pension to Eleanor D. Heath:

An act (H. R. 8553) granting a pension to Arabella Davis;

An act (H. R. 9169) granting a pension to Tempy M. Johnston;

An act (H. R. 10103) granting a pension to William Fairbanks;

An act (H. R. 10159) granting a pension to Jenny Buell;

An act (H. R. 10224) granting a pension to Elias H. Hall;

An act (H. R. 10687) granting a pension to Charles Junot;

An act (H. R. 10708) granting a pension to Jane E. Knoble;

An act (H. R. 10881) granting a pension to Nancy J. Cotner;

An act (H. R. 11057) granting a pension to Margaret Gray;

An act (H. R. 9370) granting a pension to Mrs. Susan Bates, widow of Thomas Bates, late private Company A, Twenty-sixth Regiment Michigan Volunteers;

An act (H. R. 3152) for the relief of Arlington M. Harrington;

An act (H. R. 3504) for the relief of John German;

An act (H. R. 6309) for the relief of Mary A. Covey;

An act (H. R. 8993) for the relief of Shadrack W. Brown;

An act (H. R. 8748) to increase the pension of Richard Jobes;

An act (H. R. 9935) to increase the pension of Isaac Hurd;

An act (H. R. 11021) to increase the pension of Charles Hahneman;

An act (H. R. 5193) granting an increase of pension to Benjamin Franklin; and

An act (H. R. 10245) granting an increase of pension to Hannibal Kimball.

VETO MESSAGE—JOHN ROBESON.

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read:

To the House of Representatives:

I return without approval House bill No. 6201, entitled "An act granting a pension to John Robeson."

The beneficiary named in this bill enlisted August 8, 1862, and was discharged for disability on the 21st day of November, 1862, after a service of a little more than three months.

In the certificate of disability upon which his discharge was granted, the captain of the beneficiary's company states that he has been unfit for duty for sixty days; that the soldier represents that he has not done efficient service since enlistment by reason of phthisic, from which he has suffered since childhood, but has grown worse since entering the service. The surgeon of the regiment states in said certificate that the soldier has asthma, with which he has been afflicted from infancy.

Upon this certificate based necessarily so far as his previous condition is concerned, this man procured his discharge after doing but very slight service.

He filed an application for pension in the Pension Bureau in October, 1879, basing his claim upon the allegation that he contracted asthma in September, 1862, about a month after he entered the service.

Two special examinations were had in his case, and his statement was taken in each.

On the first examination he said he could not account for the statements of his captain and surgeon, unless they arose from a remark he made that he had phthisic when he was small.

On the second he accounted for the statements of the captain and surgeon by saying that he felt very sick, and feared that he could not live if he remained in the service; that he was suffering with jaundice, as well as asthma, and having been told that he could not be discharged on account of jaundice, but could on account of asthma, he asked the captain to tell the surgeon that he had known him to have asthma before enlistment. He also says that he procured others to tell the same story.

On these examinations there was the usual negative testimony produced of certain parties who knew the claimant before enlistment, and did not know that he was afflicted. This is balanced by the evidence of others who testify that the claimant had asthma before enlistment.

Upon consideration of the character of the ailment, the testimony upon the two examinations, and the conduct of the beneficiary and his own admissions, I can not escape the conviction that whatever disability he had at the date of discharge he had when he enlisted, and that his claim was properly rejected by the Pension Bureau.

GROVER CLEVELAND.

EXECUTIVE MANSION, *October* 16, 1888.

Mr. MORRILL. I ask that the further reading of the messages be dispensed with, that they be printed in the RECORD, and referred to the appropriate committees.

Mr. MCMILLIN. I think they had better be read.

The SPEAKER. Objection is made to the request of the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. MORRILL], and if there be no objection the message will be referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

PETER LINER.

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following veto message; which was read, referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions, and ordered to be printed:

To the House of Representatives:

I return without approval House bill No. 9106, entitled "An act granting a pension to Peter Liner."

The beneficiary named in this bill enlisted as a sergeant in the regular Army in 1871, and he alleges that he served a previous term of enlistment, commencing in 1866.

While on a march from one post to another on the frontier in September, 1874, the beneficiary was severely wounded by the bursting of a gun, necessitating the amputation of three of his fingers.

The reports of this occurrence develop the fact that the gun which bursted in his hands was a shot-gun, and that the accident happened while the beneficiary was hunting "for his own pleasure or benefit."

His wound was a severe one, and the injured man was probably a good and faithful soldier, but it seems quite clear to me that it would be extending the pension theory to an unwarrantable limit to hold the Government responsible for such an accident.

GROVER CLEVELAND.

EXECUTIVE MANSION, *October* 16, 1888.

SOPHIA VOGELSANG.

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message; which was read, referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions, and ordered to be printed:

To the House of Representatives:

I return without approval House bill No. 10661, entitled "An act granting a pension to Mrs. Sophia Vogelsang."

The husband of this beneficiary was severely wounded in the military service of the United States, and in consequence of said wound his left leg was amputated. This was in 1862. In January, 1863, another amputation was performed higher up above the knee. He appears at that time to have been living, or at least was treated, at Detroit, Mich. He was pensioned at the rate of $30 per

month at the time of his death, which occurred at Louisville, Ky., where he appears to have then resided, on the 21st day of July, 1885.

The beneficiary filed a claim for pension in November, 1885, alleging that her husband died of gangrene.

There does not, however, seem to be a particle of evidence establishing that cause of death. On the contrary, the report received at the Pension Bureau of his death attributes it to sunstroke, and this does not seem to be directly questioned.

The report of the House Committee to whom this bill was referred, proceeds upon the theory that death was caused from the use of opium to allay the pain of the wound. This theory is presented upon the alleged opinion of the surgeon living in Detroit, who made the second amputation in 1863. He says that the pain of the wound obliged the soldier to take morphine. But it does not appear that he observed the case for a long time preceding death. Instead of his giving an opinion that the disability and morphine produced death, he says, as it is reported to me, after describing the condition of the limb previous to its amputation in 1863, and immediately thereafter, "according to my opinion said disability and the constant use of morphia in consequence of it may have been the cause of his death." This, and the statement of a druggist in Louisville, that he sold him morphine to alleviate pain, and of two different persons with whom he boarded at that city in 1885, to the same effect, is all the evidence that I can discover tending in the least to hint that the death of the pensioner resulted from any cause but sunstroke, which really stands as the undisputed cause of death.

The allegation in the committee's report that the beneficiary's claim was rejected by the Pension Bureau on the ground that her husband's death proceeded from the use of morphine, is erroneous. The cause of rejection is stated to be "that the death cause (sunstroke) was not the result of the soldier's military service."

We are not therefore left to the consideration of the question whether death from the use of morphine to allay pain can be charged to the disability incurred, for if death resulted from sunstroke it will hardly be claimed that it was in any way related to such disability.

GROVER CLEVELAND.

EXECUTIVE MANSION, *October* 16, 1888.

WILLIAM S. LATHAM.

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message; which was read, referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions, and ordered to be printed:

To the House of Representatives:

I herewith return without approval House bill No. 10563, entitled "An act granting a pension to William S. Latham."

The beneficiary named in this bill enlisted in August, 1862. The rolls for March and April, 1863, report him a deserter, but it having been ascertained that sickness was the cause of his failure to return to his regiment at the end of a furlough granted to him, upon which failure the charge of desertion was based, he was restored to his company and the charge of desertion removed.

All this is stated in the report of the committee to which this bill was referred.

But it is not mentioned in said report that he was again furloughed on the 17th day of August, 1863, and failing to return at the end of his furlough, one month thereafter, again became a deserter, but was not so reported until October 8, 1863.

He was arrested January 1, 1864, but there appears to be no record of his trial or his restoration.

He filed a claim for pension in the Pension Bureau in January, 1870, and he was informed twice during the year 1888 that no favorable action could be taken until the charge of desertion had been removed.

On application to the Adjutant-General, that officer, on the 21st day of February, 1888, declined to remove said charge of desertion.

The claim is still pending before the Pension Bureau.

I do not suppose that the Congress is prepared to go so far in special pension legislation as to grant pensions to those against whom charges of desertion appear of record.

In the belief that the fact of the second desertion above mentioned was overlooked by the Congress, and because the application for pension in this case is still pending in the Pension Bureau, where complete justice can still be done, I am constrained to withhold my approval of this bill.

GROVER CLEVELAND.

EXECUTIVE MANSION, *October* 16, 1888.

MARY WOODWORTH.

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message; which was read, referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions, and ordered to be printed:

To the House of Representatives:

I return without approval House bill No. 7657, entitled "An act granting a pension to Mary Woodworth, widow of Ebenezer F. Woodworth."

The husband of this beneficiary enlisted October 1, 1861. On the rolls of his company for May and June, 1862, he is reported as a deserter, and the report is the same on the muster-out roll of his regiment, dated October 24, 1864.

An effort was made on the application by the beneficiary for pension to the Pension Bureau to attribute the charge of desertion to the unfriendliness and injustice of the soldier's captain, and an unsuccessful effort was made to have the charge removed from the record by the Adjutant-General.

The soldier, therefore, is still recorded as a deserter from camp near Farmington, Miss., since March 12, 1862.

The application of the widow to the Pension Bureau in 1867 states that her husband was missing at Hamburgh, Tenn., May 7, 1862, and not having since been heard from, is supposed to be dead.

The captain of the company testifies that the soldier was employed with the ambulance corps, and that for misconduct he, the captain, ordered him to his company and censured him; that very soon after that the soldier was absent at roll-call and was marked as absent without leave; that in a day or two after that a member of a detail returned to camp from Hamburgh Landing and reported that he had seen the soldier there and had been told by him that "he was off and never would go back." Thereupon he was dropped from the roll as a deserter.

Various theories are presented to account for the soldier's absence in other ways than by desertion, some of his comrades going so far as to express the opinion that he was murdered at the instigation of his captain. None of these theories, however, seem to be more than conjectures with various degrees of plausibility.

If the question of desertion could be solved favorably to the beneficiary, another difficulty immediately arises from the fact that there is absolutely no proof of death except the soldier's long absence without knowledge of his whereabouts; and if his death could be presumed, the cause of it, and whether connected at all with military service, are matters regarding which we have no information whatever.

I am unable to see how a case in such a situation can be considered a proper subject for favorable pension legislation.

GROVER CLEVELAND.

EXECUTIVE MANSION, *October* 16, 1888.

ELIZA S. GLASS.

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message; which was read, referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions, and ordered to be printed:

To the House of Representatives:

I return without approval House bill No. 11332, entitled "An act granting a pension to Eliza S. Glass."

The husband of this beneficiary was in the military service from December 28, 1863, to April 27, 1864, a period of four months.

He was discharged at the last-mentioned date for disability, the surgeon stating in the certificate his trouble to be "chronic hemorrhoids and rheumatism, both together producing lameness of back; unfit for Invalid Corps." The captain of the soldier's company, in the same certificate, states: "During the last two months said soldier has been unfit for duty fifty-four days in consequence of chronic rheumatism, owing to spinal affections and sprains received before entering the service, and made worse by drilling in double quick."

He filed a claim for pension December 24, 1879, more than fifteen years after discharge, in which he claimed that on the 15th day of January, 1864, he received an injury to his back by slipping and falling upon the ground.

After a thorough examination, this claim was rejected on the ground that his disability existed prior to enlistment.

The beneficiary filed a claim for pension December 3, 1885, alleging the death of the soldier April 26, 1885.

This claim was also rejected on the ground that the death causes, "nervous prostration and spinal trouble," were not due to the service.

Both of these cases were appealed to the Secretary of the Interior, and in the decision of said appeals it is stated that upon an application for a discharge from the service the soldier first set up an injury to his back, from a fall while on drill; that the regimental surgeon refused to entertain this proposition; that the next day the soldier returned, and upon the representations of himself and his captain that his trouble dated back of the alleged accident upon drill, and was chronic, the certificate for discharge was made out, and pursuant thereto his discharge was granted.

I am of the opinion that considering the cause of death and all the facts and circumstances surrounding this case, the certificate of discharge which the soldier himself procured to be made out should stand as stating the true origin of his disability. And if the certificate was set aside and all the facts tending to support it were disregarded, the cause of death would still, in my opinion, appear to be disconnected with military service.

GROVER CLEVELAND.

EXECUTIVE MANSION, *October* 17, 1888.

ELLEN KELLY.

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message; which was read, referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions, and ordered to be printed:

To the House of Representatives:

I return without approval House bill No. 4820, entitled "An act granting a pension to Ellen Kelly."

The husband of this beneficiary was granted a furlough to go home and vote on the 31st day of October, 1864. On his way there he was severely injured by a railroad collision, and there does not seem to be a particle of doubt that the injuries thus sustained caused his death.

Upon these facts this does not seem to be a proper case for the granting of a pension.

GROVER CLEVELAND.

EXECUTIVE MANSION, *October* 17, 1888.

ELIZABETH HECKLER.

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message; which was read, referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions, and ordered to be printed:

To the House of Representatives:

I return without approval House bill No. 11222, entitled "An act granting a pension to Elizabeth Heckler."

The husband of this beneficiary was pensioned for asthma, and there is no doubt of the propriety of such pension, nor is there doubt upon the evidence that this affection continued up to the time of his death.

But he died of acute inflammation of the bladder and chronic enlargement of prostate gland. There is no proof that these causes of death were in the least complicated with the difficulty for which the deceased was pensioned, or any other trouble which was the result of military service.

GROVER CLEVELAND.

EXECUTIVE MANSION, *October* 17, 1888.

MARY A. CARR.

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message; which was read, referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions, and ordered to be printed:

To the House of Representatives:

I return without approval House bill No. 4102, entitled "An act granting a pension to Mary A. Carr."

The husband of this beneficiary served in the Army from November 5, 1863, to June 15, 1865. He made a claim for pension for injury to his left ankle, caused by being thrown from a horse while in the service, and some time after his death a pension was allowed upon his claim at the rate of $4 per month, commencing at the date of his discharge and ending at the date of his death.

He died on the 16th day of March, 1877, of apoplexy, and his widow filed a claim for pension on her own behalf in March, 1885, based upon the allegation that the injury for which her husband was pensioned was the cause of his death.

I can not upon the facts of this case arrive at a conclusion different from the Pension Bureau, where it was determined that the death of the soldier could not be accepted as having been caused by the injury to his ankle.

GROVER CLEVELAND.

EXECUTIVE MANSION, *October* 17, 1888.

LYDIA A. EATON.

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message; which

was read, referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions, and ordered to be printed:

To the House of Representatives:

I return without approval House bill No. 2472, entitled "An act granting a pension to Lydia A. Eaton."

The husband of this beneficiary was pensioned for chronic rheumatism at the rate of $4 a month up to the date of his death, August 4, 1884.

The beneficiary filed a claim for pension on the 2d day of September, 1884.

The cause of her husband's death was cystitis, which being interpreted is inflammation of the bladder.

The claim of the beneficiary was rejected on the ground that the fatal disease was not due to army service, and I fail to discover how any other conclusion can be reached.

GROVER CLEVELAND.

EXECUTIVE MANSION, *October* 17, 1888.

JOHN DAUPER.

The SPEAKER also laid before the House the following message; which was read, referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions, and ordered to be printed:

To the House of Representatives:

I return without approval House bill No. 10342, entitled "An act granting a pension to John Dauper."

This beneficiary enlisted April 24, 1861, and was discharged August 28, 1861, four months after enlistment.

He filed a claim for pension in September, 1879, alleging as cause of disability diarrhea and disease of the stomach, liver, kidneys, and bladder.

None of these ailments were established satisfactorily as originating in the soldier's brief service, and as constituting disabilities after discharge.

The claim was therefore rejected by the Pension Bureau, and this action appears to be entirely justified upon the facts presented.

GROVER CLEVELAND.

EXECUTIVE MANSION, *October* 17, 1888.

ESTER GAVEN.

The SPEAKER also laid before the House the following message; which was read, referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions, and ordered to be printed:

To the House of Representatives:

I return without approval House bill No. 11005, entitled "An act granting a pension to Ester Gaven."

This act provides that the beneficiary shall be placed upon the pension-roll as the widow of Bernard Gaven, and the report of the committee to whom this bill was referred throughout speaks of her as bearing that relation to the soldier.

She filed a claim in the Pension Bureau for a pension on the 31st day of January, 1881, as the mother of Bernard Gaven.

This claim is still pending, and, though evidence that the death of the soldier had any relation to his military service is entirely lacking and some other difficulties are apparent, the case may still be made out in the Pension Bureau. If it is, the beneficiary can be put upon the pension-roll in her true character as mother of the soldier, instead of widow, as erroneously stated in the bill herewith returned.

Upon the merits as the case now stands and because of the mistake in describing the relationship of the beneficiary this bill, I think, should not become a law.

GROVER CLEVELAND.

EXECUTIVE MANSION, *October* 17, 1888.

MARY HOOPER.

The SPEAKER also laid before the House the following message; which was read, referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions, and ordered to be printed:

To the House of Representatives:

I return without approval House bill No. 10504, entitled an "An act granting a pension to Mary Hooper."

The husband of this beneficiary was first lieutenant in the volunteer service from December 7, 1861, to February 28, 1862, a little over two months, when he resigned. His resignation was based upon a medical certificate in which it is stated that this officer is unfit for duty on account of chronic pleuritis and pulmonary consumption, from which he has suffered for the past four months.

This certificate is dated February 14, 1862.

The soldier filed a claim in 1871, alleging typhoid fever resulting in paralysis, and that the fever was contracted in the latter part of February, 1862.

The soldier died January 17, 1884, of paralysis.

The beneficiary filed a claim for pension November 17, 1887, claiming that her husband died of disease contracted in the service.

The claims have been specially and thoroughly examined. The testimony does not establish any disease or disability in the service other than those stated in the certificate procured by him when he resigned, but it does tend to establish that about April 17, 1862, after his resignation, the soldier was sick with typhoid fever and that afterwards he suffered from partial paralysis, which increased and finally caused his death.

I make no reference to the fact stated in the committee's report, suggesting the idea that the courage of the deceased soldier had been questioned, further than to correct the allegation of the report that either his or his widow's claim for pension has been rejected for cowardice. It appears from the record furnished to me that they were rejected on the ground that the evidence is insufficient to connect the death cause or disability with the soldier's military service.

I am unable to see what other conclusion could be reached in the face of the soldier's own statements, as contained in the medical certificate furnished him and elsewhere made, and upon consideration of the other facts in the case.

GROVER CLEVELAND.

EXECUTIVE MANSION, *October* 17, 1888.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. ABBOTT, indefinitely, on account of business.

To Mr. SAYERS, indefinitely.

To Mr. BLISS, indefinitely, on account of important business.

To Mr. ROGERS, indefinitely.

To Mr. JACKSON, for five days, on account of business.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED.

Mr. KILGORE, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that they had examined and found duly enrolled bills and joint resolution of the House and Senate of the following titles; when the Speaker signed the same:

A bill (H. R. 11139) to authorize the building of a bridge or bridges across the Mississippi River, at La Crosse, Wis.;

A bill (H. R. 11262) to authorize the construction of bridges across the Kentucky River and its tributaries by the Richmond, Irvine and Beattyville Railroad Company;

Joint resolution (S. R. 116) authorizing the Secretary of War to protect the Washington Aqueduct tunnel; and

A bill (S. 1482) granting a pension to Sarah C. Taylor.

CORRECTION.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will recognize the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. RYAN], as he desires to correct the RECORD.

Mr. RYAN. I desire unanimous consent to call attention to what I believe to be an error reflecting upon the methods of a very prominent business man, contained in a speech recently delivered by Mr. HATCH, of Missouri. It appears in a report which he quotes in his speech from a commercial agent named Washington, dated September 15, and addressed to the Assistant Secretary of State. The specific matter I refer to is as follows:

I am credibly advised——

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE, of Kentucky. What is the matter which the gentleman desires to present?

The SPEAKER. The Chair understood that the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. RYAN] desired to make a correction of the RECORD.

Mr. RYAN. I think the Chair misapprehended me. I desire to call attention to an erroneous statement which was made in a speech recently delivered by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. HATCH] upon the floor of the House—a statement which does injustice to a business man.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE, of Kentucky. That is not a question of privilege.

Mr. RYAN. It is not, and I have not risen to a question of privilege. I ask unanimous consent to call attention to this statement and have read a letter from the business man referred to. That is all I wish to say upon the subject.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE, of Kentucky. In the absence of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. HATCH] it does not seem proper that anything intended as a reply to his statement should go into the RECORD by unanimous consent.

Mr. RYAN. I do not propose to make any comment whatever on the matter myself.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE, of Kentucky. Then I object.

Mr. RYAN. I make this request simply for the purpose of allowing a gentleman who can not be heard upon this floor to correct an error which does him injustice, and his letter is very brief.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will state to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. RYAN] that under an order of the House heretofore made every member has a right to print in the RECORD remarks on the subject of the tariff, and that is a subject to which this statement relates.

Mr. RYAN. Then I will avail myself of that order to make this correction.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE, of Kentucky. I have no objection to that. All that I objected to was that unanimous consent should be given for a statement made by a gentleman not a member of the House to be printed in the RECORD as a correction of another statement said to be erroneous made heretofore by a gentleman who is a member of the House and who is now absent.

Mr. RYAN. Do I understand that the gentleman objects to having the letter read?

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE, of Kentucky. As a matter of unanimous consent.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Kansas has leave to print.

Mr. RYAN. I shall then avail myself of this leave, and shall make such comments of my own as may seem appropriate.

On the 8th of the present month the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. HATCH] made a speech in this House. The object was apparently to demonstrate to the farmers of our country that the tariff enabled our manufacturers to rob them by exacting extortionate prices. To this end he reiterated what he has elsewhere stated—

That farm implements and farm machinery manufactured in this country were exported and sold to foreign buyers both in Canada and in Mexico, as well as in Europe, at prices lower than they were sold to the American farmers.

He said he made this statement upon the authority of a report made by a commercial agent named Washington, dated London, Ontario, September 15, 1888, and addressed to the Assistant Secretary of State.

To support his statement he incorporated into his remarks the full text of Mr. Washington's report.

I find in that report the following:

I am credibly advised by a very prominent Canadian farmer that he has just bought an American self-binding reaper (Walter A. Wood's) for $110. Said

down in an American city near the lines the price of same machine in same place to an American farmer would be from $150 to $170.

This same Walter A. Wood was a highly respected member of the Forty-sixth and Forty-seventh Congresses, and is one of the largest manufacturers of harvesting machines in the United States. This morning I received a letter from him showing that this statement in Mr. Washington's report is, to use a mild phrase, decidedly misleading. Here is Mr. Wood's letter:

WORMLEY'S HOTEL, *Washington, D. C., October* 17, 1888.

DEAR SIR: I want you to call the attention of the House to a statement which appears in a speech made recently on the floor of the House of Representatives by Mr. HATCH, of Missouri, that one of my machines was sold to a Canadian farmer for a less price than I sell the same machine for to one of our own farmers.

If this is a true statement, the transaction was without my knowledge and not by my authority.

I have a trade in my harvesting machines in every grain-growing country on the globe except Canada, where I have no trade, and in no country do I sell machines for a less price than I sell them for in the United States. I have neither agents or customers in Canada, and I don't believe there are two of my make of harvesting machines in the Dominion. If there is, some one unknown to me has placed them there.

Two hundred thousand copies of this speech, I am told, have been sent out by one press for the farmers to read, from which they get the impression that I trade more fairly with Canada than with the United States, which is not the truth.

If Mr. HATCH cares enough about this question to get at the real truth as far as I am connected with it, I will show him or his secretary my books. If after an examination he does not say his speech has given to the farmers of the United States a wrong impression of the way my business is conducted, I will pay him for his expenses and the trouble he incurs in making the examination.

Very respectfully, yours,

WALTER A. WOOD.

Hon. THOMAS RYAN,
House of Representatives.

But the report of this "commercial agent," as he designates himself, contains a further statement, in substance that the Oliver Chilled Plow Company, of Indiana, sells the Oliver plow in Canada $4 less than they sell it in the United States. The Oliver Plow Company deny this in the most unequivocal terms in a letter which I find in the speech referred to. Let the letter speak for itself:

SOUTH BEND, IND., *August* 31, 1888.

DEAR SIR: Your favor of the 29th ultimo is at hand and carefully noted. We do not suppose that Hon. W. H. HATCH, Congressman from your district, would willfully misrepresent us, but the statements made in his speech at your place on the 28th instant have no foundation in fact whatever. The truth is, we have little or no trade in Canada, as the 35 per cent. duty most effectually shuts us out from that market. There may be imitations of our plows, produced by Canadian manufacturers, but we know nothing of them, and are in no wise responsible for them. We do not favor foreign trade in the least, and all reports that we do are false. We export our plows largely to Europe, Mexico, South America, and elsewhere, but buyers for those countries pay us exactly the same price that American dealers do. As to the retail price, take your number 40, which is our standard plow. It is retailed in this country, complete with wheel and jointer, for $14, while the same plow is sold in Great Britain for several dollars more. It is gratifying to us to have our plows so well thought of abroad, but we can say without egotism that their popularity is due solely to their merit.

The United States is the home of the plow, and its manufacture has been brought nearer to perfection in this country than elsewhere on the face of the globe. Competition is brisk; factories are plenty, and not only do Americans produce the best plows made, but they are sold cheaper to the user here than in any foreign land. The statements made by Mr. HATCH are not new, and each Presidential year "bob up serenely" as a factor in politics, but we are somewhat surprised that a gentleman of his reputation should make such charges without satisfying himself of their truth. What we have said to you is the truth, pure and simple, and we are prepared to substantiate the same on any or all occasions.

Mr. P. M. Smith, of your place, writes us in regard to this same subject, and we reply to him as we do to you. Thanking you both for calling our attention to the matter, and hoping that we may be set right in your community, we beg to remain,

Yours, truly,

OLIVER CHILLED PLOW WORKS.

H. F. MILLAN, Esq., *Kirksville, Mo.*

This Mr. Washington could read with profit the story of another Washington and his little hatchet. The zeal of this free-trade official of this free-trade Administration seems to have seriously warped his capacity for accuracy.

If the statements of Mr. Wood and the Oliver Chilled Plow Company are entitled to credit, the report of Mr. Washington, upon which the gentleman from Missouri based his speech, is not creditable even as a campaign document, for which it was evidently designed.

Inaccurate and misleading as it is, the speech of the gentleman of Missouri is made the vehicle to transport it through the mails at the cost of the tax-payers of the United States to the farmers of our country for the purpose of prejudicing and arraying them against the manufacturing industries of our own land. By such doubtful methods it is supposed American farmers will be persuaded to break down their own home markets that take more than 90 per cent. of their products. By such questionable influences it is sought to move the American farmer to close the American workshops and drive our wagemen therefrom or reduce them to the wretched condition of foreign labor.

By such agencies it is hoped to align the farmer against himself by securing his assistance to drive our wagemen from the shop to the farm, thereby converting the consumer of his products into a competitor. Such is the artful means by which it is expected the American farmer may be induced to strike down his own home market, without the possibility of any material increase of his foreign market, and to surrender the rich markets of our own country to foreign producers, who, when once they get a monopoly of our trade, will be able to dictate to them—to our farmers—the prices of what they have to sell and what they need to buy.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

A message from the Senate, by Mr. PLATT, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment House bills of the following titles:

A bill (H. R. 7964) granting to the Aberdeen, Bismarck and Northern Railway a right of way across a portion of the Sioux reservation in Dakota Territory; and

A bill (H. R. 10735) for the removal of the political disabilities of Theodore Lewis, of Louisiana.

The message also announced that the Senate had agreed to the amendment of the House to the joint resolution (S. R. 116) authorizing the Secretary of War to protect the Washington Aqueduct tunnel.

The message further announced that the Senate had directed its Secretary to request the return to the Senate of a bill (H. R. 1152) for the relief of the legal representatives of Eliza M. Ferris.

LEAVE TO PRINT.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, before rising to the question of privilege, I ask unanimous consent to print some remarks in the RECORD. In the early part of this session I introduced a joint resolution in relation to the employment of Army and Navy bands, and I want to print a few remarks in response to what fell from the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HERBERT] on that subject. There is no politics in it.

There was no objection.

ORDER OF BUSINESS.

Mr. KILGORE. What is the regular order?

The SPEAKER. The regular order is the call of committees for reports; but a request was made by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. CONGER] yesterday for the consideration of a bill which was objected to temporarily by the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. MCMILLIN] and the request came over to this morning, and the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. CONGER] now requests that it be considered; but the gentleman from New York [Mr. COX] states that he rises to a question of privilege, and that is the regular order if it be a question of privilege.

QUESTION OF PRIVILEGE.

Mr. COX. I send to the Clerk's desk and ask to have read an editorial from the New York Tribune of September 29, 1888.

The Clerk read as follows:

MR. S. S. COX'S POSTAL FRAUDS.

Illustrations are multiplying, as the campaign proceeds, of the dishonest use that is being made by the Administration and its supporters of the Post-Office Department. It is bad enough to have to put up with such wretched service as the Democracy is giving the country, everywhere involving numberless losses and delays in the transmission of mail matter. We could fill several columns of the Tribune with complaints of this character received from our readers during the last year. It would seem that the Democratic officials at Washington have used the postal service as a reservoir for all the stupidity they have in their party. Scarcely one of the experienced and faithful clerks whose diligence and care had made the service almost perfect when the Democrats took possession of it now remains, and in their places is a lot of ignorant employés appointed solely in payment of party labors. The inevitable result is a demoralized service. That, we say, is bad enough. But to find in addition that the Department is being used by Democratic officials and campaign committees all over the land to aid Mr. Cleveland's re-election is worse.

It was only the other day we discovered that a lot of Democratic campaign documents had been inserted in wrappers containing the Tribune after they had been mailed at the New York post-office. If there were any decency in the Department's management, the rascals who perpetrated that fraud would be hunted down and punished. And now we hold in our possession a large bundle, weighing nearly 4 pounds, addressed to an interior resident, postmarked at station E in this city, and bearing in one corner these words: "Pub. Doc., Free," and in another the signature, "S. S. COX, M. C." The law which gives Congressmen the franking privilege provides that they "may send and receive through the mail all public documents printed by order of Congress," nothing more and nothing else. Let us look at the "Pub. Doc., Free," printed by order of Congress, which Mr. COX is sending all over the State in 4-pound packages. They are:

1. One copy of "Cartoons from Puck," being a series of the works of Mr. Keppler's artists, devoted largely to the representation of Mr. Cleveland as a sort of demigod, and of Republican statesmen as clowns, dragons, snakes, and creatures of those sorts. There is no mark on this public document indicating that it was "printed by order of Congress."

2. One copy of "The Cartoon," a Democratic campaign paper, some features of which render Mr. COX's liability to the penal statutes against circulating lewd and immoral pictures through the mails a question which District Attorney Walker may perhaps think it necessary to consider. Nor does this public document bear any evidence of having been printed by order of Congress.

3. Nineteen copies of a circular containing twenty-two lies about General Harrison's Chinese record, together with a disgusting picture representing him in the embraces of a Chinaman. We hardly suppose Mr. COX capable of circulating such stuff as this circular contains, though, of course, if he would consent to cheat the Government and to tell a falsehood as he has done by declaring these papers to be "public documents printed by order of Congress," it may well be argued that it is not much worse to bear false witness against General Harrison.

4. Forty-five copies of a lie addressed to farmers, declaring that "the Republican party favors free whisky and the unrestricted manufacture of bogus butter."

5. Ten copies of a card entitled "Facts to Consider," including several that are not facts at all, among which is a statement the inference of which is that "The Christian Union" has declared for Cleveland and Thurman.

6. Ten copies of the Democratic platform.

7. Ten copies of Mr. MILLS's recent harangue at Tammany Hall.

8. Eight copies of "The Louisville Courier-Journal."

9. Fourteen copies of Mr. FITCH's speech, ten of Mr. SPRINGER's speech, and nine of Mr. SCOTT's speech, these being the only public documents in the entire bundle.

As a member of Congress Mr. COX has a great advantage in committing frauds on the postal service over the ordinary Government employé. Had a clerk in one of the Departments abused the penalty stamp as Mr. COX has abused his franking privilege he could have been indicted and sent to jail. Mr. COX will not fail, we are sure, to see the impropriety of a law which permits him to cheat the revenues with impunity.

Will Mr. Don M. Dickinson kindly return to his duty and put a stop to these scandalous abuses?

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, I am not very anxious to vindicate what little character I may have as a member of this House, nor any reputation which I may have with members on both sides for the just performance of my duties here. This editorial in the New York Tribune was as much of a surprise to me as I presume it was to any gentleman of either party. It came out while I was at home on my brief vacation, and I at once went to the office of the Tribune and saw the editor and saw the package. The package was very unlike anything ever sent out from this House or from this Congress, or from any Congress. It was not gotten up in the ordinary form; it was not in the ordinary envelope in which we send out public documents that are frankable. It was a melange of everything piled in together. It had what purported to be my frank upon it, and in large letters, "Pub. Doc."—"M. C." The signature was a tolerably good imitation, though very much larger than mine, and the "Pub. Doc." and the "M. C." were so unlike my writing that they might well have suggested the idea of a forgery; but it seems they did not to those engaged in this conspiracy.

I looked at it and told the editor on the instant that it was a forgery. Thereupon he asked me to write a statement which I dictated in his office. I ask the Clerk to read that statement, which was published in the Tribune of the 30th of September last.

Mr. ROGERS. Give us the name of the editor.

Mr. COX. I will give it.

The Clerk read as follows:

To the Editor of the Tribune:

SIR: The editorial in your journal to-day, headed "Mr. S. S. COX's Postal Frauds," must be founded on a total misconception of facts. I have not directly or indirectly sent out under my frank any documents not frankable under the statute, and no one has been authorized by me to use my name for that purpose. I have no knowledge of any such business, and would not permit it for a moment. I shall write to the Post-Office Department promptly to investigate and punish any one guilty of this infraction of the law.

Since writing the foregoing, I have called upon you in person. You have shown me the package in question, and although it bears the stamp of the Post-Office authorities, showing that the signature has been accepted as mine and the package has gone through the mails, I unhesitatingly pronounce the signature a forgery, and will unite with you in any efforts to bring the perpetrator of such a fraud to justice.

S. S. COX.

NEW YORK, *September* 29, 1888.

Mr. COX. On looking at the signature purporting to be my frank, it occurred to me to make a statement, which I did, to the Postmaster-General, calling his attention to the matter. I stated to him that while I was at home in New York, at the time when this franked package was mailed, as alleged, at Station E, near the Democratic headquarters, I had not franked any documents whatever in New York except half a dozen speeches on the Life-Saving Service and perhaps one or two on the census—speeches which I sent to friends and which I got out of my trunk. I did no other franking in New York City. Apart from that, the only franking I have done during this session has been in this city by a stamp which exhausted itself some weeks ago, when I put it under lock and key and thought no more about it. I have never used it since. The franking done in New York City under my name was the franking of my own speeches, which the national committee ordered. In that case the frank was limited by my own written order to my own speeches, and that order is on file with the committee. So that I could not have been more strict than I was in regard to this business, and I was strict, sir, because I never favored the resuscitation of the franking privilege, as my votes years ago will show.

I ask the Clerk to read also the answer of the Postmaster-General to my request for an investigation. This will give the animus of this business as nearly as I can find it out.

The Clerk read as follows:

POST-OFFICE DEPARTMENT,
OFFICE OF THE POSTMASTER-GENERAL,
Washington, D. C., October 3, 1888.

SIR: I have the honor to acknowledge receipt of your letter of the 30th ultimo, inclosing two articles extracted from recent issues of the New York Tribune with regard to the use by some unknown person of a forged imitation of your frank in the transmission through the mails of certain unfrankable matter.

Several cases involving the misuse of franks of members of Congress have been recently brought to the attention of the Department and are now undergoing investigation.

In two of these cases the genuine frank of Hon. A. P. HOVEY was used some time during the past month to send through the mails certain German Republican newspapers, one of them being the Cincinnati Volksblatt, which are not in any sense frankable matter; though Mr. HOVEY, who was notified of the facts on the 19th ultimo, has declared that the use of his frank for such a purpose was never authorized by him.

In two other cases what appears to be the genuine frank of Hon. M. S. QUAY was used to transmit free through the mails a pamphlet entitled "A Short Review of the Public and Private Life of General Benjamin Harrison;" another entitled the "State Prison South;" several tariff tracts isued by the Industrial League, and a card entitled "Cleveland's Record," which are not and do not purport to be public documents.

In still another case an apparently genuine frank of Hon. JNO. KEAN, jr., has been used to cover a pamphlet entitled "The Liquor Traffic," and another entitled "Protection and Prices," neither of which is frankable under the law.

Information was communicated on the 19th ultimo to both Mr. QUAY and Mr. KEAN of this misuse of their franks, but the Department has, up to this time, not received from either of them any explanation whatever in regard thereto.

These cases all differ from yours in this respect: that they involve the misuse of genuine franks, while in your case the frank is an unmistakable forgery. They are cited to show that the Department is giving prompt attention to matters of this character.

The chief post-office inspector will be directed to give this affair a prompt and thorough investigation, in the course of which an endeavor will be made to obtain from the publishers of the Tribune the wrapper bearing the forged frank, and also to ascertain how the franked package came into their possession.

Yours, very respectfully,

DON M. DICKINSON,
Postmaster-General.

Hon. S. S. COX,
House of Representatives.

Mr. COX. After I had written to the Postmaster-General asking his attention to the matter and his scrutiny into it he sent to the regular authorities at New York, who sent out an inspector. The inspector first called at the New York Tribune office and afterward on me. What he did, the result of his investigation and examination, appears in the report which has been made to the Postmaster-General, and which I procured this morning. I ask the Clerk to read the report to the Postmaster-General and the paper which is an exhibit attached to it.

The Clerk read as follows:

POST-OFFICE DEPARTMENT, OFFICE OF POST-OFFICE INSPECTOR,
New York, N. Y., October 9, 1888.

DEAR SIR: Above case, No. 105072c, subject "Alleged illegal use of the frank of Hon. S. S. COX, M. C.," has been investigated, and I have the honor to submit the following report: The complaint of the Hon. S. S. COX is that his frank has been used upon a package of mixed matter, some of it frankable and some not. Said package was addressed to "Susan B. Beebe, P. M., South Apalachin, Tioga County, New York," and indorsed "Pub. doc., free; S. S. COX, M. C.," all in writing, and postmarked "New York, E." The papers in the above case were handed to me on the morning of the 5th day of October, 1888, and I at once proceeded to an investigation by calling at the editorial rooms of the New York Daily Tribune, in New York City, N. Y. Saw Mr. Reid, the editor-in-chief, and informed him that the Post-Office Department had undertaken an investigation of the complaint of the Hon. S. S. COX, M. C., as to the illegal use of his frank, and for the purpose of making a proper and thorough investigation, I requested that I be allowed to take the package in question. This request was refused, saying that he had no authority to allow the package to go out of his possession. He was asked if he would allow me to take the package with the assurance that the same would be safely kept and returned to him in good order. He still refused, saying that he would not allow the package to go out of his possession except upon an order from the addressee of the package. He suggested that as successful investigation of the case could be made with a facsimile of the package bearing the frank of S. S. COX, M. C., and published in the Daily Tribune of October 3, 1888, as could be made with the original package. He was also requested to give the name of the person from whom he received the package. He refused to give the name, saying that he received it from a responsible party. Believing that the possession of this package was absolutely necessary in order to make a successful investigation of this case, I started for South Apalachin, N. Y., on the night of October 5, 1888, to procure, if possible, an order from Susan B. Beebe on Mr. Reid for the delivery of the package. I also desired to make an investigation of the case at South Apalachin, N. Y., post-office. On arriving at the post-office at South Apalachin, N. Y., on the 6th October, 1888, I ascertained that Susan B. Beebe was not the postmaster at that place, and had not been since September 30, 1887.

Elvira E. Bills is the postmaster at South Apalachin, N. Y., and has been since the 30th September, 1887. She is now an invalid, and her husband attends to the duties of the office.

Alonzo Bills, assistant postmaster, says that he was in charge of the post-office at South Apalachin, N. Y., when a package addressed to Susan B. Beebe arrived in the mail from Apalachin, N. Y., about two weeks ago, and he delivered it to either Reuben or Orrin Beebe; does not know which; can not say whether the package was similar to the one described in the Tribune of October 3, 1888, or whether the package was addressed to Susan B. Beebe, postmaster; can not say that the package described in the Tribune of October 3, 1888, ever came through the mail and was delivered to Susan B. Beebe or any member of her family; would not swear that the package did or did not come through the mail; his opinion was that the package came through this office.

Susan H. Beebe says that she was postmaster at South Apalachin, N. Y., up to about the 1st of October, 1887; received a package same as the fac-simile published in the Tribune of October 3, 1888; received the package from her grandson, aged about seven years, who brought the same from the post-office; noticed the address on the package, and my husband and stepson examined the contents, laid it away, and my stepson, Orrin Beebe, took charge of it; never before received a package addressed as the one in question; the package contained books and papers; have not seen the package since my stepson took charge of it; had no knowledge of the package before it was received, nor did not know what disposition would be made of the same after it was received. After explaining the object of this investigation, Mrs. Beebe was requested to give us an order on the editor of the Tribune for the package in his possession addressed to her, which she did.

Reuben Beebe, husband of Susan B. Beebe, says the package was received, as stated by Mrs. Beebe, some time from the 16th to 20th September, 1888; it was handed to me, and I opened the same, took out one paper and read it. The package was in the house two or three days. My son, Orrin Beebe, was a delegate to the Republican Congressional convention held at Owego, N. Y., about the 22d September, 1888, and when there he met Mr. DE LANO, Republican candidate for member of Congress, to whom he stated the circumstance of my wife receiving the package. Mr. DE LANO requested my son to send the package to him, and it was forwarded to him by express from Apalachin. The next we heard of the package was what we read about it in the Tribune.

On the afternoon of October 8, 1888, I presented the order received from Mrs. Beebe for the delivery of the packages at the editorial rooms of the New York Daily Tribune, and the gentleman to whom it was presented questioned the genuineness of the order, remarking that the body of the order was not in the same handwriting as the signature. I informed him that the order was written by myself at Mrs. Beebe's request, and that she signed the same. He refused to deliver the package, at the same time exhibiting a telegram dated at Owego, October 6, 1888, purporting to be from Mrs. Beebe, countermanding the order given me on the same date, remarking at the same time that if he considered the package necessary in the prosecution of this investigation he would deliver

it to me notwithstanding the telegram countermanding the order for the delivery of the same. He further remarked that he did not believe the Department was sincere in its efforts to investigate this matter.

Investigation of this case at headquarters of the Democratic national committee at No. 10 East Twenty-ninth street, New York City, N. Y., shows that documents sent out from this place are usually sent out in large quantities to State or county committees, and only by request from an individual or from some person for them are small packages sent out; that no request to send Susan B. Beebe, P. M., a package of documents has been received at said headquarters; that the name of Susan B. Beebe, P. M., does not appear on the list of persons to whom packages are to be sent, and that documents are not sent out bearing the frank of S. S. Cox, M. C. J. B. Treanor, the gentleman who has charge of forwarding documents, says that he will make affidavit that the package in question was not sent from the national Democratic headquarters in New York City by authority of any one in charge of the mailing department at said headquarters; that he is thoroughly acquainted with the postal laws, and never sends matter under frank of "M. C." unless the same is frankable.

Investigation at the New York State Democratic headquarters at the Hoffman House in New York City shows by the statements of C. R. De Freest, clerk of the executive committee, that no packages similar to the one described in the Daily Tribune of October 3, 1888, have been sent out from the said headquarters; that explicit orders have been given by him not to mail documents addressed to females, whether they were postmasters or not, and that such orders have been strictly observed; that the frank of S. S. Cox, M. C., is only used on envelopes covering the speeches of said S. S. Cox, M. C., mailed from the said New York State Democratic headquarters.

Investigation at Branch E of the New York, N. Y., post-office, shows that large quantities of documents have been received at said Branch E for mailing from the headquarters of the national and State Democratic committees in New York city, and it is impossible to ascertain at what time or by whom the package in question was mailed.

Hon. S. S. Cox, M. C., states that the alleged package franked by him is an unmistakable forgery; and that he will testify on oath that the signature is not his and he did not authorize it.

As a result of this investigation I conclude as follows:

First. That the indorsement of the name of S. S. Cox, M. C., on the package addressed to Susan B. Beebe, P. M., South Apalachin, Tioga County, New York, and mailed at Branch E, New York, N. Y., post-office, is a forgery.

Second. That the Hon. S. S. Cox did not authorize the use of his name on said package.

Third. That it does not appear that said package was authorized to be made by any one at either the national or State Democratic headquarters in the city of New York.

Fourth. That the investigation as to who forged the signature of Hon. S. S. Cox as it appears on said package is practically defeated by the attitude of the Tribune in refusing to deliver up the package upon which the forgery appears. The action of the Tribune seems to have been directed so as to obstruct and defeat investigation rather than promote it. They have done everything possible to block the way to the truth rather than assist in developing the facts.

Herewith inclosed please find order of Susan B. Beebe on the editor of the Tribune for the delivery of the package.

Respectfully, yours, etc.,

C. L. MORRIS,
Post-Office Inspector.

C. E. DOSSER, Esq.,
Inspector in charge New York Division.

Mr. COX. I have the original of that order from Mrs. Beebe. I have made a copy of it, as I must return the original to the files of the Post-Office Department. I will ask the Clerk to read the order of this lady.

The Clerk read as follows:

[Copy.]

SOUTH APALACHIN, N. Y., *October* 6, 1888.

DEAR SIR: I am informed through the columns of the New York Daily Tribune that you have in your possession a package of documents and papers addressed to "Susan B. Beebe, P. M., South Apalachin, Tioga County, New York. Pub. Doc., free; S. S. Cox, M. C." For the purpose of an investigation by the Post-Office Department as to whether the indorsement upon said package of the signature of S. S. Cox, M. C., is a forgery or not, will you have the kindness to deliver the said package addressed as above to C. L. Morris, post-office inspector, and oblige,

Yours, respectfully,

SUSAN B. BEEBE.

Mr. WHITELAW REID,
Editor New York Daily Tribune, New York City, N. Y.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, I think the only package of this kind sent out under what purported to be my frank—at least so far as I could ascertain—was the package which has been traced from Station E, New York City, to this place in Tioga County; so that it is not a fact, as stated in the Tribune article, that the country has been flooded with matter of this kind.

Shortly after my statement to the editor of the Tribune and after the publication of my letter to the Postmaster-General, which has been read, the editor very graciously withdrew his charge against me; and in an editorial published on the 30th of September, which happened to be my birthday, he gave me very kindly congratulations, stating that he was very glad to know I was not such a person as I had been represented.

Now, the animus of all this business I will not to-day inquire into. It is not a matter for rhetoric; it is not a matter for objurgation; it is not a matter for retaliation on either side of this House. I bring the subject to the attention of the House now when there is leisure, with the view to the adoption of some remedy for this business in the future. These very franks or stamps which have been used are still being used by Senator QUAY and others, notwithstanding the Postmaster-General has called attention to the matter and written letters to them——

Mr. HENDERSON, of Iowa. The gentleman will allow me a moment. He states that the franks referred to are still being used by Senator QUAY. There is no evidence of that fact.

Mr. COX. I get it from the Postmaster-General; but I withdraw that statement.

Mr. HENDERSON, of Iowa. There is no evidence before the House that that is so.

Mr. COX. Yes, sir; there is some evidence.

Mr. HENDERSON, of Iowa. It has not been put in.

Mr. COX. I have a statement by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. MANSUR] that recently, within a few days, the State of Missouri has been flooded with these unfrankable documents under the stamp of Mr. QUAY; and I have one here before me, sent to me this morning, which comes from a gentleman in New Berne, N. C. The matter covered by the frank in this case embraces extracts purporting to be from various London and other papers—we all know the character of the matter—matter not taken from the RECORD at all; and this is still going on.

Mr. FARQUHAR. The gentleman says those extracts are not from the RECORD. I believe all those British extracts have been published in the RECORD as a part of Congressional speeches.

Mr. COX. If the gentleman will wait until I get through he will find out something more. In this letter from New Berne, N. C., the writer says:

NEW BERNE, N. C., *October* 11, 1888.

DEAR SIR: Inclosed please find one of Mr. QUAY'S franks as used by him and sent all over North Carolina. I did not even have time to read it; anyhow, it may be of service to you.

Very truly,

C. ABNER,
Of Baltimore City, 26 S. Paca street.

Mr. SUNSET COX, *Washington, D. C.*

I do not know anything about this, except that it comes to me from an authentic source.

In regard to the retraction of this publication, so far as it impugned my character and reputation, the Tribune did very well on my birthday, and I supposed it was all ended.

I did not propose any remedy for myself personally. I knew that article which was read here was libelous both in law and in fact. I knew it was libelous on Congress—not a legal but a moral libel on Congress. I knew the whole thing would be developed in time; that is, after the election, perhaps; and therefore I rested there about it—did not make it a question to be presented here, did not come here for that purpose. I rested on the statement made by Mr. Reid, editor of the Tribune, after he gave publicity as he did to that cruel and outrageous charge on me of being a cheat and a fraud and using these frauds for some personal or party purpose.

Now, what is the object of fixing a forged frank on me? I had no knowledge, until the inspector revealed it, Mr. DE LANO, my colleague in New York, was engaged in this business. I hope he is not, but it seems a delegate in his Congressional convention was a nephew of the woman who received this anomalous and curious package. He gives it to Mr. DE LANO. I invited him to be here this week, for I did not know how long Congress would last. He is not here. I wish he were, so we might understand why it was that when this forged package—this unfrankable matter came into his possession—why it was that he did not send it to the Postmaster-General. Why did he not at least call attention that such postal matter was going out? Why did he not at least inform me of the transaction and inquire into the alleged forgery? My relations with this gentleman were friendly enough to warrant his doing this much. It certainly demands explanation.

Mr. MCCULLOGH. Mr. DE LANO, the gentleman from New York, is a friend of mine. Does the gentleman mean to make any charge against him?

Mr. COX. You got up once before when I was talking. I thought you were getting tired of getting up. [Laughter.]

Mr. MCCULLOGH. I will get up and sit down whenever I choose.

Mr. COX. Whenever you want anything from me you can get it. [Laughter.] I will take a drink with the gentleman after the election.

Mr. MCCULLOGH. You ought not to say anything about a man behind his back.

Mr. COX. It is not my fault he is not here.

Mr. MCCULLOGH. But he is not here.

Mr. COX. I gave him notice to be here. I am not responsible for this matter at all, or his absence.

Now, any one will see when he examines this signature that it looks like mine. Anybody can make my name; there it is, a few circular marks and it is done. [Laughter.] I know also that if you examine the "Pub. Doc., M. C.," any one can see it is a shabby awkard forgery.

I state now that I sent no matter in New York or elsewhere not frankable. I never have done it. Whoever did do it did it for some purpose. It was to fix reproach on our party or in order to avoid the reproach which may fall upon gentlemen on the other side. Not gentlemen who sit here on the other side, but gentlemen of the party.

These documents have gone all over the country. Why did not these Senators and others call attention of the Post-Office Department to them as I have done? I have done my duty. Why do they not do it? It is all I can do. I can not go elsewhere. You authorized this inspection service. I can not go elsewhere. I am too old a politician to meddle much in newspaper business. It does not pay in the long run to have a contest with one of these grand newspapers, therefore I have avoided it now as I have always done. I felt it to be my duty to my constituents to make this statement to the House.

Why do I say that? Because after the statement of Mr. Reid, so handsomely made, of having thoroughly exculpated myself from the action

alleged in the editorial to which I have called attention here, he comes out on the following Sunday in an editorial and reiterates substantially the same statements, and publishes a fac-simile of the forged signature and indorsements on the package, with the name reduced so as to make it more similar to the manner in which I ordinarily write my own name. It was written originally fully three times as large as I ordinarily write. In the fac-simile as published in the Tribune it is reduced to about the size of my signature. Why is this thing being promulgated? What is the animus of it? Is it for a good purpose? The forged package is now, as a matter of fact, posted up in the Tribune window in Park Row—in their show-window in Printing House Square—for the people to look at and fix a stigma upon me as a man and as a candidate for Congress.

It will not have the effect hoped any more than if it was written in water. But the reproach is there, and every gentleman in Congress shares in it with me if this thing should be allowed to go on with such scandalous effrontery.

These, Mr. Speaker, all are facts. Every gentleman must see that there is a little, sneaking, unkind, unfair, microscopic meanness about it for which language has no term of reproach and human ingenuity no fit mode of expression.

Without reflecting upon anybody, unless to vindicate myself and the American Congress, I leave the matter where it is, to the good sense o the American people everywhere. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. BAYNE. Mr. Speaker——

The SPEAKER *pro tempore* (Mr. MCMILLIN). For what purpose does the gentleman from Pennsylvania rise?

Mr. BAYNE. I wish to be heard upon this question for a moment.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. It is not debatable. The gentleman from New York rose to a question of privilege.

Mr. BAYNE. I wish to be heard——

Mr. COX. Permit me one moment further. I have a letter here sent from a gentleman in Iowa, which contains certain matter which is unfrankable, extracts from English newspapers. "England seeks to make the United States a dependency of her own" and other matter of that kind, which has been sent out in that part of the country under the frank of Mr. QUAY to a gentleman in Iowa, whose name I will not give unless it shall be necessary, and which matter has been sent to the Speaker of this House for the purpose of showing that Iowa is also being flooded with just such matter as I have called attention to. If the assault upon me has not been made to cover up this sort of action on the part of somebody else I am unable to perceive what can be the motive.

Mr. HENDERSON, of Iowa. Will the gentleman allow a word?

Mr. COX. Certainly.

Mr. HENDERSON, of Iowa. I do not know what frank, if any, these documents are being sent out under; but I do know that the State of Iowa is being flooded with Puck, and the oleomargarine document to which reference is made in that package, from New York, and which is in the Tribune office. The very same documents are being sent out there and scattered throughout that State; but whether franked or not I do not know.

Mr. COX. Well, will the gentleman from Iowa, if there be a wrong in this thing, aid me in finding out the wrong-doer?

Mr. HENDERSON, of Iowa. I do not know who does this.

Mr. COX. Well, will you join me in endeavoring to hunt the matter down? The Postmaster-General says that he will probe the matter to the bottom, and he will bring it before the grand jury. He will do this in the forgery in my case to obtain a conviction of the forger. To this end, to prove the body of the crime, the original document will be had.

Mr. HENDERSON, of Iowa. I will join with you in an endeavor to investigate the matter.

Mr. COX. I knew you would. You are an honorable man and a soldier, and I am satisfied to stand by you.

Mr. HENDERSON, of Iowa. But I call the attention of the gentleman to the fact that the Postmaster-General is swift to give the names of men on one side whose franks are alleged to be used in this manner, but he does not call attention to any on the other, even to the name of the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. ALLEN] whose name was used in that same connection.

Mr. WHEELER. Because there are no Democrats engaged in that business.

Mr. HENDERSON, of Iowa. I presume the gentleman from New York can attend to this matter.

Mr. COX. I will take care of it.

Mr. HENDERSON, of Iowa. And I trust that the gentleman from New York in the range he has taken will take a broad enough view of this subject to concede the right on this side of the House to be heard briefly on this question, and not to shut off some remarks in answer to what he has said.

Mr. COX. I have not tried to do so. I will be very glad to hear from the gentleman.

Mr. HENDERSON, of Iowa. The gentleman from Pennsylvania and myself would like to be heard.

Mr. EZRA B. TAYLOR. I would like to ask the gentleman from New York a question.

Mr. COX. Certainly.

Mr. EZRA B. TAYLOR. Believing most sincerely in the statement that the gentleman from New York has made with reference to his connection with the matter under discussion, I hope for the sake of the dignity of the occasion that he will withdraw all allusions to the possibility of this action having been inaugurated for the purpose of covering up any infractions of law which may be alleged against the other side.

Mr. COX. I will withdraw that with a great deal of pleasure, *pro forma*, if you will have the manliness to say that I have made a perfect exculpation of myself from the charge of the New York Tribune.

Mr. EZRA B. TAYLOR. I do say it.

Mr. COX. Then I hope the gentleman from Pennsylvania will begin his remarks in the same kind tone.

Mr. BAYNE. I wish to make a few observations.

Mr. COX. I will yield to you, if you will begin in that way. [Laughter.]

Mr. BAYNE. If the gentleman had permitted a suggestion I was about to make to come without putting a condition upon it, it would have been more satisfactory to him and to myself also. I fully acquit the gentleman from New York of having committed anything wrong in this matter, and take his explanation to be candid and true.

Mr. COX. That is all right.

Mr. BAYNE. While, however, the gentleman has made an explanation which should be entirely satisfactory regarding himself, he has by the report of the Postmaster-General and by some observations he himself has made undertaken to involve Senator QUAY in the kind of a difficulty from which he has extricated himself. I desire to say a word or two on this part of his speech. The gentleman stated, and he must have done so without sufficient examination, that the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. MANSUR], I believe, handed him documents——

Mr. COX. I said he had gone for the documents, and that a great lot of them had gone to his State. This one came from North Carolina.

Mr. BAYNE. This is another one.

Mr. COX. Yes, sir.

Mr. BAYNE. Well, the gentleman stated that some documents had gone into North Carolina under the frank of Hon. M. S. QUAY, United States Senator, and that they were not frankable matter. There are several documents contained in that envelope, and every one of them is a frankable document. The gentleman did not examine them. If he will do so, he will see that every one is a portion of a speech made by somebody in the House of Representatives or the Senate. The first I have in my hand quotes a number of sentences from a speech made by Hon. NELSON DINGLEY, Jr., of Maine, in the House of Representatives, May 4, 1888. This is followed by a quotation from a speech by Hon. SETH L. MILLIKEN, of Maine, in the House of Representatives, May 12, 1888; then comes an extract from a speech of Hon. S. R. PETERS, in the House of Representatives, May 17, 1888; then a quotation from a speech made by Hon. JAMES BUCHANAN, of New Jersey, April 26, 1884; then a quotation from a speech of the same gentleman; still another, and still another. Then there is a quotation from a speech made by Hon. WILLIAM MCKINLEY, Jr., of Ohio, in the House of Representatives, May 18, 1888; then another quotation from Mr. MCKINLEY, and one quotation after another from speeches made by members of the House of Representatives in the discussion on the tariff question during this year and in the year 1884.

Mr. NELSON. Will the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BAYNE] allow me a question?

Mr. BAYNE. Let me get through with my statement.

Mr. NELSON. I just want to ask one question.

Mr. BAYNE. Very well.

Mr. NELSON. My question is this: Were these papers printed at the Government Printing Office?

Mr. BAYNE. I do not know whether they were or not.

Mr. NELSON. Now, is not that the dividing line?

Mr. BAYNE. Oh, no, sir.

Several MEMBERS. No, it is not.

Mr. BAYNE. I have seen an immense edition of the speech delivered by the able Speaker of the House of Representatives, which was not printed at the Government Printing Office, and which was distributed under frank.

Mr. NELSON. Suppose somebody collects speeches and makes a compendium and the printing is done at a private printing office. Is that frankable?

Mr. RYAN. Yes.

Mr. WARNER. Certainly it is.

Mr. BAYNE. It is perfectly plain that it is; and it has been the practice all along. You can have them printed at any place you please and send them out under the franking privilege.

Now, Mr. Speaker, these documents, all of which seem to have been inclosed in one envelope and sent to Mr. J. K. Kearn, New Berne, N. C., and under the frank of Senator QUAY, are frankable documents. There may be a disposition on the part of some one to take a technical exception, because, perhaps, captions are put on them.

Mr. COX. I would like to ask the gentleman a question there.

Mr. BAYNE. Whether these captions appear in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD I do not know.

Mr. COX. Suppose they do not?

Mr. BAYNE. I do not know——

Mr. COX. Suppose they do not appear in the RECORD, would that be frankable matter?

Mr. BAYNE. I should say it was, because the substance is given; and a designation of that sort, especially where separated from the body of the speech, is necessary to direct attention to the subject-matter of the article.

Mr. MCMILLIN. Does the gentleman from Pennsylvania hold that excerpts from or a syllabus of a speech that was never made or printed in the RECORD as such would be frankable matter because it was put in that speech?

Mr. BAYNE. I say that it has been the practice of the parties from time immemorial.

Mr. MCMILLIN. To send that kind of matter?

Mr. BAYNE. To send that kind of matter.

Mr. MCMILLIN. I deny it. There never was an instance of it, so far as I know, until it went out under Senator QUAY'S frank, in such a form as I will read if the gentleman will permit me:

The present conspiracy against the material interests of the Pacific coast. Remarkable utterances of an English statesman. Free trade will establish there all the insignia of conquest.

That goes out as a heading to an extract from a speech.

A MEMBER. Was it ever published in the RECORD?

Mr. MCMILLIN. There is no evidence that it ever was. It does not have any such appearance; it is not in the type of the Government Printing Office, and I hold that there is no justification for such a publication being sent out under a frank.

Mr. BAYNE. And I aver, with knowledge of the facts to a very considerable extent, that it has been the practice of both parties from time immemorial to send out such matter.

Mr. MCMILLIN. Where is the evidence of it?

Mr. BAYNE. I decline to be interrupted further.

Mr. MCMILLIN. The gentleman has been holding the floor by unanimous consent, and can be cut off at any moment.

Mr. BAYNE. The gentleman from New York [Mr. COX] yielded to me.

Mr. MCMILLIN. I am not going to cut the gentleman off, but I called attention to the fact that he was proceeding by unanimous consent, because I wanted him to understand that neither the gentleman from New York [Mr. COX], nor any other gentleman has the right, upon a question of privilege, to yield the time of the House to any one else. I want it understood that we know how we are proceeding here.

Mr. BAYNE. Courtesy was extended to the gentleman from New York [Mr. COX], and very properly, to make his statement, and then he yielded to me, and I——

Mr. MCMILLIN. Courtesy was extended to the gentleman from New York on a question of privilege.

Mr. BAYNE. Who has the floor? Courtesy was extended to the gentleman from New York to go on and make his statement. He made it. Part of that statement, it seemed to me, was open to serious exception, even as a vindication of himself. He read a report from the Postmaster-General which failed utterly to explain the matters with which the frank of the gentleman from New York [Mr. COX] was connected; and when the Postmaster-General went to the extent of alleging that General HOVEY, and Senator QUAY, and Mr. KEAN, of New Jersey, had sent out improper matter under their franks, as if that distinguished legal mind thought that the vindication of the gentleman from New York was to be made by saying to these Republicans "You're another; somebody else has done what you have done, and therefore you are guiltless." When the Postmaster-General went to that extent, I thought it was quite outside of this case.

The statement of the gentleman from New York himself with respect to his connection with this affair, and the statement of the inspector, were evidence that bore directly upon the case, and constituted, to my mind, the gentleman's full vindication, and I accord to him the full benefit of it. But when it was assumed and alleged by the Postmaster-General that Senator QUAY had sent out documents improperly, when it was assumed and alleged by the gentleman from New York that Senator QUAY had violated the franking privilege, and when the evidence produced to sustain that allegation utterly refutes it in the light of the experience and practice of both parties from time immemorial, then the country can form some judgment of the value of the conclusion arrived at by the Postmaster-General respecting the alleged abuse of the franking privilege by Senator QUAY. It is conceded that a part of the matters contained in the package sent out under the frank of the gentleman from New York were in no sense frankable. That package contained a copy of Puck, which certainly was not frankable, and there were other unfrankable matters in it. But when documents made up of excerpts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, extracts from speeches delivered in the House and in the Senate, with perhaps a little heading added for the purpose of drawing attention to the substance of the extract—when these things are adduced here as evidence to show that the franking privilege has been violated by other gentlemen, I say they utterly fail to establish that fact, and the allegation is false, whether it comes from the Postmaster-General or any other man, and deserves no confidence.

Mr. ROGERS. Do I understand from the statement of the gentleman from Pennsylvania that he admits that Senator QUAY is sending out those things, or authorizing it to be done?

Mr. BAYNE. I do not know, but I do not doubt that he is, and I claim that these matters are properly and legitimately frankable.

Mr. ROGERS. I only wanted to have the fact understood.

Mr. BAYNE. I do not know the fact, but I have no doubt of it.

Mr. DOUGHERTY. Will the gentleman permit a question?

Mr. BAYNE. Yes, sir.

Mr. DOUGHERTY. I hold in my hand a copy of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of August 25. Does the gentleman mean to say that if this RECORD was sent to any printing office in any part of the country and was there copied *verbatim et literatim*, the copy thus made would be a frankable document?

Mr. BAYNE. I do.

Mr. COX. Suppose there were subheads as large as the extracts?

Mr. BAYNE. That is another question.

Mr. COX. Now, are you really clear in your own mind and conscience that you are right about that?

Mr. BAYNE. I am, because it has been the practice, and because liberty has been given in these campaigns to prepare extracts from speeches and circulate them in this way. In reply to the suggestion of the gentleman from Florida [Mr. DOUGHERTY], I will say that I have at times sent out copies of my own speeches delivered in the House which were printed outside of the Government Printing Office. The present Speaker of this House has also done it; and he ought to know what is proper in this matter. There are many other members of this House who have done the same thing. It has been the practice for many years to do it. These subheadings themselves, for aught that I know, may appear in the speeches themselves. I have had no opportunity to make an examination and comparison in that respect; but whether that be so or not, both parties are doing this thing in this canvass, and both parties have done it in years past. Right on my left——

Mr. COX. Allow me——

Mr. BAYNE. One moment.

Mr. COX. I hope the gentleman will yield to me; I was courteous to him.

Mr. BAYNE. I will yield in a moment. On my left sits the distinguished gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. BRECKINRIDGE], who is either sending out or having sent out hundreds upon hundreds—perhaps thousands upon thousands—of speeches, each one of which seems to take up a particular topic; and these speeches are circulated with subheads which do not appear in the RECORD. I have copies of them at home now, lying on my desk. If there has been, then, a violation of the franking privilege by Senator QUAY, the gentleman from Kentucky is guilty of a similar violation of law in the circulation of these speeches which are now going over the country, for aught that I know, by tens of thousands.

Mr. COX. I gave to the gentleman at his request the extracts which were sent to Mr. Speaker CARLISLE. Does the gentleman undertake to tell the House that any of those extracts were ever in the RECORD?

Mr. BAYNE. I say exactly that; that these extracts were in the RECORD. Here is a speech of Hon. J. N. DOLPH——

Mr. COX. Do not mix up the different matters.

Mr. BAYNE. No, sir. I have here the one sent to Speaker CARLISLE. It is a speech of Hon. J. N. DOLPH, of Oregon, in the Senate May 12, 1888. From this speech two of the extracts are taken, one a quotation from the London Globe, which Senator DOLPH put in the RECORD; another from the London Daily News, which, no doubt, he also put in the RECORD as a part of his speech. These are credited to Senator DOLPH, as embraced in his speech in the Senate May 12, 1888. Here is another, and still another, from the same quarter. Here is a quotation from the speech of Hon. WILLIAM MCKINLEY, of Ohio, in the House of Representatives, May 18, 1888. Everything set forth in these extracts is in the RECORD, unless it be the subheads, and as to subheads the gentleman from Kentucky has properly enough employed them in the circulation of some of his speeches; and other gentlemen on both sides of the House have, no doubt, done the same.

This is all I have to say. These facts tell their own story. They are a complete and thorough vindication of the integrity of Senator QUAY in this matter. I have no doubt that the case of Mr. KEAN, of New Jersey, is analogous. If some German papers were sent out under the frank of General HOVEY, of Indiana, it is stated that he has explained the matter to the satisfaction of the Postmaster-General, just as my friend from New York [Mr. COX] has made an explanation satisfactory, not only to the Postmaster-General, but to the whole country.

Mr. COX. Does the gentleman believe that a translation into German of matter taken from the RECORD would be frankable?

Mr. BAYNE. I do.

Mr. COX. Well, I declare!

Several MEMBERS. Regular order.

The SPEAKER. The regular order is demanded.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE, of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I think after the allusion which has been made to me, I ought to be allowed a moment. The difference between——

Mr. BAYNE. The gentleman from Kentucky will excuse me one moment. I wish to add that inquiry was made of the Postmaster-

General, and he gave authority for the sending through the mails under frank of public documents translated into different languages.

Mr. COX. And you think that right?

Mr. BAYNE. The Postmaster-General has so decided.

Mr. HAUGEN. I wish to state that in the early part of this session Senator SAWYER made inquiry at the Post-Office Department whether translations into other languages of matter taken from the RECORD were frankable, and he was informed that they were. At the same time inquiry was made whether RECORD matter, if printed elsewhere than at the Government Printing Office, was frankable; and again the answer was in the affirmative.

Mr. COX. Who authorizes the translation and who translates in such cases? How can it be known that the translation is accurate?

A MEMBER. The Postmaster-General has given his opinion.

Mr. COX. I do not care who gives an opinion, if the law be not complied with. The Postmaster-General has been too liberal.

Mr. MILLIKEN. You have no right to impeach your own witness.

Mr. COX. I am not doing so.

I wish to reiterate, before my friend from Kentucky addresses the House, that the only object I had in calling attention to the statement of the Postmaster-General as to these other franks was to get at the intent of making this false charge against me. What could have been the reason for it? Was it the cry of "Stop thief?"

Mr. BAYNE. Oh, no, because the cases are not analogous.

Mr. COX. Really!

Mr. BAYNE. Although I acquit the gentleman from New York, and believe every word he has said about this matter, I insist there is no foundation whatever for any charge against Senator QUAY or Mr. KEAN—not a particle.

Mr. COX. I thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania very cordially for his kind expressions in regard to myself.

Mr. BAYNE. Let me say one thing further to the gentleman from New York. Upon an investigation, it appears that every one of these subheads is taken from the speech as published in the RECORD.

Mr. HENDERSON, of Iowa. Every one of the subheads appearing in the copy of the speech sent to Mr. CARLISLE will be found in the RECORD.

Mr. BAYNE. So that in fact no matter has been circulated by Senator QUAY in this way except that which was a part of the RECORD?

Mr. COX. If the subheads are taken from the RECORD, it does not matter, of course, as to the typography.

That is not the question I raise here against Senators and others, of complaints of subheads sent broadcast over the country and no response made to this statement of the Post-Office Department by the Republican party; but whether there was not a sort of mystery, a sort of diabolism in raising this charge against an innocent man like myself. [Laughter.]

Mr. HENDERSON, of Iowa. The gentleman must remember so far as the charge is true these documents were sent out by somebody. You stand acquitted, but the Tribune has the right to publish that to show the Democratic party during that time, not through the gentleman from New York, has been distributing these documents to the editors of the country.

Mr. COX. My inference is that there is some motive outside of mere politics.

Mr. HENDERSON, of Iowa. The reports furnished by the gentleman from New York show a greater desire to comment for political effect rather than to get at the real party.

Mr. COX. It is true I might find as a motive for this transaction it was if intended to cloud this business by sending out garbled extracts and subheads from Republican headquarters and from others to raise the charge on me.

Mr. HENDERSON, of Iowa. You have not proved they are garbled. That remains to be proved. And you must admit those documents referred to in the Tribune were sent under your frank. Notwithstanding what the Postmaster-General says, it is evident they submitted them to inspection and invited them to make exact copies, which would answer every purpose for the use of the inspector. They had the right, however, to hold the thing itself in the Tribune office, because everybody knows that would be legal evidence in court.

Mr. BAYNE rose.

Mr. MCMILLIN. I call for the regular order.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman's hour expired some time ago.

Mr. BAYNE. I ask to be printed as part of my remarks this document.

Mr. MCMILLIN. I object, because I do not want it made frankable.

Mr. BAYNE. These documents——

Mr. HENDERSON, of Iowa. It is frankable now, and you can not prevent it.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE, of Kentucky. Give me a moment, only a moment, as my name has been brought in. I do not make any comment upon what has been done by the Senator from Pennsylvania, for I have not examined the documents, nor have I any information whether this is frankable, whether these compendiums can be made; but as to the gratuitous reference to myself by the gentleman from Pennsylvania the whole foundation for it is, and I have sent for one of my speeches, at the top of page 3 are the words, "On free raw hides and free wool." Another one was "Tax on books or information." I have not that one here.

Mr. BAYNE. Another was on sugar.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE, of Kentucky. Yes. Another was on the sugar bounty.

Mr. BAYNE. Another on free raw hides.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE, of Kentucky. Yes; another on free raw hides. Those are subheads.

Mr. BAYNE. And do not appear in the RECORD.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE, of Kentucky. And I suppose do not appear in the RECORD.

Mr. HENDERSON, of Iowa. All right. We do not object. It is done by both committees, and has been since the flood.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE, of Kentucky. What I wanted to do was to put on the record the exact fact so far as I am concerned so the RECORD may show the extent of my guilt, if I am guilty, and to thank my friend from Pennsylvania [Mr. BAYNE] for acquitting his distinguished Senator by saying he followed my example, even if it were a bad example.

Mr. HENDERSON, of Iowa. You were both innocent.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED.

Mr. KILGORE, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that they had examined and found duly enrolled a bill (H. R. 1152) for the relief of the legal representatives of Eliza M. Ferris; when the Speaker signed the same.

UNITED PEORIAS AND MIAMIES.

Mr. PEEL. Mr. Speaker, I wish to submit a privileged report from a committee of conference.

The report was read, as follows:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 8074) to provide for the allotment of lands in severalty to the United Peorias and Miamies in the Indian Territory, having met, after full and free conference have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 2, and agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 1, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

On page 2 in line 29, of the matter proposed to be inserted by said amendment, after the word "building," insert the words "together with the land."

On page 5 of said amendment, in lines 9 and 10, strike out the words "in the Interior Department."

On page 6 of said amendment in line 1 strike out the word "removed to the Indian Territory;" and strike out all from lines 16 to 19, inclusive, on page 6 of said amendment, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"And the court may ascertain the reasonable value of the services of counsel employed by said confederated tribes to represent the tribes on said examination, not to exceed 10 per cent. of the aggregate sum actually in controversy; and the Secretary of the Interior shall cause to be paid to said counsel so much of the sum so ascertained as in equity and justice he may consider to be due for such service, out of any money in the Treasury of the United States now due to said tribes arising from the sale of the lands of said tribes in Kansas."

And the Senate agree to the same.

S. W. PEEL,
J. M. ALLEN,
B. W. PERKINS,
Managers on the part of the House.

H. L. DAWES,
O. H. PLATT,
JOHN T. MORGAN,
Managers on the part of the Senate.

The managers on the part of the House submit the following statement:

The managers upon the part of the House after a full and free conference with the conferees upon the part of the Senate upon the disagreeing votes of the two Houses upon H. R. 8074, alloting lands between the Peoria and Miami Indians in Indian Territory, and for other purposes, beg leave to submit the following report: House bill provided that each person of the confederated tribes be allotted 220 acres with the privilege of selling all of his or her allotment except 160 acres. Senate amendment changed the amount to be allotted to each person from 220 to 200 acres without right to sell any part of it, and the remainder of this reservation to be held in common and leased for the benefit of the tribes under direction of the Secretary of the Interior, to which your conferees agree, and ask that the House adopt, etc.

Also Senate amendment allowing that portion of the Peorias known as the citizens members to bring suit in Court of Claims to settle their rights and interest to certain moneys held in trust by the United States, to which we also agree, and respectfully ask concurrence upon part of the House.

S. W. PEEL,
J. M. ALLEN,
B. W. PERKINS,
Managers on the part of the House of Representatives.

Mr. PEEL. I ask the adoption of the report.

Mr. HAUGEN. Mr. Speaker, at the time this bill was under consideration in the House there were certain features of it which were opposed by my colleague, Mr. LA FOLLETTE, a member of the Committee on Indian Affairs. He is now, with so many other members of the House, necessarily absent, but informs me that after the passage of the bill through the House he made an inquiry at the Indian Office and found that the Commissioner of Indian Affairs was opposed to the bill in its present form.

He desires to have this bill held for consideration until his return, as he wishes to make some observations or remarks in regard to it; and for that reason I shall have to oppose its consideration at this time. I shall do it on his account alone.

Mr. PEEL. I am not aware that there is any opposition in the Indian Office or anywhere else to the bill in its present form. My colleague on the committee [Mr. LA FOLLETTE], as I understand, never made any opposition to the provisions of this bill.

Mr. HAUGEN. The particular feature of the bill to which he is opposed, and to which he informed me the Indian Office is opposed, is that referring to the alienation of the lands by the grantees of the allottees.

The bill, as I understand it, for I am not familiar with its provisions, provides that the allottees shall not alienate the lands allotted to them except to some other Indian; but there is no restraint upon the other Indian who may become the grantee of the allotment.

Mr. PEEL. There is nothing of that kind in the Senate amendment.

Mr. HAUGEN. Not in the Senate amendment, but in the bill as it passed the House.

Mr. PEEL. This bill has been changed entirely by the Senate. This simply changes the manner of allotment.

Mr. HAUGEN. I understand the Senate amendment does not touch that feature.

Mr. PEEL. That is not the bill at all.

Mr. HAUGEN. But the Senate amendment does not strike that from the bill?

Mr. PEEL. The Senate amendment is a substitute for the bill. It is all stricken out.

Mr. HAUGEN. Let the bill lie over until to-morrow——

Mr. PEEL. I should not object to that, but I will be compelled to be absent.

Mr. HAUGEN. Then let it lie over for a few moments until I can examine it. I do not object, of course, on my own account.

Mr. PEEL. Very well; I will withdraw the report for a few minutes to give the gentleman an opportunity to examine the bill.

LAND DISTRICT, FOLSOM, N. MEX.

Mr. CONGER. Mr. Speaker, I desire to call up for present consideration the bill S. 2040, which was before the House on yesterday.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore* (Mr. COX). The gentleman from Iowa [Mr. CONGER] calls up the bill the title of which the Clerk will read.

Mr. CONGER. This bill was read on yesterday.

Mr. HENDERSON, of Iowa. And it is a continuing matter.

Mr. RYAN. What is the bill?

Mr. CONGER. A bill for the establishment of a land district in the eastern part of the Territory of New Mexico.

Mr. RYAN. Was unanimous consent given on yesterday?

Mr. CONGER. It was laid over at the suggestion of the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. MCMILLIN], who wanted time to examine it before giving consent to its consideration. I hope the gentleman from Kansas will not object.

Mr. RYAN. I desire to know the status of the bill. I understood it was objected to on yesterday by the gentleman from Tennessee. If that is so, and if he withdraws the objection this morning, it is still the subject of objection, as I understand.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The gentleman from Tennessee asked that it lie over until to-day; but it is still open to objection.

Mr. RYAN. Then I hope it will not be considered this morning. I wish to examine it, and shall object for the present.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. Objection being made, the bill is not before the House.

Mr. KILGORE. I demanded the regular order a few moments ago, but will withhold it for the present to allow the gentleman from Kentucky to make a request.

REPAIR SHOP FOR MAIL-BAGS.

Mr. MONTGOMERY. I ask unanimous consent to take up for present consideration the bill which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 11599) authorizing the Postmaster-General to rent a suitable building in the city of Washington, to be used as a mail-bag repair-shop, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

The bill was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Postmaster-General be, and he is hereby, authorized to rent for a term until July 1, 1889, a suitable building in the city of Washington for the purpose of being used as a mail-bag repair-shop and for the storage of the supplies used by the Post-Office Department in supplying post-offices, at a rental not exceeding the rate of $3,000 per annum.

And for the purpose of providing for the expenses incidental to the occupancy of such building and for the proper performance of the work therein until July 1, 1889, the following sums are hereby appropriated, payable out of any moneys in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated:

For rent, $3,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary; for two watchmen, at the rate of $720 per annum each; one laborer, at the rate of $660 per annum; one charwoman, at the rate of $240 per annum; for gas, $250, or so much thereof as may be necessary; and for fuel, $500, or so much thereof as may be necessary; in all, $6,090.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time; and being engrossed, it was accordingly read the third time, and passed.

Mr. MONTGOMERY moved to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed; and also moved that the motion to reconsider be laid on the table.

The latter motion was agreed to.

Mr. MONTGOMERY. I ask that the letters, which I send to the Clerk's desk and which are explanatory of the necessity for the passage of this bill, be published in the RECORD.

Mr. EZRA B. TAYLOR. What is the substance of the letters?

Mr. MONTGOMERY. They simply explain the necessity for the passage of this bill.

Mr. EZRA B. TAYLOR. I have announced my purpose of objecting to the passage of any bills except those connected with labor; and understanding that this bill just passed was one of that kind I made no objection. I do not see the necessity for printing the letters.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The gentleman from Ohio objects.

Mr. EZRA B. TAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, it is stated to me that it may be for the information of the Senate to have these letters printed, and I therefore withdraw my objection.

There was no further objection, and it was so ordered.

The letters are as follows:

POST-OFFICE DEPARTMENT,
OFFICE OF THE SECOND ASSISTANT POSTMASTER-GENERAL,
Washington, D. C., October 5, 1888.

SIR: In view of the fact that the post-office at Washington City will be removed from its present site on Louisiana avenue, and that the mail-bag repair-shop, which is located in the post-office building, can have no room in the new building at the Pension Office, I have the honor to request that application be made to Congress for an appropriation of at least $5,000 to enable the Department to rent a suitable building for the mail-bag repair-shop.

Under recent orders issued by you, the mail-bag repair-shop at the city of Washington has become the main repair shop of all the bags in the service. At present there are ninety persons employed in this shop, and the premises now occupied by them are partly unfit and can not be used in the winter.

The result of your order making Washington City the main repair office has been a very large saving in the annual cost of bags and sacks, and it would be a great detriment to the public service and seriously to be deprecated if the efficient work of this shop should be interfered with for the want of proper accommodation.

Very respectfully,

A. LEO KNOTT,
Second Assistant Postmaster-General.

Hon. DON M. DICKINSON,
Postmaster-General.

POST-OFFICE DEPARTMENT,
OFFICE OF FIRST ASSISTANT POSTMASTER-GENERAL,
DIVISION OF POST-OFFICE SUPPLIES,
Washington, D. C., October 8, 1888.

SIR: By the request of the chief clerk of the Post-Office Department I have the honor to submit the reasons in brief for the necessity of additional storage room being furnished to the division of post-office supplies.

The present space is entirely inadequate to keep on hand a sufficient stock of the articles required by the postal service. Owing to this lack of room the Department is required to make orders for small quantities of the various articles contracted for, thus adding largely to the clerical work; and in case of contractors furnishing inferior supplies, owing to the limited amount of these articles enabled to be kept on hand the inspection committee is obliged to accept them at a reduction instead of rejecting them as should be done in all cases when supplies do not come up to the contract requirements. This course is detrimental to the service and costly to the Department.

Often, when contractors are delayed in the delivery of supplies owing to the breaking of machinery or negligence, or when railroads fail to deliver promptly, from accident or otherwise, the Department is unable to furnish postmasters with the supplies necessary to properly conduct their business, and the postal service of the country is embarrassed. For nearly four years no additional storage room has been furnished, while during that time 12,510 new post-offices have been established, which, taken with the natural growth in the business of the service, have completely overrun the storage room of the division. Every available space is now occupied to its fullest extent, even to the corridors, and heavy articles like twine and wrapping-paper have to be piled to such a height that the lives of visitors to the Department and of employés are often in danger. By this course additional help is required to perform the manual labor. Action should at once be taken to procure storage room sufficient to carry at least a three months' supply of the various articles furnished.

I have the honor to remain, very respectfully,

J. L. WOODBRIDGE, *Superintendent.*

Hon. DON M. DICKINSON,
Postmaster-General.

WASHINGTON, D. C., *October* 9, 1888.

SIR: Referring to my letter of the 5th instant to the Postmaster-General, by him referred to you with a recommendation for an appropriation of $5,000 for a repair shop in the city of Washington and a storage-room for post-office supplies, I have the honor to submit the following facts:

An investigation made last March disclosed the fact that there were in the New York and Washington post-offices on March 1, 1888, about 375,000 bags—leather and jute—which had been suffered to accumulate in those repair shops and had not been, by proper repairs, kept in the current stock of the Department and in use.

Under an order of the Postmaster-General, the repair shop at the city of Washington was placed under my immediate charge, and Maj. R. D. S. Tyler was appointed superintendent thereof, and orders were issued to the various repair shops and to the railway mail service to send all the damaged bags—leather, jute, and canvas—to this shop for repairs. In order to perform this work expeditiously the force was from time to time increased until it now stands at the following figures:

Women, on jute sacks	51
Canvas-workers	9
Leather-workers	14
Laborers	17

The total number of bags, jute, canvas, and leather, repaired in this shop since the order placing this work under the charge of the Second Assistant Postmaster-General was made, is 344,643, and the current service has been kept in full and abundant supply without making any additional requisitions for new bags.

By the establishment of the Washington repair-shop and the bringing of the damaged bags here under the immediate direction of this office, instead of leaving them to the postmasters at the several repair-shops, the saving to the Department therefor can be best illustrated by the following statement, to wit:

The amount paid for new pouches and bags of all kinds from June 30, 1887, to February 1, 1888, was $167,460.75.

The amount paid for new mail-bags from February 1, 1888, to October 10, 1888, was $10,621.62.

The total cost for the ninety employés in the repair-shop during the month of September was $4,016.26.

We have not employed ninety persons during this time, but the average probably since February 1 was about forty-five, and the expenditure per month since that date for payment of wages to employés, materials, and tools used in the repair of bags would probably average $3,000, making a total of about, say, $25,000 expended for this purpose since February 1, 1888. This added to the sum of $10,621.62 gives a total of $35,621.62 expended for mail sacks and mail bags as against an expenditure of $167,460.75 for new pouches and bags of all kinds from June 30, 1887, to February 1, 1888, making a difference of $131,739.17. I say that this illustrates a saving, but I do not mean to say that this sum of $131,739.17 would have been expended in new mail bags, as the stock which was thus obtained would have gone through the balance of the fiscal year. Assuming that we would not have expended more than one-half of this amount for new bags from February 1 to October 1, 1888, in other words about $65,869, the figures still show the sum of at least $30,248 as the estimated saving resulting from repairing the accumulated stock and putting it in the service and use since February 1, 1888. The best estimate that I can reach as to the annual saving to the mail-equipment division of this office by keeping the repair shop in Washington on its present basis will be $60,000 per annum.

Very respectfully,

A. LEO KNOTT,
Second Assistant Postmaster-General.

HON. C. L. ANDERSON,
Acting Chairman Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads,
House of Representatives.

JULIA A. NUTT.

Mr. LAGAN. I wish to offer the bill which I send to the Clerk's desk to be read, for the purpose of having the claim referred to the Court of Claims.

The Clerk read the title of the bill, as follows:

A bill (H. R. 11580) for the relief of Julia A. Nutt, widow and executrix of Haller Nutt, deceased.

Mr. EZRA B. TAYLOR. I shall object to the consideration of that bill.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The gentleman asks that the claim be referred to the Court of Claims.

Mr. EZRA B. TAYLOR. I object.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

A message from the Senate, by Mr. NEWELL, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate requested the House to return to the Senate the bill of the House (H. R. 1152) for the relief of the legal representatives of Eliza M. Ferris.

ORDER OF BUSINESS.

Mr. KILGORE. I demand the regular order.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The regular order is the call of committees for reports.

Mr. McMILLIN. The announcement having been made that no business can be transacted, I therefore move that the House adjourn.

Mr. HENDERSON, of Iowa. Pending that, I ask to be excused from attendance at further sessions of the House during this session, as it is impossible to do business without a quorum. I make this request on that account.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa? The Chair hears none.

Mr. PLUMB. I also ask to be excused during the remainder of the session.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois? The Chair hears none.

Mr. DOUGHERTY. Mr. Speaker, I make the same request.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. Speaker, I want to present a privileged question before we adjourn.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. Does the gentleman object to the request of the gentleman from Florida for leave of absence?

Mr. KILGORE. Oh, no; let him go. [Laughter.]

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The Chair hears no objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida.

FINAL ADJOURNMENT.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. Speaker, I want to present a privileged question.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. DOUGHERTY. I think the House will probably be glad if I take the gentleman from Texas with me. [Laughter.]

Mr. KILGORE. I ask consideration of the resolution I send to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives, That the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives be authorized to close the present session by adjourning their respective Houses on Saturday, October 20, 1888, at 1 o'clock p. m.

Mr. McMILLIN. For the purpose of permitting action to be taken on the resolution, I withdraw my motion to adjourn.

Mr. WHEELER. I desire to offer the following amendment.

Mr. KILGORE. I demand immediate consideration of that resolution.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The gentleman from Alabama proposes an amendment, which the Clerk will read.

Mr. WHEELER. A substitute.

Mr. EZRA B. TAYLOR. I understand that the previous question was demanded on the resolution as it stands.

Mr. KILGORE. I do demand the previous question.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The previous question is demanded.

Mr. WHEELER. Without allowing the amendment to go in?

Mr. RICHARDSON. Pending that motion, I move to refer the resolution to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Mr. KILGORE. I want to raise the point of order that that can not be done under the rules. [Laughter.]

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The Chair will hear the gentleman on the point of order.

Mr. KILGORE. I understand that this is a privileged question, and if this privileged question can be referred to a committee, then any other privileged question can be so referred. Now, the rule in relation to questions of privilege is this:

Questions of privilege shall be, first, those affecting the rights of the House collectively, its safety, dignity, and the integrity of its proceedings; second, the rights, reputation, and conduct of members individually in their representative capacity only; and shall have precedence of all other questions, except motions to fix the day to which the House shall adjourn, to adjourn, and for a recess.

A motion to adjourn appears to be the highest question of privilege that can possibly be presented to the House, because it can even take precedence of a question affecting the safety of the House, the dignity of the House, or the personal privilege of any member of the House; and I assume that it would not be contended for a moment that a question of privilege affecting the safety or the dignity of this House could be referred to the Committee on Ways and Means, or any other committee.

But further, sir, there appears to be no Committee on Ways and Means here. About the only committee that has been able to make any report to this House for the last three months is the Committee on Enrolled Bills, and I think that if the resolution is to be referred at all, it ought to go to that committee. [Laughter.]

Mr. RICHARDSON. I beg the gentleman's pardon, the Committee on Printing has made several reports lately.

Mr. WHEELER. The Committee on Expenditures in the Treasury Department has made four reports within a month.

Mr. KILGORE. With the chairmen of these committees and the clerks and the apple women out in the lobby we have got a quorum. [Laughter.]

Now, Mr. Speaker, let us look at the jurisdiction of the Committee on Ways and Means, and I think it will be seen that this resolution might just as well be referred to the Committee on Enrolled Bills as to the Committee on Ways and Means, so far as jurisdiction is concerned, because the jurisdiction of the Committee on Ways and Means applies to bills relating to revenue and to the bonded debt of the United States. But I assume, sir, that a question of privilege like this can not be referred to any committee at all. The very meaning of the "privilege" is that the matter may be called up and acted upon at the time it is called up instead of being buried in a committee. Gentlemen can of course vote it down, and that will be tantamount to referring it to a committee.

Now, I want to make an observation about the policy of continuing this Congress in session.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE, of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I rise to a question of order.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE, of Kentucky. As I understand, the gentleman from Texas wishes to call up a motion to adjourn.

The SPEAKER. The present occupant was not in the chair when this matter came up, but his understanding is that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. KILGORE] has offered a resolution to adjourn.

Mr. KILGORE. I have.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE, of Kentucky. And I understand that upon the offering of that resolution a motion was made to refer it to a committee.

The SPEAKER. The Chair would like to understand the situation. If the gentleman from Texas has simply called up the resolution which was offered yesterday, then the motion to refer was pending at the time the proposition was postponed. If the gentleman has offered a new resolution, of course that is a new proposition and subject to all proper parliamentary motions.

Mr. McMILLIN. The gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. RICHARDSON] moved to refer the resolution after the gentleman from Texas [Mr. KILGORE] had demanded the previous question.

The SPEAKER. Did the gentleman from Texas offer a new resolution?

Mr. McMILLIN. He did.

Mr. KILGORE. Yes, sir; I offered a resolution to adjourn on Saturday.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE, of Kentucky. The point I make is that this was not a privileged matter when there was already pending a motion to refer a similar resolution offered by the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. OATES] on yesterday.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thinks there may be any number of the same character.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE, of Kentucky. And that any proposition to adjourn is privileged, no matter how often it may be made?

The SPEAKER. The Chair thinks so.

Mr. RICHARDSON. I rise to a point of order.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. RICHARDSON. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. KILGORE]

offered his resolution, and upon it he demanded the previous question. I then moved that it be referred to the Committee on Ways and Means. The gentleman from Texas now makes the point of order upon my motion that it can not apply to his resolution for a final adjournment. The gentleman arose to debate the question of order, but he has departed from that and has stated that he wishes to debate now the question of the propriety of an adjournment, and the point I make is that in debating the question of order he can not proceed to debate the other question.

Mr. DOUGHERTY. I rise to a point of order.

The SPEAKER. There is one point of order now pending.

Mr. DOUGHERTY. Then I rise to a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. DOUGHERTY. Is a motion to adjourn debatable?

The SPEAKER. A motion to fix the time at which the House shall adjourn *sine die* is debatable. This is not a motion to adjourn, nor a motion to fix a day to which the House will adjourn.

Mr. RICHARDSON. I want to add, upon the point of order which the gentleman from Texas [Mr. KILGORE] makes upon my motion, that the words "shall adjourn" and "for a recess," in the rule which he quotes, apply not to final adjournment, but to the usual daily adjournments of the House.

The SPEAKER. The Chair has just stated that distinction. The Clerk will read the fourth subdivision of Rule XVI as to the priority of motions.

The Clerk read as follows:

When a question is under debate, no motion shall be received but to fix the day to which the House shall adjourn, to adjourn, to take a recess, to lay on the table, for the previous question (which motions shall be decided without debate), to postpone to a day certain, to refer or amend, or to postpone indefinitely, which several motions shall have precedence in the foregoing order.

The SPEAKER. It will be observed that the motion for the previous question has priority, under the rule, over the motion to refer; therefore, while the motion to refer may be made pending the demand for the previous question, the vote must first be taken on ordering the previous question. If the House should decline to order the previous question——

Mr. RICHARDSON. I beg pardon for one moment. If the Chair will refer to Rule XVII he will find the following language:

It shall be in order, pending the motion for, or after the previous question shall have been ordered on its passage, for the Speaker to entertain and submit a motion to commit, with or without instructions, to a standing or select committee.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman is correct; the Chair for the moment did not remember the rule. It is a rule which has usually been applied to matters of legislation, the passage of bills, joint resolutions, etc., but the Chair thinks it applies as well to any proposition pending before the House. Therefore the motion to refer is in order pending the demand for the previous question, or after the previous question has been ordered.

Mr. WHEELER. Is this motion to refer debatable?

The SPEAKER. It is not, under the rules of the House.

The question being taken on the motion to refer the resolution to the Committee on Ways and Means, there were—ayes 19, noes 20.

Mr. RICHARDSON. No quorum.

Tellers were ordered; and Mr. RICHARDSON and Mr. KILGORE were appointed.

The House again divided; and the tellers reported—ayes 20, noes 7.

Mr. RICHARDSON. I withdraw the point of no quorum.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. Speaker, I renew it. [Laughter.]

Mr. SOWDEN. It is very evident there is no quorum present. I therefore move that the House do now adjourn.

Mr. PEEL. I hope the gentleman will allow a vote on the conference report which was presented a short time ago. The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. HAUGEN] withdraws his objection.

The SPEAKER. The House is dividing, and under the rules a conference report can not be entertained when a division is being taken. But if there is no objection, the Chair will entertain the request of the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. PEEL].

Mr. KILGORE. What is involved in the matter?

Mr. PEEL. The report was presented awhile ago; and the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. HAUGEN] asked that action be deferred until he could look into it. He does not now object.

The SPEAKER. The report has already been read. The question is on agreeing to it.

Mr. HAUGEN. Since this report was presented I have examined this matter; and I am satisfied that if my colleague were here he would not object to the bill in its present form. I withdraw my objection.

The report of the committee of conference was agreed to.

ORDER OF BUSINESS.

Mr. SOWDEN. I now renew my motion that the House adjourn.

The SPEAKER (having put the question). The ayes seem to have it.

Mr. McMILLIN. I call for a division.

Mr. KILGORE. I withdraw the point of "no quorum" upon the reference of the adjournment resolution. I am willing to allow the matter to be referred.

The SPEAKER. A motion to adjourn is pending.

Mr. McMILLIN. I ask that the Chair announce the result of the vote on the question upon which the House was dividing.

The SPEAKER. Upon the motion made by the gentleman from Tennessee to refer the resolution with regard to adjournment to the Committee on Ways and Means, the ayes were 20, the noes 7. The ayes have it, and the motion is agreed to.

Mr. McMILLIN. I now withdraw the demand for a division on the motion to adjourn.

The SPEAKER. The demand for a division being withdrawn, the motion that the House adjourn is agreed to.

The House accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 10 minutes p. m.) adjourned.

PRIVATE BILLS INTRODUCED AND REFERRED.

Under the rule private bills of the following titles were introduced and referred as indicated below:

By Mr. J. E. CAMPBELL: A bill (H. R. 11600) granting a pension to W. T. Nichols—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HOOKER: A bill (H. R. 11601) for the relief of the Roman Catholic Church of St. Peter, Jackson, Miss.—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. FELIX CAMPBELL: A bill (H. R. 11602) to reinstate John Wilson in the Engineer Corps of the United States Navy—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. McRAE: A bill (H. R. 11603) for the relief of John B. Luttrell—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. McMILLIN: A bill (H. R. 11604) to amend an act approved March 3, 1885, to authorize the construction of bridges across the Cumberland and Caney Fork Rivers, in Tennessee—to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. WILLIAM WHITING: A bill (H. R. 11605) for the relief of William Murphy—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

PETITIONS, ETC.

The following petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk, under the rule, and referred as follows:

By Mr. CLEMENTS: Petition of Benjamin Heath, of Georgia, for reference of his claim to the Court of Claims—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. McMILLIN: Petition of E. W. Bass, late captain in Fifth Tennessee, for removal of charges against him—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. WHEELER: Petition of Rachael Lawson, of Lauderdale County, Alabama, for reference of her claim to the Court of Claims—to the Committee on War Claims.

SENATE.

THURSDAY, *October* 18, 1888.

Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. J. G. BUTLER, D. D.

The Journal of yesterday's proceedings was read and approved.

MAIL-BAG REPAIR-SHOP.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The Chair lays before the Senate a bill from the House of Representatives.

The bill (H. R. 11599) to authorize the Postmaster-General to rent a suitable building in the city of Washington to be used as a mail-bag repair-shop, and for other purposes, was read the first time by its title.

Mr. SAWYER. I ask unanimous consent that that bill may be now considered.

By unanimous consent, the bill was read the second time at length, and considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, and was read the third time.

Mr. SAULSBURY. Before the vote is taken on the passage of the bill, I should like to inquire of the Senator in charge of it whether in the opinion of the Department the passage of the bill is necessary, or whether it is a voluntary movement on the part of the House of Representatives.

Mr. SAWYER. I will state to my friend from Delaware that representatives of the Post-Office Department came to the Senate Committee on Appropriations and requested a clause for this purpose to be put into the Post-Office appropriation bill. It passed the Senate, but the conferees on the part of the House insisted upon its being struck out, and it was struck out. Then the representatives of the Post-Office Department went to the House and got the House to pass this bill, and came here yesterday and asked me specially to take charge of it and secure its passage by the Senate. I think the bill ought to pass. It is very important.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The question is, Shall the bill pass?

The bill was passed.

LANDS OF UNITED PEORIAS AND MIAMIES.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The Chair lays before the Senate the action of the House of Representatives on the conference report on House bill 8074, which will be read.

The Chief Clerk read as follows:

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, *October* 17, 1888.

Resolved, That the House concur in the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 8074) to provide for allotment of land in severalty to united Peorias and Miamies in Indian Territory.

Mr. MORGAN. I submit the report of the committee of conference on the part of the Senate.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The report will be read.

The Chief Clerk read as follows:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 8074) to provide for the allotment of land in severalty to United Peorias and Miamies in Indian Territory, having met, after full and free conference have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 2, and agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 1, and agree to the same with amendments as follows:

On page 2, in line 29, of the matter proposed to be inserted by said amendment, after the word "building" insert the words "together with the land." On page 5 of said amendment, in lines 9 and 10, strike out the words "in the Interior Department."

On page 6 of said amendment in line 1 strike out the words "removed to the Indian Territory;" and strike out all of lines 15 to 19, inclusive, on page 6 of said amendment, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"And the court may ascertain the reasonable value of the services of counsel employed by said confederated tribes to represent the tribes on such examination, not to exceed 10 per cent. of the aggregate sum actually in controversy; and the Secretary of the Interior shall cause to be paid to said counsel so much of the sum so ascertained as in equity and justice he may consider to be due them for such services out of any money in the Treasury of the United States now due to such tribes arising from the sale of the lands of said tribes in Kansas."

And the Senate agree to the same.

H. L. DAWES,
O. H. PLATT,
JOHN T. MORGAN,
Managers on the part of the Senate.

S. W. PEEL,
JOHN M. ALLEN,
B. W. PERKINS,
Managers on the part of the House.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The question is on concurring in the report.

The report was concurred in.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

Mr. GRAY. I present a petition, which has been sent to me in the absence of both the Senators from Connecticut, being the petition of more than 500 citizens of that State, representing nearly all the gainful occupations of our country. As the petition is short I will ask permission to read it.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The Chair hears no objection.

Mr. GRAY. The petition is as follows:

To the Senate of the United States:

GENTLEMEN: The workingmen of Connecticut, wage-earners, manufacturers and farmers, use upwards of $100,000,000 worth of raw materials annually in their industries. A large amount of these materials can not be obtained in this country. Nearly all of these materials come from without the borders of our State. The increased cost of these materials, particularly of wool, salt, lumber, tin-plates, etc., by reason of the tariff taxes, has become an intolerable burden. The Mills bill, which now comes before you, relieves us from many of these taxes. The final enactment of the bill will be worth millions of dollars to our people. It will revive many industries which are now much depressed. It will tend to increase the wages of our mechanics and the profits of our manufacturers. It will add value to our farms and our factories. We, the undersigned, citizens of Connecticut, therefore most respectfully ask that the bill be speedily passed by your honorable body.

The petition is signed by W. H. Shannon and over 500 others.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The petition having been read will appear in the RECORD, as the Chair supposes without the names. It is so ordered, if there be no objection. The bill having been reported, the petition will lie upon the table.

BILL INTRODUCED.

Mr. HALE (by request) introduced a bill (S. 3641) to confer the rank of lieutenant by law on Nathaniel Johnson Coffin; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

PROPOSED RECESS—FINAL ADJOURNMENT.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The Chair lays before the Senate a resolution coming over under objection from yesterday, which will be read.

The Chief Clerk read the concurrent resolution submitted yesterday by Mr. ALLISON, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That at 1 o'clock p. m. on Saturday, the 20th day of October, instant, the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives adjourn their respective Houses, to meet on Monday, the 19th day of November next, at 12 o'clock m.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. If the Chair remembers correctly, the Senator from Missouri [Mr. COCKRELL] yesterday moved to refer the resolution to a committee of five, to be appointed by the Presiding Officer, and under the objection of the Senator from Alabama [Mr. MORGAN], the subject went over until to-day.

Mr. COCKRELL. That is right.

Mr. PADDOCK. I desire to offer an amendment to the resolution.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. It is proposed to amend the resolution in line 3, by striking out "20th" and inserting "27th;" and in line 4, by striking out "19th" and inserting "12th;" so as to read:

That at 1 o'clock p. m. on Saturday, the 27th day of October, instant, the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives adjourn their respective Houses to meet on Monday, the 12th day of November next, at 12 o'clock m.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. Does the Senator from Missouri desire action upon his motion to refer?

Mr. COCKRELL. Not now. I withdraw it for the present.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The question is on agreeing to the amendment proposed by the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. PADDOCK].

Mr. ALLISON. I have consulted as many Senators as I could on both sides of the Chamber as to what we should do respecting the question of adjournment, and I think the prevailing opinion is on both sides—I know there are Senators on both sides who do not agree to it—but the prevailing opinion is that it is wiser to adjourn until the first Monday in December. I think that is the prevalent opinion on both sides of the Chamber, so far as I can gather that opinion. I understood that the Senator from Georgia [Mr. BROWN] intended to propose an amendment looking to an adjournment, and if he does so, I shall for myself support it.

Mr. BROWN. I think the Senate should pursue whatever course would best promote the passage of a tariff bill at the earliest day that it can reasonably and properly be done, but I do not believe that we can facilitate that result by taking a recess from Saturday until the 19th day of next month, and then again assembling before the regular time of meeting in December.

The Senate has been in session now over ten and a half months. Senators who have attended to their duties during that length of time at the Capitol might, it seems to me, reasonably ask for at least a month and twenty days of vacation before the commencement of the next session of Congress. My own opinion is that you could not get a quorum to attend on the 19th of next month, and if a quorum did appear it would only forward the matter by a few days and would not really be a gain in time of any great public concern.

Again, the Presidential election takes place in the mean time, and the popular verdict that may be then pronounced will have a great deal to do with the shape in which the tariff bill will finally pass. If the Democrats are successful, I presume something very near the Mills bill, if not identical with the Mills bill, will be passed at the December session. If the Republicans should be successful, probably something more nearly like the bill reported by the Finance Committee of the Senate as a substitute would be enacted into a law.

I think it is desirable therefore, in this state of the case, that we should not take final action until the Presidential election, and let the popular verdict be known before the tariff bill is passed into a law.

Entertaining these views, and being satisfied that the resolution to take a recess would be unwise, I think I should call for a division on that question if it should be put to the Senate, and we should then have to test the question whether there is a quorum present. Under all the circumstances, however, I believe it is better that we should adjourn; and therefore I offer the following resolution as a substitute for the resolution of the Senator from Iowa:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives declare their respective Houses adjourned without day on Saturday, the 20th day of October, at 1 o'clock p. m.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The Senator from Georgia moves to strike out all after the word "that" in the resolution of the Senator from Iowa, and to insert. The question is on agreeing to the substitute proposed by the Senator from Georgia.

Mr. EVARTS. Mr. President, I hope the amendment proposed by the Senator from Georgia will be adopted. We of all the people in this country ought not to be inattentive to the fact that the two Houses of Congress are not now in a position to debate the details of the tariff bill, on which, of course, divisions would need to be taken. We of all men in the country should not be the only ones unobservant of the fact that the Presidential election intervenes about half way between our present date and the meeting of the next session of Congress. We are all aware that the subject of the tariff is the principal topic heretofore debated, and the principal matter to be decided in the opinions of the people at this election.

It seems to me, therefore, from any observation that I have made outside of these Chambers and outside of Washington, that the general feeling of the country is that we have faithfully debated on both sides the question of the change of the tariff, and that now the debate on principles has been brought to a close in this body, and the details, if they are ever to become practically determinable by this Congress, will need an attendance of a majority here.

I therefore heartily support the motion made by the Senator from Georgia.

Mr. DOLPH. If it is proposed to adjourn, I should like to be informed as to the object of putting the hour at 1 o'clock on Saturday. I have not heard of any Senator on either side of the Chamber who proposes now to enter into a general discussion of the revenue bill which has been under consideration. I suppose there is no certainty that the deficiency bill will be signed before that date, and if we are

going to adjourn I do not see what difference it makes whether we adjourn to-day at 1 o'clock, or to-morrow at 1 o'clock, or on Saturday—whenever the other House can act on the resolution.

Mr. ALLISON. I will say to the Senator from Oregon that the deficiency bill, which is certainly an important bill, is now under consideration, I suppose, by the President; and the object in fixing Saturday is to give him an opportunity to examine that bill and some other bills which have recently been sent to him.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The Chair will state that several other bills of considerable importance have recently been signed by the Presiding Officers of both Houses and forwarded to the Executive for his approval. In the opinion of the Chair there should be an interval in which the Executive might act; otherwise, the Senate and the House adjourning, the legislation would entirely fail.

Mr. DOLPH. It is well understood that the legislation of the Congress continues through the short session, until 12 o'clock on the 4th of March, and bills are hurried to the President and receive his signature at the close of the session. However, I merely make the suggestion, if we have proceeded with the tariff bill as far as we can under existing circumstances and there is no further legislation, whether it is necessary that the session should be extended until Saturday.

Mr. ALLISON. I think there are Senators who desire to make some observations on the bill before we adjourn, so that we are not ready to adjourn to-day. But certainly the President should have an opportunity to examine the bills which have been sent to him, because if they are not signed they fail on adjournment.

Mr. DOLPH. If they are not signed they will fail in any event, and if returned without the signature of the President they would fail in the existing condition of both Houses.

Mr. PADDOCK. The object that I should seek to accomplish by the amendment which I propose is that if we could continue the consideration of the tariff bill and such speeches as would be made between this and the 27th should be delivered, the Senate being relieved to that extent, it might happen that a date not remote in the future might be fixed for a final vote on this proposition. Possibly the Committee on Finance might conclude after a little that it would be proper to name a date upon which the vote could be taken—perhaps the 12th of December, or some time thereabouts. Whereas if we should take so long a recess as has been proposed, or if we should adjourn, the speeches which could be made now would have yet to be made hereafter, and the date of the determination of this question correspondingly delayed—postponed very far into the future.

My judgment is, and the desire of the people of the State whom I have the honor in part to represent here is, that there should be a revision of the tariff at the earliest possible date. I believe that a great majority of my constituents are in favor of the bill which has been perfected and reported by the Committee on Finance and which is before the Senate at this time. That committee have performed a very great labor, having done in six weeks what they might have been properly allotted six months to do. That bill is here; it is a good bill. I am very much in favor of it, although I should perhaps desire and expect at the proper time to ask for a change or two in the bill. However, I think we could go ahead until the 27th, and relieve the Senate of a certain number of speeches that will have to be made some time. My friend, the Senator from Alabama [Mr. MORGAN], whose speech is phenomenal, both as to its duration and its quality, has unwound himself a little. I should hope before the end of next week he would be unwound still further, and then, if we should come back here on the 12th, we should have an easier time until the commencement of the next session, and I think we would make very decided progress.

I think it would gratify the country if we would undertake to push this measure as rapidly as we can. If we adjourn on the 27th, that will give all of us, Senators from the remotest as well as those from the nearer States, an opportunity to get home in time to rest a little before the election on the 6th day of November, and the date I suggest for the reassembling will give them sufficient time to return. Then if we can possibly fix a date so early as the 12th of December to vote on this question, it would be in order, and it would be very proper, that there should be a long holiday recess afterwards. We might take a recess from the 15th of December or somewhere there to the 6th of January, which would ease us up a little after the enormous amount of time and labor we will have put in by that date, and indeed have already put in.

This is my view. I think it would be better to do as I suggest. I think the country would be better satisfied with it, and I think it would be well for the Senate to take that course. Of course I know perfectly well, as every Senator does, that the bill can not be passed in the short time to intervene between this and the 6th of November, when of course we shall have to take a recess.

Mr. COCKRELL. Is the Senator from Nebraska in earnest?

Mr. PADDOCK. The Senator from Nebraska will answer that he is terribly in earnest.

Mr. COCKRELL. I should think he was terribly in earnest in trying to make the people believe that which does not exist. Now look! Hold up your fingers and count them. Talk about business!

Mr. TELLER. You will not get a quorum if you count.

Mr. COCKRELL. I have not said anything about that. I am simply calling the attention of the Senator from Nebraska to what he might count on his fingers. Talk about transacting business! If the Senator wants to pass that bill before the 6th day of November, we will stay here. If that is the object, we will stay here.

Mr. PADDOCK. Of course the Senator knows that is an absurdity. The bill certainly ought to have a month's consideration. It is patent of course to everybody that it ought to have a month's consideration, and it can have that under my plan.

Mr. COCKRELL. A month's consideration! How do you mean to act upon it?

Mr. PADDOCK. I mean to discuss it so far as it may be desired to discuss it up to the 27th, and when my friend from Missouri comes back on the 12th of November he will very likely be prepared himself to make another speech.

Mr. COCKRELL. Every Senator who has desired to speak has had an opportunity, and we have three days longer really before Saturday in which to talk. The claim of the Senator from Nebraska is perfectly farcical. If you want to pass that bill before the election, we will stay here with you. You can not do it. It is a farce to undertake it, and you know it.

Mr. PADDOCK. The Senator knows the primary trouble about the matter, and that is that the other House has not had a quorum for six weeks.

Mr. COCKRELL. That does not make a particle of difference. The House has nothing to do with this bill now; it is the Senate, nothing more and nothing less and nothing else.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The Chair hopes Senators will cooperate with the Chair in preserving order.

Mr. COCKRELL. We will do so most heartily. It does not make a bit of difference, as to the action of the Senate, whether there is a quorum in the House or not. The House has disposed of the tariff bill. It is here in the Senate. It is for the Senate to dispose of it. The House ought to have gone home long ago. There is no use for any of them here. Wait until you pass your bill. It will be time enough to talk about a quorum in the House when the bill is passed by the Senate. If it is before the 6th of November, or any other time, there will be a quorum in the House. Don't trouble yourselves about that.

Mr. GEORGE. They will be here promptly.

Mr. COCKRELL. They will be here in time to act immediately upon the bill. Now, pass it. It does not make a bit of difference when you pass that bill, there will be a quorum of the House here. Get the Senate in a condition to work. That is your business. You are in control of the Senate and not of the House. Here is the place for you to act. Do not commence complaining about the House. You are not responsible for the House. The Democratic party is responsible for that, not the Republican majority of the Senate. Let every tub stand on its own bottom, if it has any bottom.

Mr. PADDOCK. The Senator can certainly charge no laches to this side of the Chamber in the consideration of the bill. There has never been so much labor performed by any committee of the Senate upon any measure in so short a time as was performed by the Committee on Finance that perfected and reported this bill, in the consideration of the same and the preparation of its very able report. There has been no moment lost that could have been utilized on this side in the discussion of the proposition.

Now, if the Senate wishes to quit, it is all right, but so far as I am concerned, although I am not disposed to take up any time of the Senate in the discussion of the proposition—I am not much in the habit of doing that sort of thing—at the same time I am ready to stay here and listen to my friend from Missouri, and to my friend from Alabama, and the others who I know will speak on this question. If we were to stay here until the 17th we would have plenty of speeches, which we shall have to have later if we do not stay.

Mr. COCKRELL. The Senator talks about the haste with which the Finance Committee has disposed of this bill. Why, it is a farce. What did you do in 1882 and 1883? You took a little internal-revenue bill in December, 1882, and you referred it to the Committee on Finance, and you reported that back in less than thirty days, and you passed it in less than thirty days after that, and then forced a conference upon it, and you got the present tariff law. How does that compare? This is the longest time the Senate Committee on Finance has ever considered a tariff bill in the history of the United States Congress.

Mr. PADDOCK. What about the House committee in this year, 1888?

Mr. COCKRELL. That does not make any difference. Do not trouble yourself about the House. The House will take care of itself. Take care of the Senate. Here is your responsibility.

Mr. ALDRICH. I suppose the Senator from Missouri desires to make a correct statement?

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. Does the Senator from Missouri yield?

Mr. COCKRELL. As a matter of course he yields.

Mr. ALDRICH. The Senator must have forgotten that in 1883 the bill to which he alludes passed the House of Representatives at the long session, and was referred to the Finance Committee during the long session.

Mr. COCKRELL. Why do you trouble yourself about the House? We are talking about the Senate.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. Senators will please address the Chair.

Mr. ALDRICH. If the Senator will be patient with me for a moment so that I may make my statement, I will state when the Senate met at the short session of 1882–'83 the bill already prepared by the Tariff Commission was presented to them for consideration, and all the committee had to do in the consideration of the question was to consider the Tariff Commission bill, which was a complete and perfected measure. In this case it became necessary for the Senate committee to prepare a new and original measure, which took a very much longer time, of course, than was taken in 1883 for the consideration of the measure which was prepared by the Tariff Commission.

Mr. COCKRELL. You did not follow the Tariff Commission report at all in 1883. You never pretended to follow it. They told you to reduce the revenues from 20 to 25 per cent. Instead of that you raised them. The Tariff Commission report did not help you at all. It was not your guide, it was not your standard. You had it at this time. If it was of any benefit to you then, it could have been of benefit to you now. You had all the investigations. All the members of Finance Committee but one were members who considered the bill of 1882–'83. Every one of you is perfectly familiar with it. The other member of the committee, the junior Senator from New York [Mr. HISCOCK], was a member of the Ways and Means Committee of the House then. So all the members of your committee are men who considered that bill.

I say the Senate committee has taken a longer time in the consideration of this bill than has ever been consumed in the Senate of the United States in the consideration of any tariff bill.

Mr. FRYE. We have got the best bill.

Mr. COCKRELL. The best bill?

Mr. FRYE. Yes.

Mr. COCKRELL. Wonderful it is! It catches the breeze from whatever point of the compass it comes. It is an admirable bill to report on the eve of an election, to "fry the fat" out of those who are interested in manufactures!

I have the record here in regard to all these matters. Let us understand ourselves distinctly now. If the Senator from Nebraska, if the majority of the Senate on that side of the Chamber say they can pass this bill before the 6th of November, we will stay here with you. If you can not pass it before the 6th of November, then I say you know, and every intelligent, thinking, conservative man knows, that to meet here on the 12th of November or on the 19th of November will not facilitate the final disposition of the bill. That is all there is in it. It is a perfectly patent matter. Understand me. If they want to pass the bill before the 6th of November we will stay here. If they will come and confess that they can not do it before that time, then we say to them, you know as we know that merely taking a recess until the 12th of November or until the 19th of November or any other day in November will not hasten final action on the bill one particle, and will be of no service in the final settlement of it.

I gave the reasons yesterday for this view. You will not have a quorum of the Senate here if you meet on the 12th or the 19th of November. You can not take votes upon the various amendments. Nothing will be decisive. You may get through the Committee of the Whole with the bill, and then when you go into the Senate you will have to do the work all over again. Therefore, I say, taking your position, if you can not pass the bill and do not intend to pass it before the 6th of November, in the interest of early action upon the bill the Senate should adjourn and meet on the regular day in December, and then we should have no adjournment for the Christmas holidays, no holiday recess, but should go on continuously working upon the bill regularly, just as if we were in the midst of a session, or on the heels of it. That is the only sensible, practical plan, and it is all you can do. You have got to do one or the other of these things.

Mr. ALDRICH. It is a matter of little consequence, but in regard to the statements made by the Senator from Missouri as to the action of the Finance Committee in 1883, I must say that each one of those statements is a misstatement of fact. The Committee on Finance did take the Tariff Commission bill as the basis of their work, and they reported it with very few exceptions as the bill came from the commission; and whenever changes were made they were made in the nature of reductions; and the bill as reported from the committee and as passed by the Senate made more and greater reductions than the Tariff Commission bill itself.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. Is the Senate ready for the question upon agreeing to the amendment proposed by the Senator from Georgia [Mr. BROWN]?

Mr. MORGAN. Was that accepted by the Senator from Iowa?

Mr. ALLISON. I said I was going to vote for it.

Mr. MORGAN. I thought you said you were going to accept it.

Mr. ALLISON. I will vote for it.

Mr. COCKRELL. It is not worth while to have any vote on these questions. Unless it can be done by unanimous consent it can not be done at all.

Mr. ALLISON. Very well; I accept the amndment.

Mr. DOLPH. I object to it.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The Senator from Oregon the Chair did not understand. The Chair understands the Senator from Iowa to accept the amendment.

Mr. DOLPH. I do not know that I am here to accept everything that is offered from the other side.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The amendment, then, being accepted, will be read as an original resolution.

The Chief Clerk read as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives declare their respective Houses adjourned without day, on Saturday, the 20th day of October, at 1 o'clock p. m.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. Is the Senate ready for the question on agreeing to the resolution? [Putting the question.] The ayes appear to have it. The ayes have it. The resolution is agreed to.

BILLS PASSED OVER.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The Chair lays before the Senate the first bill on the Calendar under Rule VIII.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (H. R. 5080) for the relief of C. B. Wilson.

Mr. DOLPH. Let that go over.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The bill will be passed over to the Calendar under Rule IX. The next bill on the Calendar will be stated.

The bill (H. R. 593) for the relief of James Albert Bonsack was announced as the next bill on the Calendar.

Mr. COCKRELL. Let that go over.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The bill will be passed over under Rule IX.

EXECUTIVE SESSION.

Mr. MORGAN. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business. After six minutes spent in executive session the doors were reopened.

WAGONS MADE BY PRISON LABOR.

Mr. TELLER. I submit the following resolution:

Whereas it is reported that the Secretary of the Interior has purchased a large number of wagons for the Indian service that were manufactured with prison labor in the State of Tennessee, thus putting the honest labor of the country in competition with such prison labor: Therefore,

Resolved, That the Committee on Indian Affairs be authorized and directed to inquire as to the truth of such report, the number of wagons so purchased, the price paid for the same, whether the price paid was the fair market price thereof, and whether legislation is or is not required to protect the honest labor of the country from such prison convict-labor competition.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

Mr. COCKRELL. Let it go over.

Mr. TELLER. If the Senator will withdraw his objection a moment——

Mr. COCKRELL. I will withdraw it.

Mr. TELLER. I will state why I offer the resolution.

Mr. President, my attention has been called to this fact by several people who are interested in the labor of the country. My attention was first called to it by the following, which I cut from a newspaper:

A GOVERNMENT CONTRACT.

The firm of Cherry, Morrow & Co. has secured a Government contract for the building of four hundred army wagons, or wagons to be used in the Territories occupied by Indians. The contract was secured over the competition of many of the leading wagon manufacturers in the United States.

I understand that the firm of Cherry, Morrow & Co. are the lessees of the convict labor of the State of Tennessee and are manufacturers of wagons at Nashville, Tenn. I have here their advertisement in which they allege themselves to be manufacturers of wagons, and they have on their advertisement the words "No imported pauper labor employed." I am told that this firm does its work by convict labor and that their bid for wagons—it is at least so reported—was below the bids of other persons not employing convict labor, and so low that they could not compete with them.

I myself do not believe that the Government of the United States should encourage this system of leasing convict labor, nor do I believe that the Government of the United States by its purchases should give a preference to the products of involuntary labor that underbids necessarily the honest independent labor of this country. I do not object to the employment of convicts in a proper manner, so that they may maintain good health, that they may in some degree relieve the State of the burden of their support by the manufacture of such things as are necessary for them within the prison walls, or the production, where they can work on farms, of such articles as may contribute to their own support; but I do object to a system that encourages this class of labor, involuntary labor, in the hands of corporations and individuals at a nominal rental, thus enabling a corporation at a place where criminals are kept to compete to the disadvantage of the people who are employed in the honest manufactures of the country.

I find in the President's message of 1886 a rather remarkable statement, which, it seems to me, may probably have been acted on by the official who purchased these wagons, nominally the Secretary of the Interior, but really and practically, of course, the Commissioner of In-

dian Affairs; for while the Secretary must be held, I suppose, technically accountable, it was a matter not brought to his attention, and if complaint is to be made against any official it is against the Commissioner of Indian Affairs and not against the Secretary; but of course the purchase is made in the name and by the authority of the Secretary. The President, in his message to Congress in 1886, said:

With prisons under its own control, the Government could deal with the somewhat vexed question of convict labor, so far as its convicts were concerned, according to a plan of its own adoption, and with due regard to the rights and interests of our laboring citizens, instead of sometimes aiding in the operation of a system which causes among them irritation and discontent.

Upon consideration of this subject it might be thought wise to erect more than one of these institutions, located in such places as would best subserve the purposes of convenience and economy in transportation. The considerable cost of maintaining these convicts as at present, in State institutions, would be saved by the adoption of the plan proposed; and by employing them in the manufacture of such articles as were needed for use by the Government, quite a large pecuniary benefit would be realized in partial return for our outlay.

I desire to enter my dissent from that suggestion. I desire to say here that I do not believe the Government of the United States should, for the purpose of saving a few dollars in supporting its criminals, be purchasing convict labor products or using convict labor products.

Mr. President, in the Forty-ninth Congress the House of Representatives sent to this body House bill 5541, entitled "A bill to prevent the employment of convict labor and alien labor upon public buildings and other public works, and convict labor in the preparation or manufacture of materials for public buildings or other public works, and to regulate the manner of letting contracts therefor."

It provided—

That in all advertisements for the erection or construction of public buildings or other public works, or for materials to be used in their erection, construction, or completion, and for all supplies of every description to be furnished to or for the use of any of the Departments, and in all contracts made under or in pursuance of such advertisements, there shall be inserted a condition that no convict or prison labor whatsoever, or the product thereof, shall be employed or used upon any public building or other public work, or in the preparation or manufacture of any of the articles, materials, or supplies contracted to be furnished therefor; and there shall also be inserted in said contract the further condition that no person who is not a bona fide resident within the limits of the United States, and who has not declared his intention to become a citizen thereof in the manner provided by law, shall be employed in the erection, construction, or completion of any public building or other public work.

SEC. 2. That any willful breach of any of said conditions by any contractor shall authorize and work a forfeiture of the contract, and shall constitute a complete defense in bar against any claim or action against the United States for the recovery of any sum or sums under said contract; and it shall be the duty of the officer letting any such contract, upon being advised that any contractor has knowingly violated the terms of such contract, to declare the same forfeited.

This bill passed the House of Representatives July 15, 1886, coming to the Senate just about the close of the session, and passed the Senate on February 28, 1887. It then went to the President of the United States, and was disposed of by what is commonly called a pocket veto. The bill never came back to the House in which it originated, was not signed by the President, and did not become a law. Here was a legislative declaration, as far as it was competent for a legislative declaration to be made without the approval of the President, that hereafter the United States would buy materials that were the products of honest labor and honest labor alone. The Senator from Delaware [Mr. SAULSBURY] asks me if that was not confined to public buildings. I will read it again for him:

That in all advertisements for the erection or construction of public buildings or other public works, or for materials to be used in their erection, construction, or completion, and for all supplies of every description to be furnished to or for the use of any of the Departments, and in all contracts made under or in pursuance of such advertisements, there shall be inserted a condition that no convict or prison labor whatsoever, or the product thereof, shall be employed or used upon any public building or other public work, or in the preparation or manufacture of any of the articles, materials, or supplies contracted to be furnished therefor.

That covers the whole ground. It is a legislative declaration that not only public buildings should not be built by convict or alien labor, but that no supplies on the part of the Government should be bought from any party using convict labor nor from any party who had used convict labor in any degree for the construction of the article sold. This is not the law, I will admit; but it seems to me that in view of this legislative declaration, although it did not meet with the approval of the President, not having been vetoed by him, the Departments ought at least to refrain from purchasing the products of convict labor.

I find that the State of Tennessee has provision—I see one of the Senators from that State here and presume that is the present law, but if not he will correct me—for the hiring out of its convicts in general terms. I will not stop to read it. Under that system I understand that this firm of wagon-makers have become at some price the employers of the convicts of the State. In nine cases out of ten the corporations or individuals who contract with a State for convict labor contract at a mere nominal sum, sufficient to feed and clothe them, and the balance of the proceeds of the labor of the convicts goes into the pockets of the contractors. As a general thing it is a money-making system. It has become in some sections of the country, I am sorry to say, a very general system of disposing of convicts. Especially is that true of the southern part of the United States, and great scandals and great disgraces and great cruelties have grown out of it, and great detriment to the public service and to the honest labor of the country in my judgment.

If I may be allowed to say what I think the Government of the United States ought to do through its executive officers, when they have occasion to purchase supplies, it is to purchase the needed supplies in the market at a fair market price from the men who produce them, and who also, when they are producing are contributing to the support of the Government, national, State, and municipal. I do not think it is becoming to the Government of the United States to employ convict labor or to buy the products of convict labor, a labor that bears none of the burdens of the State; nor do I believe that it is the proper thing for the Government of the United States to employ alien labor in this country or in foreign countries. I do not believe that the Government of the United States is justified, as was done through the War Department very recently, in buying from English manufacturers a very large number of blankets, upon which the only saving of money to the Government was 30 cents each, and then in order to make that they remitted the duty, amounting on that one purchase of blankets to more than $600. In other words, when the manufacturers bid for the blankets they bid within 30 cents of their English competitors who got the contract, and who were notified before they bid that their bids would be received without reference to duty; that the Government of the United States would exercise a privilege given to it to buy of foreign manufacturers less the duty; that it would remit the duty. A newspaper the other morning stated that there had been another consignment of foreign blankets to the United States.

Mr. HALE. The Senator will allow me to suggest that the steamer Aurania on her last trip brought a large number of woolen blankets purchased for the use of our Army, and the newspapers so stated at that time.

Mr. TELLER. Is it the proper thing for the United States Government to send abroad for goods it needs? If it sends abroad and would allow foreign manufacturers to compete with the American manufacturer on the basis that I would compete if I wanted to buy, it might be another case. They do not do that. They exercise a sovereign power and say, "duty off," and save 30 cents on a blanket, or $300 on a thousand blankets. It does seem to me that that is beneath the dignity of this great Government. I think it is beneath the dignity of this great Government to purchase and use as its supplies, because it may get them a few dollars cheaper, the results of convict labor, whether in Tennessee or anywhere else.

Involuntary labor has always been cheaper than voluntary labor. It always will be cheaper, because the involuntary laborer is compelled to labor whether he will or not; he is under the force that is put upon him by his task-master, and it is not fair to put honest American laborers in competition with that class of labor. I am as much opposed to that as I am to buying the product of Chinamen, whether they manufacture their goods in this country or anywhere else, who will manufacture them at prices at which American manufacturers can not manufacture, unless they destroy the prosperity of American laborers in this country. Inasmuch as this bill, which ought to have become a law, which passed both Houses of Congress, as I understand, without a dissent, is not a law by the failure of the President to sign it, I propose to see if at a subsequent session when there is more time we can not enact a law that will compel the administration—not this Administration, but all administrations that may come hereafter—to buy the honest product of honest American labor, whether it be blankets or whether it be wagons, or whatever it may be.

Mr. SAULSBURY. Will the Senator allow me to ask him whether he is not aware that some of the manufacturers of this country employ foreign labor in the production of blankets and other things?

Mr. TELLER. I am quite aware that they do.

Mr. SAULSBURY. I want to say to the Senator that I, myself, in 1877 was in a mill in the city of San Francisco, or in the neighborhood of San Francisco, that was run exclusively by Chinese laborers. I went there about the time that they were at their lunch, and I was invited by the superintendent to go in. There were about two hundred Chinamen who were manufacturing blankets exclusively, and some of the nicest looking blankets I ever saw, and I was told by the superintendent of that mill that by reason of the cheapness of their labor they could compete with the laborers of England in the manufacture of blankets. So, I suppose, it is the custom among manufacturers everywhere to employ the cheapest labor they can get.

Mr. TELLER. I do not deny that when an alien comes to this country he must be an alien for some period; he can not be a citizen at once; and when we open our doors to the aliens of every country to come here, we can not shut the factories and mills against them. The Government might exclude them from its labor; it has the power to do that; nobody else would do it. I understand that the manufacturers of this country will use the cheapest labor they can get. I understand that some of the manufacturers of this country are clamoring for free raw material. I understand that many of them are willing that the sheep industry of the West should go down if they can get free Australian wool. I understand that the manufacturers of California were willing to use Chinese labor, and from the manufacturers of California, and those alone, and the class of men who wanted to employ that labor there in manufacturing something else, came the opposition to the legislation that has finally settled the Chinese question.

I understand that quite well, but that is a very different thing from the Government engaging in this sort of business. I do not say in this

case, because I do not know, that these wagons were offered at a rate so low that the honest manufacturer of wagons in Tennessee could not furnish them; but that is the assertion made in Tennessee; that is what I want this committee to inquire about. I want to find out whether that is so or not. If so, these manufacturers and other manufacturers would take the place of all the honest manufacturers, and after awhile the only wagon-makers in this country would be the convicts. I do not know that there are quite enough convicts to supply all wagons, but they could supply a very large number undoubtedly.

This is not a matter of mere indifference to the public. This is a question that has agitated the public for many years, and I therefore have submitted this resolution.

Mr. FRYE. I want to call the Senator's attention to the fact that Austria has a general law under which the product of all convict labor shall none of it be sold at home to compete with home labor, but all of it shall be for exportation, and a large part of it is exported now to the United States of America.

Mr. TELLER. I was aware of that fact, and I meant to have mentioned it, but it escaped my mind. I understand that is a fact. While in another body recently when this question was up men were clamoring for the passage of the Mills bill, were declaiming against convict labor and denouncing everybody who employed it or bought the products of it, yet they were willing to open the doors, open our ports to the convict labor of Austria and other countries without stint and without restriction.

Mr. BATE. Mr. President, as to the point the Senator from Colorado makes in regard to the purchase of wagons by the Interior Department manufactured in Tennessee, I know nothing of the matter except that I know that there is such a firm as that named by him, and that it is a very reliable firm. I further know that they have a fine reputation all over this country. They do an immense amount of work and ship to all parts of the country. Perhaps no firm of that kind of wagon-makers has a superior reputation. I know further that the Senator is mistaken if he thinks that the sum paid for the labor performed by convicts in Tennessee is merely nominal. I know something personally about that, because I happened to be connected with the executive office of the State at the time the law was passed, and I, as chief executive, accepted the bid, the highest made for convict labor in the United States. That firm to the State of Tennessee gives annually $100,250—at any rate it is upwards of $100,000 that they pay annually—for the labor of convicts, all of which is matter of legislation in Tennessee, and was approved by the Legislature to which it was reported.

I think the Senator will find himself likewise mistaken when he investigates this matter to the bottom as to its being the lowest bid. It is a very large contract, and I have heard it spoken of casually, but I did not investigate it, knowing the character of the firm of Cherry, Morrow & Co., whom I know very well. I know they are responsible, and I furthermore know they are gentlemen of high character and correct in their dealings. They stand very high; perhaps no firm in this country stands higher. I also know most favorably the Commissioner of the Indian Bureau, who had the dealings with them referred to by the Senator, and my understanding at the time was that it was the only firm in the United States that could furnish the particular kind of wagons needed by the time they were wanted. That is to say, the wood had to be of a certain character, and had to be seasoned, which required much time to effect. A large supply of four hundred wagons of the kind wanted within the time specified could be furnished by them. At least I so understood.

I want to say further that neither of these parties has any objection in the world to going into any investigation that may be desired on the part of the Senator from Colorado or of the Senate, and I approve of anything he suggests in regard to an investigation of the case. If there is anything wrong about it, let us know it. I think it will turn out that there is no wrong, and not only that, but that it was the best bargain that could be obtained by the Secretary of the Interior or those who acted under him in getting that particular kind of goods of the amount and quality desired.

So I see no reason why it should not be investigated. If the Senator thinks there is a cat in the meal, let it out; these gentlemen will not object; but do not let us prejudge the case on the eve of an election and at the very close of the session of Congress. Let us have the proof, let us understand it; but right here, on the eve of the election, and at the close of the session nothing can be done now to contradict it. I will join hands with the Senator to have an investigation at the proper time of this matter.

These people are from my State, and I know the character of the gentlemen who made this contract on both sides, and I am persuaded that we could take the Senator as a jury himself, or as a member of the committee to act upon it, and he would indorse what has been done in this regard.

I speak of it from the fact of the character of these gentlemen and of the work that they perform. That is the only point that concerns my constituents and the only one I care to discuss.

Mr. TELLER. I am not attacking the Senator's constituents. I am not finding fault with Cherry, Morrow & Co. I have no doubt they are men of high character, as he says; at least I will take his word for it that they are men of financial responsibility and character. I have no reason to suppose they are not. I will take issue with the Senator, though, when he says that Cherry, Morrow & Co. are the only firm that can furnish that kind of wagons.

Mr. BATE. I understood at the time that they had a very large supply of seasoned timber from Indiana and other States which they have had drying there for years, and the Commissioner required that the wagons should be made of seasoned lumber; and my understanding was that they were the only firm that could deliver within the specified time the large number and the particular kind of wagons to be furnished.

Mr. TELLER. If the number is only four hundred—I have seen it stated as high as eight hundred; but even if it was eight hundred, I will guaranty, having had some observation, that there are many concerns that can furnish eight hundred wagons. They do not furnish the wagons all at once.

Mr. BATE. Pardon me. My understanding was that there was a bid. Whether the wagons were advertised for or not, I do not know.

Mr. TELLER. All such matters must be advertised.

Mr. BATE. Then I think I am justified in saying that they were advertised and that this firm was the lowest bidder for that particular kind of work in the quantity and quality required.

Mr. TELLER. They were the lowest bidders. That is what the other wagon-makers complain of. That is what the honest labor of the country complains of. The Commissioner of Indian Affairs must advertise for bids, and when he had advertised for them, of course he took the lowest bid. He need not have taken the wagons from this concern.

Mr. COCKRELL. You say he need not have taken the lowest bid?

Mr. TELLER. No, sir.

Mr. COCKRELL. Suppose this firm was the lowest bidder?

Mr. TELLER. He is not obliged to take the lowest bidder.

Mr. COCKRELL. Then to whom should he give the contract?

Mr. TELLER. He could give it to any other concern that he saw fit, that was responsible, that made a bid.

Mr. COCKRELL. And not be impeached for violating the law?

Mr. TELLER. Yes, sir.

Mr. COCKRELL. In other words, then, you hold that the laws of Congress are not binding on the Executive Departments.

Mr. TELLER. No, I do not. The laws of Congress do not require the officer to do it.

Mr. COCKRELL. Does not the law of Congress expressly require him to let the contract to the lowest bidder?

Mr. TELLER. He is to be the judge of the fitness and propriety of every bid. He has discretion, and there are a great many bids that are received which are lower than others that are not deemed proper for the Government to accept. The Government rules out a class of bidders and gives them notice, "If you bid here, although you are the lowest bidder, you can not come in." Why? "Because you are a failing bidder; because you have not kept your contracts." The officer was not necessarily compelled to accept the bid. If he was, then there is the more necessity for a change of the law.

Mr. COCKRELL. In other words, if he were compelled to do it, it was a Republican law that compelled him.

Mr. TELLER. That law was on the statute-book long before the Republican party came into power or into existence. I noticed that the Senator from Missouri and some others seem to think when any complaint is made of mal-administration anywhere, if they can just find that it was done under Republican administration, that is all right and they are justified.

Mr. BATE. Will the Senator pardon me if I ask him a question? He has been connected with the Interior Department in an official capacity. Was it the custom when he was there to allow contracts to go to any other than the lowest bidder?

Mr. TELLER. These contracts are made by a board of commissioners. A board in New York makes these contracts, a board of distinguished philanthropic gentlemen, and many and many a time they report in favor of giving contracts not to the lowest bidder, because they think it to the advantage of the Government to take some other.

Mr. BATE. Then this whole thing is justifiable according to the Senator's own suggestion, as those distinguished philanthropic gentlemen, as a board, approved it.

Mr. TELLER. I am talking about the administration of public affairs. I am saying that if that is the law, if they are compelled to do it, I want the law changed and I want some legislation. We have proposed legislation and we have passed a bill in both bodies of Congress which would have been the law but for the action of the President.

Mr. BATE. The Senator wants legislation. Does he expect to have it at the close of this session here?

Mr. TELLER. I do not, but I want it at the next. There is a bill pending now which can be so amended as to cover the whole ground. I want to know what the facts are. I want to know something about them. We have submitted this question to the Commissioner of Labor. He made a report in 1886.

Mr. BATE. What committee is this resolution directed to?

Mr. TELLER. The Committee on Indian Affairs. On the 2d of August, 1886, the following resolution was approved by the President:

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Commissioner of Labor be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed, under the direction of the Secretary of the Interior, to make a full investigation as to the kind and amount of work performed in the penal institutions of the several States and Territories of the United States and the District of Columbia, as to the methods under which convicts are or may be employed, and as to all the facts pertaining to convict labor and the influence of the same upon the industries of the country, and embody the results of such investigation in his second annual report to the Secretary of the Interior: *Provided*, That the investigation hereby authorized can be carried out under the appropriations made for the expenses of the Bureau of Labor for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1887.

Under that the Commissioner of Labor made an exhaustive report which, I submit to the Senator from Tennessee, it would be well for him or any other Senator to study who believes that convict labor is the proper thing, who believes that the honest labor of this country should be put in competition with convict labor, and that the Government should be the patron of convict labor. I do not believe in it. The Commissioner reports that it is hostile and injurious, as did the commissioners of various States. Mr. Louis D. Pilsbury, the superintendent of prisons of New York, in 1879 reported against putting the free laborers of New York in competition with convict labor. I want so far as I can that the Government of the United States shall give no aid or encouragement to what is considered a degradation of American labor that is prevailing all over the Southwest and South. No such thing can be done in the North.

Mr. BATE. The Senator will permit me to say that I looked into that matter formerly to some extent, and the very system in vogue in Tennessee in regard to the management of the prisons, which involves necessarily the leasing of the convicts and the work that they do, is taken from the report of James G. Blaine, of Maine, when he was in the Legislature there as chairman of a committee.

I want to state further in regard to the convict labor question, that I am not discussing it now, but only looking to the matter brought out by the Senator which concerns my State and my constituents.

Mr. TELLER. If there is any wicked thing that has occurred in this country that the Democrats do not lay to James G. Blaine I should like to know what it is.

Mr. BATE. It seems whenever we do we hit the nail on the head every time.

Mr. TELLER. If he ever made a mistake, they are ready to follow him, but they are not ready to follow him in any good work. They do not adopt his principles of protection to American labor, and all that.

Mr. BATE. I hope they never will.

Mr. TELLER. But if he should come out in favor of convict labor they would regard it as good authority and they would consider themselves absolved from the slightest criticism if they could only cite him as a witness.

Mr. BATE. The Senator follows him in other things; but he does not propose to follow him in this, as it does not suit todo so just now on the eve of a national election.

Mr. TELLER. I was a protectionist and I knew something about these things before I ever heard of James G. Blaine. I am as old in years as he is, if not older. I do not follow him when I think he is wrong. I follow him when he is in accord with my ideas. I do not know whether he recommended convict labor or not. If the Senator means to say that he is in accord with him on that let him produce his authority. I do not know whether he is in favor of doing work of this kind with convict labor or whether he is opposed to it. I only speak for myself, and I am not condemning or criticising Tennessee. I have nothing to do with it. I am simply stating that, as a member of the legislative department of this Government, I want, if I can, to say ot the Executive Departments of the Government, "You shall not do this thing;" and if they reply that they think they are compelled by law, then they may be absolved until we pass new legislation, and I shall inquire of the Executive then, when they come back with that reply, "Why did you not put your signature to that bill passed in 1887? Why did you not, when the legislative department of the Government said they would protect the honest labor of the country against convict competition, say that you agreed with us?" When the Commissioner of Indian Affairs sets up his defense, that it was the positive enactment of law that compelled him to make this purchase, that is the answer I propose to make to him.

Mr. BATE. There is no objection to the inquiry on the part of either the Commissioner of Indian Affairs, the Secretary of the Interior, or the parties to the contract. I join with the Senator in asking for the investigation.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. Under the objection interposed by the Senator from Missouri [Mr. COCKRELL], the resolution lies over until to-morrow.

Mr. COCKRELL. I withdrew the objection to enable the Senator from Colorado to make his remarks.

Mr. President, this resolution recites that:

It is reported that the Secretary of the Interior has purchased a large number of wagons for the Indian service that were manufactured with prison labor in the State of Tennessee, thus putting the honest labor of the country in competition with such prison labor.

And therefore a committee of investigation is to be appointed. There is no allegation here that this alleged action is in violation of law. There is no allegation here that there was any criminality in letting this contract. There is no allegation that the Secretary of the Interior has, directly or indirectly, transgressed or violated or evaded or in any manner avoided the operation of the laws in force. Then, why ask for a committee? What do you want to inquire into? Do you want a smelling committee to take testimony and publish it on the heels of the election? Is that the object?

Mr. TELLER. No, Mr. President, if the Senator will allow me to say a word. I have not any idea that there will be any testimony taken before the election. It has nothing to do with the election. The committee will probably not touch the question until the next session.

Mr. COCKRELL. Then why introduce it here now? Why not wait until next session? No, Mr. President, this is purely political; and as such I meet it.

I say that if the Senator wants information from the proper Department in regard to this, a resolution of inquiry addressed to the Department will be answered, and that is legitimate.

Mr. TELLER. The Senator will allow me to say that I do not need any. I assert here that they have bought these wagons, if that is what the Senator means.

Mr. COCKRELL. Do you assert that it was done in violation of law? I say that they were compelled to buy them if they followed the law.

Mr. TELLER. Then I want to change the law.

Mr. COCKRELL. Then bring in a bill to change the law. Do you want a committee to inquire whether the law should be changed or not?

Mr. TELLER. We passed a bill through the Senate and through the House, and the President pocketed it. That is why the trouble now exists. But for that pocket veto the bill would have been a law.

Mr. COCKRELL. When was that bill sent to the President?

Mr. TELLER. It passed this body on the 28th day of February, 1887. I will venture to say one hundred bills that passed later than that got his signature.

Mr. COCKRELL. That may be. When did it pass the House? When did it reach the President?

Mr. TELLER. It was a House bill, and went from here to the President.

Mr. COCKRELL. That was on the 28th of February, and Congress adjourned on the 3d of March. Any honest President who knows what he is doing is compelled when a multitude of bills are passed at the close of a session to withhold his signature from a few.

Mr. President, this is the law, and I assert that the distinguished Senator from Colorado, when he was Secretary of the Interior, never permitted one of his subordinate bureau officers to reject the lowest responsible bidder for a proper article when the law required bids to be invited. He would not have risked his reputation as an honest man and as an honest official before the people of this country by compelling one of his subordinate officers to accept a higher bid than was put in by another responsible bidder, and he knows it. These bids were made in the same way that they have been and under the same law for years and years.

This is only in keeping with what I saw some time ago in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. My attention was not called to it in the RECORD, but was called to it by an editorial article in the St. Louis Globe-Democrat, which, as I now recollect, was almost *verbatim* the speech of a distinguished Republican member of the House of Representatives, and it was headed "A brilliant financial exploit," and goes on to state:

In 1887 the Federal Government advertised for bids for 2,000 blankets for the Medical Department of the Army. The specifications were plain as to the texture and quality of the fabric, and the weight was to be 4 pounds. The lowest bids were one from an American manufacturer for $2.56 and one from an English maker for $2.25. There was a difference, therefore, of only 31 cents between the bids, the British figures being the price delivered in this country minus the duty. Under such circumstances, the natural inference would be that the Government would give the contract to the American manufacturer, and keep in this country the money which they would cost, so that this money would go to the benefit of domestic labor.

Now, the Senator from Colorado is trying to draw the same conclusion, that the natural inference would be that the official would disregard the lowest bid and give the contract to somebody else. No, Mr. President, no honest official could do it. My attention was called to that charge, and I addressed a letter to the Secretary of War for the facts in the case. I have his reply in my hands, and I am very glad of the opportunity to read it and spread it upon the record:

WAR DEPARTMENT, *Washington City, August* 7, 1888.

SIR: I have the honor to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of the 2d instant, inclosing a clipping from the St. Louis Globe-Democrat relative to the purchase of blankets for the Medical Department of the Army, and requesting to be furnished with a statement of the facts in the case.

In reply, I beg to state that on March 4, 1887, the Medical Department advertised for proposals for medical and hospital supplies; among the articles were 2,000 white all-wool twilled blankets. The letter of advertisement (copy herewith) informed all bidders that two prices might be given to any proposal for any item, one for delivery in bond, the other for delivery duty paid. The number of blankets purchased was 2,000. The price was $2.252 each. The only proposals received were from American bidders.

Not British bidders.

The lowest bid for a blanket of domestic manufacture, to be made of imported wool, was $2.56. The contract was awarded to C. W. Hayes, of Washington, D. C., at $2.252, in bond at the port of New York.

2,000 blankets, at $2.56, would have cost	$5,120
2,000 blankets, at $2.252, cost	4,504
Amount saved to the Government	616

The blankets supplied by Mr. Hayes were superior in quality and weight to any of the samples submitted by the other bidders, and exceeded the standard weight of 4 pounds by 2½ to 4 ounces each. They were all wool, as reported by the Army chemist after examination, while none of the other samples submitted exceeded the standard weight; and in the matter of quality some were of inferior wool or manufacture and others were not all wool. The principle acted upon by the Medical Department has been to buy the best article that could be had from the lowest bidder, this being in strict compliance with paragraph 1534, Army Regulations, which provides that "except in the rare cases where the United States may elect to exercise its reserved right to reject proposals, contracts will be awarded to the lowest responsible bona fide bidder, who, when required, produces a proper article and whose proposal therefor is not unreasonable in amount."

Mr. TELLER. Will the Senator read that sentence again, going back to where the Government reserves the right to reject?

Mr. COCKRELL. I will read it again:

This being in strict compliance with paragraph 1534, Army Regulations, which provides that "except in the rare cases where the United States may elect to exercise its reserved right to reject proposals, contracts will be awarded to the lowest responsible bona fide bidder, who, when required, produces a proper article, and whose proposal therefor is not unreasonable in amount."

That is always reserved in all proposals for contracts, not that you can reject the lowest bid and take the second or third, but you have got to reject them all and advertise again. That is what is meant by the rejection of proposals.

Section 2505, Revised Statutes of the United States, provides that articles imported for the use of the United States shall be admitted duty free if the price of the articles did not include the duty. Various articles of foreign manufacture, such as quinine, morphine, olive oil, linen sheets, and pillow-cases, as well as books, meteorological instruments, plate-glass, and Portland cement, have for many years past been purchased, in bond, from American bidders for use in the Medical Department, the Signal Corps, and for river and harbor works. Such articles as are enumerated herein were purchased in bond under the administrations of Presidents Grant, Hayes, and Arthur. Under the administration of President Grant the number of purchases of articles made abroad for the Signal Service was largely in excess of those for any corresponding period. Under President Hayes's administration there were forty permits granted for free entry for the Signal Service. Under President Arthur's administration there were sixty-one permits, and under the present Administration the number has fallen to nineteen.

The newspaper clipping is returned herewith.

Very respectfully,

WM. C. ENDICOTT,
Secretary of War.

Hon. F. M. COCKRELL,
United States Senate, 1518 R street, northwest, Washington, D. C.

This was published as a direct charge against this Administration; the intention was to make the impression that it was doing something that had never been done before, that it was violating the law, that it was giving British manufacturers the advantage in our own home market over our home manufacturers, and was purchasing British goods to the exclusion of American goods. It was published as a departure from the settled practice. That was the reason the article was published as a criticism upon the Administration. Now this record shows what? It shows that the officers of the Medical Department were only pursuing the policy which has been pursued invariably; that the same thing was done under the administration of President Grant to a greater extent, under President Hayes to a greater extent, and under President Arthur to a greater extent, and was in compliance with law and with Army regulations, and instead of being a discrimination against American manufacturers or American goods, the invitations were to American bidders, and Americans bid for furnishing the supplies.

Mr. TELLER. I should like to ask the Senator a question, now that he has got through with that.

Mr. COCKRELL. Certainly, I yield.

Mr. TELLER. I ask the Senator if he approves of this system of doing business, whether it was done under Grant or Arthur or anybody else?

Mr. COCKRELL. Yes, sir; when the Congress of the United States passes a law and requires the executive branches of this Government to purchase everything upon invitations or bids for contracts, and directs them to be let to the lowest responsible bidder, I say that the officer who acts must do as the law prescribes. He has no discretion.

Mr. TELLER. That is not the question I asked the Senator. I asked whether he favored and approved the principle of buying of foreigners when we could buy at home? I want to know if he is not in favor of so modifying the law that the Government shall buy of American manufacturers and American producers.

Mr. COCKRELL. My opinions are not in discussion, and it is not anybody's business what they are so far as this point is concerned. I say so without wishing to answer the Senator shortly; but it is a question of fact with which my opinions have nothing to do. I have not time to give my opinion on that question when I am discussing another. Here is the law which has been on the statute-books during twenty-odd years of Republican administration.

Mr. TELLER. Are you in favor of changing it?

Mr. COCKRELL. You have been in power; you were Secretary of the Interior; and where is your recommendation to change the law, sir? If you were in favor of it, when did you recommend it?

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. Order.

Mr. COCKRELL. The Chair will pardon me. When did the distinguished Senator from Colorado when he was Secretary of the Interior send to the Congress of the United States through his chief executive officer a recommendation to repeal this law which he and his subordinates carried out?

Mr. TELLER. I think if I had done so, the Senator would have regarded it as a very remarkable performance on my part to send in such a recommendation.

Mr. COCKRELL. It is the duty of the Department officers and the President to communicate to Congress their views in regard to necessary legislation.

Mr. TELLER. Not at all.

Mr. COCKRELL. And the Senator, when Secretary of the Interior, was derelict if he did not do it.

Mr. BATE. That is one of the just criticisms to be made, that while the Senator was in office seeing all these evils, that he did not recommend a remedy in his official capacity, and that he has not heretofore done it, but waits till the close of the session, and right upon the heels of an election, and then makes his suggestions.

Mr. TELLER. If the Senator will allow me, I have not recommended it now.

Mr. BATE. But the resolution does.

Mr. TELLER. I have not attacked the Commissioner of Indian Affairs. The Senator says there is no charge of an illegal contract. Of course not. I did not intend to make any. I simply say this thing has been done, and I want a committee to inquire whether any legislation is necessary. We know that the House of Representatives and the Senate thought it was, and if the Senator from Missouri is right it was necessary, but the President did not approve of that kind of legislation.

Mr. COCKRELL. I am perfectly astonished at one thing, that the distinguished Senator from Colorado gets up here and frankly admits that he has not even given his opinion on this question when he has been trying to incite me to give mine.

Mr. TELLER. Why, Mr. President, I said distinctly what my views were. The Senator could not have listened to me.

Mr. COCKRELL. It may have been in the Senator's first remarks, but not in the last.

Mr. TELLER. I said distinctly that I was opposed to anything of that kind, but if legislation was necessary, as both Houses seem to have thought it was at one time, I was in favor of that legislation, and I want the committee to report whether it is necessary or not.

Mr. ALLISON. Mr. President——

Mr. COCKRELL. I dislike extremely to be annoyed in the midst of my discourse, but I will yield to the Senator from Iowa.

Mr. ALLISON. I desire to interrupt the Senator about this very matter. I am gratified myself to hear the letter read from the Secretary of War. That seems to disclose the fact that the only difference between a 5-pound blanket produced in this country and one produced abroad, irrespective of duty, is 31 cents per blanket. In Iowa we have been taught for a good many years that the duty is added to the price of all domestic productions. But it seems from the letter of the Secretary of War that that is a great mistake, that our domestic producers produce blankets within 31 cents for a 5-pound blanket of the cost abroad, irrespective of duty. That is a very gratifying letter to me, and I hope the Senator will have it printed in the RECORD.

Mr. COCKRELL. I hope the distinguished Senator from Iowa will listen again and refresh his multiplication powers, and he will ascertain that he is very much mistaken. He must go back to the elementary arithmetic.

Two prices might be given to any proposal for any item, one for delivery in bond, the other for delivery duty paid. The number of blankets purchased was 2,000. The price was $2.252 each. The only proposals received were from American bidders. The lowest bid for a blanket of domestic manufacture, to be made of imported wool, was $2.56. The contract was awarded to C. W. Hayes, of Washington, D. C., at $2.252 in bond at the port of New York.

Duty free. The Government pays no duty.

Mr. ALLISON. Certainly; that is to say, the price of the domestic blanket is within 31 cents of the price of the foreign blanket. So this old idea about duties seems to be dissipated by this letter.

Mr. COCKRELL. "Dissipated!" Not at all.

Mr. ALLISON. That is the point I make.

Mr. COCKRELL. Not at all. If they had been of the same quality it would have been a different matter; but here was imported wool upon

which the home manufacturer had paid a duty, but then the home manufacture was not all wool.

Mr. ALDRICH. Did the Secretary of War require that these blankets should be made from imported wool as a part of the specifications?

Mr. COCKRELL. Congress required it.

Mr. ALLISON. Oh, no.

Mr. ALDRICH. To be made from imported wool?

Mr. COCKRELL. Congress requires any woolen blanket if it has the right kind of wool in it, by virtue of the very law they passed to have the imported wool.

Mr. ALDRICH. I should be glad to have my attention called to that law.

Mr. COCKRELL. The law imposing duties on imported wool.

Mr. ALLISON. That statement of the Secretary of War is in a little addendum there. It is perfectly absurd to suppose that he issued proposals for American blankets to be made of imported wool. That is a little *lapsus* of the clerk who wrote that letter and for the purpose of making a point. There is no such thing possible as that the Secretary of War, certainly not a Democratic Secretary, would require a domestic manufacturer of blankets to bid to furnish only blankets made of imported wool. That would be an absurdity that I would not suppose the Secretary of War would be guilty of.

Mr. ALDRICH. I guess he did not do that.

Mr. ALLISON. That can not be so.

Mr. COCKRELL. The letter speaks for itself. The letter shows exactly what the transaction was, and it shows the meanness and the desperation of a political party that undertakes to censure the action of Democratic officials for what it did for twenty-odd years itself and what was done under its laws; and when it criticises a Democratic official in that act, to make the impression that it is the first time in the history of the country that such a thing was ever done, there is where I say the censure is.

Mr. ALLISON. I am not on that point.

Mr. COCKRELL. I am on that point, and I am going to grind it in.

Mr. ALLISON. I am on the other point.

Mr. COCKRELL. That is the point I am on. Here a distinguished Republican member of the House of Representatives gets up on the floor and makes that statement to produce the impression that the Democratic party has deviated from the law and from the policies of former administrations, and has given preference to a British manufacturer over an American manufacturer, and it is in consonance with the hypocrisy of the so-called "foreign British policy" when applied to our revenue policy; it is in keeping with that.

Mr. President, the statement was made for the express purpose of deceiving the people. It was made to create the impression upon the people of the United States that this Democratic Secretary of War had done a thing that never had been done in the history of this country; done a thing which a Republican administration would have scorned to do; done a thing which ought to deter the honest American voters from voting for it; and it is spread upon the record and sent broadcast throughout the country. Now, the facts are what? That the Secretary of War pursued the law exactly. The facts are that the Republican administrations of Grant, of Hayes, and of Arthur, every one of them, did the same thing, and did it when the Secretaryship of the Interior was held by the distinguished Senator from Colorado.

Mr. TELLER. We did not buy any blankets from Great Britain.

Mr. COCKRELL. They were bought precisely in the same way under the administration of Arthur, of which the Senator was a member. There were sixty-one permits then—more than under any other administration.

Mr. TELLER. For blankets?

Mr. COCKRELL. To buy articles of foreign manufacture for the Signal Service and other services, and it makes no difference whether they were blankets or not.

Mr. TELLER. Olive-oil, and instruments not made in this country.

Mr. COCKRELL. Not at all; nothing of that kind. They were precisely the articles manufactured here, and now the Senator comes in when he knows his resolution can not pass——

Mr. TELLER. I do not see why it should not. The Senator may possibly know.

Mr. COCKRELL. Simply because I say to you frankly that I do not propose that you shall have any smelling committees to put forth just what they please before the election. You can call upon the Secretary for any information in regard to this matter, and he will give it to you. I am speaking plainly now. There is no deception about the matter. That is all of it. We have no objection to the investigation, none in the world, but you can not make it now. You can not have your committee sitting here between now and the election to put out any kind of report it chooses. You can call on the Secretary of the Interior for information, and he will furnish it immediately; but I will not consent to this kind of a process. It is not fair nor honest nor just.

This is an attempt to censure the Secretary of the Interior and the administration of the Indian Office, for what? For precisely what has been done, and for precisely what the law requires and what was done under the administration of the distinguished Senator from Colorado when he was Secretary of the Interior, and what was done under all his Republican predecessors when they were honest, in every instance. They had the law before them. They were compelled to take the lowest responsible bidder, and they had no right to inquire whether these wagons were made in Ohio, in Pennsylvania, in Missouri, in Kansas, or in any other State. Where they were manufactured had nothing to do with the wagons themselves, but their character and fitness for the work desired was the point. And why does the Senator introduce this resolution? It is to make an impression upon the voters of the United States that the Democratic administration of the Interior Department has been acting against American labor and in favor of convict labor. It is not fair, it is not just, it is not right.

Mr. TELLER. Mr. President, the Senator from Missouri seems to be offended because I did not attack the Commissioner of Indian Affairs or the Secretary of the Interior. That is rather remarkable. I suppose if I had done so, he might have got up more indignation than he has now over this thing. I did not pretend to attack the Secretary of the Interior. I said this was what was being done. I said I was opposed to it, that I wanted the committee to see if it could be stopped either under existing law or by other laws to be enacted. The Senator says it can not be stopped under existing law. So much the worse, then, for the Executive of this country who declined to sign the bill sent to him from the legislative branch of the Government without a dissent, everybody being in favor of it.

The Senator from Missouri will not stand in his place and say that he is in favor of the Government buying convict-labor products in this country to-day. Of course I understand he is in favor of our buying the products of foreign convict labor from Austria, because he can not be otherwise if he is in favor of free goods, which he is whenever the necessities of the Government do not compel it to have revenue from duties.

Mr. President, the Senator says that this thing has been done, and was done under my administration of the Interior Department. The Senator does not know as much about the administration of the Interior Department as I do, especially while I had charge of it. I know we never bought any wagons made by convict labor. I know, what is more, that I never would have bought them. He knows and everybody knows that there is a discretion in every public officer that he may exercise, and he is only amenable when he abuses the exercise of that power. The very notice that the Senator reads here shows that the officials may reject the proposals made, and it is not, as he says, necessary to reject them all. They may reject any man's proposal if they think he will not furnish a good article, or that he will not furnish it according to the contract. There is a list in every Department of the Government of what are called "failing bidders," who are prohibited from bidding; that is to say, the Departments, when they come to their bids, throw them out.

The Senator has seen fit to read a very remarkable letter of the Secretary of War, which I am very glad he has submitted.

Mr. DOLPH. I ask the Senator before reading the letter to yield to me a moment to see if I understand this matter of the purchase of foreign blankets.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. Does the Senator from Colorado yield?

Mr. TELLER. Certainly.

Mr. DOLPH. It is asserted here that there is a law which requires supplies for the Army and other Departments to be purchased by advertisement and that the contract must be let to the lowest bidder. I can not believe that there is any law which requires the acceptance of the lowest bid from a foreigner of goods delivered in bond if the price of the goods delivered in bond is less than the price of the home manufactured article. Take this instance. I understand that the blankets which were furnished were 5-pound blankets. The price of the foreign article delivered in bond was $2.25. The lowest bid for blankets of American manufacture, as I understand, was $2.56; but we are told that the duty upon 5-pound blankets would be 12 cents a pound or 60 cents, with an addition of 35 per cent. ad valorem, which would make a total duty of $1.37, which, added to $2.25, would make the actual cost of the English blanket $3.62, as against the cost of a blanket of American manufacture $2.56, or a difference of $1.06, or a little over a dollar's difference in the price of the 5-pound blankets.

If there is a law that requires the acceptance of a bid for a foreign article delivered in bond without payment of duty to be received, if it is less than the price of the domestic article, I shall be very glad to learn it. I can not believe there is any such law in existence. I shall be glad to be informed on a subject of which I am ignorant, and I shall be sorry to learn that we have such a law on the statute-book by which an executive officer would be authorized to purchase blankets and to actually pay—because it amounts to that—a dollar apiece more for the foreign than for the domestic article. If I understand this matter, that is this exact case, because if the blankets had paid the duty every blanket would have paid to the Government $1.37, to be added to the price.

Mr. TELLER. The Senator from Missouri, as I said a little while

ago, regards himself as justified and the Administration as justified for anything it does if he can find that it has ever been done under a Republican administration. The trouble with this Administration and the Democratic party is that they have only adopted our vices. Whenever we have been doing things that we ought not to have done they follow quickly in our wake to do the same thing, and if anybody criticises the action they say "You did the same thing." When we attempt to make any reform in these things we shall be met with Democratic opposition upon the theory that it was done under Republican administration. That is not the question. The question is whether it is right. When I ask the Senator whether he approves it, he says it is of no consequence what his opinion is. That is not the question. He is justifying the Administration, and says they did right.

This letter is a remarkable letter, and I agree with the Senator from Iowa that it is a valuable addition to the literature of this age on the tariff question. It is remarkable in several respects. It is an admission that the charge made was true. It is remarkable because it attempts to justify the transaction on the ground that somebody else had done the same thing. And yet it does not say that any Republican administration ever bought a blanket of this character. Olive oil and some other things were bought for the Signal Service, perhaps some instruments, something, nobody knows what. The Senator says that the Department got a superior article at a gain of 31 cents per blanket. When the Departments advertise for an article they specify what that article shall be. If they want an all-wool article it must be all wool, and if a man bid for an all-wool article and did not send the right sample, all wool, of course his bid was not accepted. Now let us see what this says:

In reply I beg to state that on March 4, 1887, the Medical Department advertised for proposals for medical and hospital supplies. Among the articles were two thousand white all-wool twilled blankets. The letter of advertisement (copy herewith)—

I wish the Senator, if he has that letter, would produce that—

informed all bidders that two prices might be given to any proposal for any item, one for delivery in bond, the other for delivery duty paid. The number of blankets purchased was two thousand. The price was $2.252 each. The only proposals received were from American bidders.

The Senator emphasized that. He thinks he has escaped the charge that we are buying foreign products because an American go-between, a middle-man, was making a profit, was bringing these blankets in and selling them to the Government, an American importer, who of course in the nature of things agrees with the Senator from Missouri in his views of the political economy of the country which would justify the buying of everything from abroad and making nothing at home. That has nothing to do with it. The question is not who sold them to the Government, but who made them? Were they of American or of foreign manufacture? It is admitted here that they were foreign blankets.

The lowest bid for a blanket of domestic manufacture, to be made of imported wool, was $2.56.

Other American manufacturers might have bid and not suggested in their bid that the blanket was to be of imported wool. This foreign Administration could not get along unless they had imported blankets or blankets made of imported wool. The good old-fashioned wool of American sheep would not do. The Senator undertook to say that we could not make any blankets out of American wool, and that if they were suitable blankets they had to be made of imported wool. Does not the Senator know that we have produced the finest blankets ever made in the world on the American continent? There has been no blanket made under the light of the sun that is superior to blankets which have been made on the American continent, and I think they were made of American wool. Does not the Senator know that there has been no finer wool raised anywhere than we have raised in this country? The high-bred sheep of this country have sold for more money in America than any other place in the world. If the Senator does not know it, he ought to look up the sheep industry and he would find it out.

Evidently the Senator has a copy of the advertisement. If he will produce it, we shall find out whether this was a call for blankets made of imported wool or not. I do not know, I can hardly believe that we have reached that state of affairs where the Secretary of War would advertise for blankets that must be made of imported wool. I know that they have gone very far in those things, but that is going further than I think any Secretary of War would ever do, or anybody else. I do not think the Senator from Missouri would justify that.

The contract was awarded to C. W. Hayes, of Washington, D. C., at $2.252 in bond at the port of New York.

2,000 blankets at $2.56 would have cost	$5,120
2,000 blankets at $2.252	4,504
Amount saved to the Government	616

I am glad of the correction. It has gone all over the country that the amount was $16 less—$600 instead of $616.

The blankets supplied by Mr. Hayes were superior in quality and weight to any of the samples submitted by the other bidders—

Of course they were. They were made of imported wool, and made abroad, and of course they were better because they were made abroad. I know a great many gentlemen who would not buy an article of American manufacture for their clothes. They think if they are not made in Great Britain they are not good, and half the time they are wearing American cloth under the supposition that they are wearing English goods. Not long ago a gentleman in New York wanted to fit his house with carpets, and he went up to one of the distinguished carpet manufacturers of the country and looked over his stock, and said that there was nothing there at all that would suit him, that he must have an English carpet. Then he went to another establishment where he purchased what he supposed to be an English carpet, but it was really an American carpet, and he was entirely content to pay 50 per cent. more for what he supposed was an English carpet. There is a good deal of that sort of feeling in this country, but I did not know that it had got into the War Department to the extent that it seems to have got there by this letter. But let me read on—

and exceeded the standard weight of 4 pounds by 2½ to 4 ounces each.

There was a fraud on every American bidder. What right had they to give any preference because the blanket weighed more? They said: "Bring us a blanket of this kind." If they wanted 4 ounces more, or half a pound more, it was their place to ask for it. The American bidder had a right to suppose that he was to bid for the blankets they had advertised for, and no others. However, we have not got the blankets, and, seeing this thing through British eyes, it may be that the quality and the weight are both superior because of the origin of the blankets.

They were all wool, as reported by the army chemist after examination, while none of the other samples submitted exceeded the standard weight.

Of course not. Why should they? Naturally they would not, and naturally men would bid for the quality of blankets that were described in the advertisement calling for bids. If the Department wanted a 4-pound blanket men would bid for a 4-pound blanket. If they wanted a 2½-pound blanket they would bid for a 2½-pound blanket.

And in the matter of quality some were of inferior wool or manufacture and others were not all wool.

If they were not all wool they did not come within the provisions of the advertisement, and of course they would be rejected.

The principle acted upon by the Medical Department has been to buy the best article that could be had from the lowest bidder, this being in strict compliance with paragraph 1534, Army Regulations, which provides that "except in rare cases where the United States may elect to exercise its reserved right to reject proposals."

So that they do reject proposals. The Senator says—and I know he has the power to do it—that this resolution shall not pass, that there shall be no smelling committee, there shall be no secrets of this Administration exposed on the eve of the election which might exhibit the fraudulent pretenses of the Senator's political associates when they say that they are in favor of the protection of American labor, and that their system of economy will not injure American labor. It is possible that an examination might disclose something. The Senator says it will be harmless after election; we must wait until after election. If the Senator's theory is correct, that there is a statute which makes it imperative on the Administration thus to buy the product of convict labor, then the greater guilt rests upon him who pocketed a bill that we had passed with entire unanimity to prevent that very thing.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. FRYE in the chair). The consideration of the resolution is objected to by the Senator from Missouri, and it goes over under the rule.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. CLARK, its Clerk, announced that the House had passed the following joint resolutions, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

Joint resolution (H. Res. 231) authorizing the Secretary of the Senate and Clerk of the House of Representatives to pay to the officers and employés of the Senate and House of Representatives borne on the annual rolls their respective salaries for the month of October on the 20th day of said month; and

Joint resolution (H. Res. 232) making appropriations to enable the Secretary of the Senate and Clerk of the House of Representatives to pay to session employés of the Senate and House for the full month of October.

The message also announced that the House had non-concurred in the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 7843) granting to Citrous Water Company right of way across Papago Indian reservation in Maricopa County, Arizona; agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and had appointed Mr. HUDD, Mr. PEEL, and Mr. NELSON the managers at the conference on the part of the House.

THE REVENUE LAWS.

Mr. ALDRICH. Mr. President, in the report of his speech made day before yesterday, the Senator from Missouri [Mr. COCKRELL] incorporated a letter from the Commissioner of Internal Revenue, in

which the Commissioner said he inclosed a letter which had been addressed to Hon. JAMES B. BECK, on the subject of methylation of spirits. The inclosure was not printed with the Commissioner's letter, and I should be very glad, if the Senator has a copy of it, if he will have it inserted.

Mr. COCKRELL. I have it at my room. I have not got it here. I will bring it in the morning. There were five or six inclosures which I never read in full, and, as the Senator will remember, I had finished my speech before I discovered that I had not read this letter, and simply handed it in. The others I will have here in the morning. I forgot to give to the Reporter the other letters. There were quite a number of them. I will bring them and have them put in the RECORD in the morning. I do not remember what he says about the letter spoken of, but there were, I think, three or four other communications. I will let the Senator see them in the morning just as if they were printed. I regret that I did not think of it. I see I have not got them here, and I remember now that there were a number of them.

I move that we take a recess for fifteen minutes. There may be some communications from the President, and I should like to have a short recess.

Mr. ALDRICH. Make it half an hour.

Mr. COCKRELL. Thirty minutes, then.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Missouri moves that the Senate take a recess for thirty minutes.

The motion was agreed to, and the Senate thereupon took a recess for thirty minutes. At the expiration of the recess the Senate reassembled, at 2 o'clock and 50 minutes p. m.

REPORT OF PRODUCTION OF PRECIOUS METALS.

Mr. ALLISON. I should like to take this occasion, if there is nothing pressing before the Senate, to call attention to two or three matters for the convenience of the Senate and to ask the consideration of several House resolutions in regard to printing.

Mr. ALDRICH. Are they resolutions reported from the Committee on Printing?

Mr. ALLISON. I will say to the Senator from Rhode Island that these are not reports from the committee. They are resolutions which have been handed to me by the clerk of the Committee on Printing. I ask the Senate to consider the concurrent resolution of the House of Representatives for printing the report of the Director of the Mint on the production of the precious metals of the United States for the year 1887.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. If there be no objection, the Committee on Printing will be discharged from the further consideration of the resolution. The resolution will be read.

The resolution was read, as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the report of the Director of the Mint on the production of the precious metals in the United States for the year 1887 be printed, and that 9,000 extra copies be printed, 4,000 copies for the use of the House of Representatives, 2,000 copies for the use of the Senate, and 3,000 copies for the use of the Director of the Mint.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The Senator from Iowa asks unanimous consent for the present consideration of the resolution just read.

The Senate, by unanimous consent, proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. ALLISON. The estimate of the cost of this printing is $2,484.

The resolution was agreed to.

REPORTS OF COMMISSIONER OF LABOR.

Mr. ALLISON. I ask that the Committee on Printing be discharged from the further consideration of the concurrent resolution of the House of Representatives to print copies of the first and second annual reports of the Commissioner of Labor, with a view to its present consideration.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The Committee on Printing will be discharged from the further consideration of the resolution, if there be no objection.

The resolution was considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That there be printed 5,000 copies each, in cloth binding, of the first and second annual reports of the Commissioner of Labor for the use of the Department of Labor.

AGRICULTURAL REPORT FOR 1888.

Mr. ALLISON. I ask that the Committee on Printing be discharged from the further consideration of the joint resolution (H. Res. 229) to print the Agricultural Report for 1888.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. If there be no objection, the Committee on Printing will be discharged from the further consideration of the joint resolution. The Chair hears none.

Mr. ALLISON. I ask for the present consideration of the joint resolution.

By unanimous consent, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the joint resolution (H. Res. 229) to print the Agricultural Report for 1888, which was read, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That there be printed 400,000 copies of the annual report of the Commissioner of Agriculture for the year 1888: 70,000 copies for the use of the members of the Senate, 300,000 copies for the use of the members of the House of Representatives, and 30,000 copies for the use of the Department of Agriculture, the illustrations for the same to be executed under the supervision of the Public Printer, in accordance with directions of the Joint Committee on Printing, said illustrations to be subject to the approval of the Commissioner of Agriculture; and the copy for the illustrations of said report shall be placed in the hands of the Public Printer not later than the 20th day of December, 1888, and the copy of the text not later than the 1st day of February, 1889.

Mr. ALLISON. I believe the division as between the Senate and the House of Representatives is the usual division. The House are to receive 300,000 copies and the Senate 70,000 copies, and 30,000 copies will be for the use of the Department of Agriculture. I ask the Senator from Missouri if that is not the usual division.

Mr. COCKRELL. I wanted to make an inquiry in regard to that matter. We have a rule as to documents which I think we have pretty well established, that the Senate shall have in the proportion of one-third and the House two-thirds, but, as I understand, it has been the rule of the Committee on Printing, and also a rule acquiesced in by the Senate for some years, to let the House members have a larger proportion of the Agricultural Report than of the other documents. I understand from the clerk of the Committee on Printing that this is the usual ratio. If it is, I have no objection to it.

Mr. TELLER. I think that gives us the usual ratio of about eight hundred that we have had, or something in that neighborhood; but it has always seemed to me that it was folly to go to the great expense of publishing a large book like this and then limiting us to so small a number of copies. When the book is once published the few thousand additional copies that the Senate and House would get more would be a mere nothing. I have never been able to get enough copies of the Agricultural Reports to meet the demand in my State, which is not considered an agricultural State.

Mr. ALLISON. I think it might be well to allow the joint resolution to pass. This volume will not be printed until after we convene again, and if we desire additional copies they can be ordered then.

Mr. TELLER. I do not desire, of course, to interfere with the passage of the joint resolution, but it seems to me that we ought to take steps to give the people more of these volumes. I get 800 copies and attempt with my colleague to go through the farmers in the State, and we can not do it. One man gets a copy and another man does not get it. There should be enough of these volumes to give every farmer who would make practical use of it a copy. There should be no distinction in giving a few men here and a few men there, but there should be a general distribution, and the additional cost would be merely nominal. I have felt myself, from time to time, compelled to buy copies, as I know others have done when they could be bought at second-hand.

Mr. PADDOCK. I ask that the joint resolution be again read.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. At the request of the Senator from Nebraska the joint resolution will be again read.

The joint resolution was again read.

Mr. PADDOCK. I should like to inquire of the Senator from Iowa if this is the usual number that has been allowed in times past?

Mr. ALLISON. This is the usual number, I believe. I am not quite sure as to the exact proportion, but the clerk of the Committee on Printing states that it is about the proportion usually given as between the two Houses.

Mr. PADDOCK. If the joint resolution does not give the usual number, I should like to have it amended so as to print at all events as many copies as it has been the custom of Congress to print. In fact, I think the number ought to be increased. I indorse fully all that the Senator from Colorado has said in respect to making the aggregate number of these reports larger. I myself have been compelled to make purchases largely during the past session of these reports in order to supply the demand of my constituents, who are almost exclusively an agricultural people. I think if the number named in the joint resolution were even doubled we should then need more.

Mr. TELLER. It will give about 900 copies apiece. That would give to the State of Colorado a little over 2,700 copies, which is totally inadequate if you attempt at all to supply the live farmers of the country.

Mr. COCKRELL. I rather agree with the Senator from Iowa that we had better pass this joint resolution. It will be a short time until the meeting of the next session, and then we can pass a resolution for the printing of additional copies. My impression is that this is about the number that we have printed for the last three or four years.

Mr. REAGAN. Each Senator was given about 800 copies last year, and this gives 900 copies.

Mr. PADDOCK. I have just been informed by the clerk of the committee that this is the usual number, and I withdraw the objection, hoping that hereafter Congress will make provision to increase that number.

Mr. ALLISON. I will say to the Senator from Nebraska that next winter a resolution can be introduced to print additional copies. This volume will not be printed until after the convening of Congress in December.

The joint resolution was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

WASHINGTON AQUEDUCT TUNNEL.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. Under the concurrent resolution of

October 9, authorizing the appointment of a joint committee to investigate work upon the Washington Aqueduct tunnel, the President *pro tempore* designates as members on the part of the Senate the Senator from Vermont [Mr. EDMUNDS], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. DAWES], and the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. FAULKNER].

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. T. O. TOWLES, its Chief Clerk, announced that the House had agreed to the concurrent resolution of the Senate providing for the adjournment of the two Houses of Congress without day on the 20th instant.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED.

The message also announced that the Speaker of the House had signed the enrolled bill (H. R. 11599) to authorize the Postmaster-General to rent a suitable building in the city of Washington to be used as a mail-bag repair-shop, and for other purposes; and it was thereupon signed by the President *pro tempore*.

THE REVENUE LAWS.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 9051) to reduce taxation and simplify the laws in relation to the collection of the revenue.

Mr. ALDRICH. Mr. President, among the criticisms which have been made upon the bill reported from the Finance Committee, there are two which, on account of the source from which they emanate, rather than their gross inaccuracy, seem to the committee to be worthy of attention.

The first of these is what purports to be an official statement and estimate of the effect of the Senate substitute, made by the Bureau of Statistics of the Treasury Department and signed by the Chief of that bureau. This table was submitted to the Senate by the Senator from Missouri [Mr. VEST], now absent, and is found on printed pages 10448 and 10449 of the RECORD. It purports to show in detail what the effect of the Senate bill would be upon importations under the different tariff schedules, and the different items in the schedules, if that bill should become a law. This official statement further illustrates the absurdity of attempting to prove by elaborate statements of average ad valorem rates and percentages the character or effects of a tariff bill.

For instance, the promoters of the House bill claim great credit for having put sawed lumber and other articles in the lumber schedule upon the free-list. Yet it appears from an examination of this statement of the Bureau of Statistics that the average rate of duty imposed by the House bill upon articles in the lumber schedule (Schedule D) is 29.32 per cent., while the average rate imposed by the Senate substitute is 18.88 per cent. In other words, the House bill levies an average ad valorem duty on lumber according to this table greater by 55 per cent. than the Senate substitute, and yet a large proportion of the articles in that schedule are placed on the free-list by the House bill.

Mr. COCKRELL. I did not catch the Senator's statement about the first item, if it will not interrupt him to say so.

Mr. ALDRICH. I said that the House bill, according to this statement, imposes an average rate of duty upon all articles in the lumber schedule of 29.32 per cent., while the Senate bill imposes but 18.88 per cent., and therefore, to follow the reasoning adopted by the Senator from Missouri [Mr. VEST] in relation to the remaining portion of the table, the House bill imposes 55 per cent. higher rates upon lumber than the Senate bill.

Mr. FRYE. As a matter of course this statement of the Treasury Department is an entire mistake as to that item?

Mr. ALDRICH. It is not a mistake. The figures are accurate, I think. I have had the figures compared, but I think they are accurate. I only mention it to show the utter worthlessness and absurdity of attempting to show the character either of this bill or the House bill by a system of ad valorem rates and percentages.

Mr. ALLISON. That is to say, if a man were to pick up this table and look at it and consider it a verification he would say that the House bill levies a duty on lumber 55 per cent. higher than the Senate bill.

Mr. ALDRICH. Yes; 55 per cent., and he would have this official statement of the Bureau of Statistics of the Treasury Department to prove it.

Mr. ALLISON. On the stump.

Mr. FRYE. What I meant to say was that it is an entire mistake. The House bill has not increased the duty, nor has the Senate bill increased it.

Mr. ALDRICH. The deductions which the gentlemen on the other side of the Chamber seek to make from this table would lead to a great mistake in this case, although the statement itself is not incorrect.

The Senator from Missouri in submitting this table to the Senate stated that it disclosed the fact that the Senate bill had very greatly increased the duty upon certain necessaries of life. Among these he cited woolen and cotton cloths, the rates upon which he claimed were largely increased.

The fact is, as was stated by the Senator from Iowa [Mr. ALLISON] in his opening speech upon the bill, that the rates of duty imposed upon the lower grades of woolen cloths and cotton cloths are not increased by the Senate bill. Upon all the lower grades of woolen cloths the rates fixed by the bill are 35 cents a pound and 35 per cent. ad valorem, which is exactly the same rate as that imposed on the same class by existing law.

On the other hand upon all the grades or classes of cotton cloths which could by any possibility be called necessaries of life—those which are used by the great masses of our people—the bill instead of increasing the rates of duties decreases them. Yet this official statement is brought here for the purpose of trying to prove to the people of this country that we have largely increased the duties upon all cotton and woolen cloths.

Mr. REAGAN. Will the Senator allow me to ask him a question?

Mr. ALDRICH. Certainly.

Mr. REAGAN. I ask if the Senator from Ohio [Mr. SHERMAN] did not state in his opening address on the subject of the Senate bill that it did increase the duty on woolens to some extent?

Mr. ALDRICH. Yes; on the higher grades of woolens, and the Senator from Iowa also made the same statement. It is also true that upon the higher grades of cotton cloths and of fine cotton yarns the bill increases the rates. There never has been any attempt at concealment on the part of the committee of the fact that it proposes an increase of rates on these goods, and in every other case where an American industry required additional protection, or where the working people engaged in any pursuit were suffering from inadequate rates. That has been the avowed purpose of the framers and promoters of this bill.

The criticism which Senators make is not that these duties are greater than different industries require, but they content themselves with the general statement that we have largely increased the duties upon the necessaries of life.

This statement is misleading and inaccurate in its general features and in its details. I am not surprised that partisan newspapers or members of Congress should assail the Senate bill and misrepresent its provisions; but I am surprised that the Bureau of Statistics, which, above everything, should be fair and non-partisan, and to whom we have always looked for mathematical accuracy, should put forth an official paper which is not only grossly inaccurate in its mathematics, but is entirely unfair and misleading in the application of the information in its possession in a matter of great public importance.

The first item in the table before me to which I shall call the attention of the Senate is woolen cloths. The rate fixed by existing law upon woolen cloths is upon all cloths below 80 cents a pound 35 cents a pound and 35 per cent. ad valorem, and upon all cloths exceeding 80 cents a pound in value 35 cents a pound and 40 per cent. ad valorem. The rates fixed by the Senate substitute are upon woolen cloths valued at below 40 cents a pound 35 cents a pound and 35 per cent. ad valorem, the same it will be borne in mind as upon the lower class under existing law; on those valued between 40 and 60 cents a pound 35 cents a pound and 40 per cent. ad valorem, and exceeding 60 cents a pound 40 cents a pound and 40 per cent. ad valorem.

It will be observed that in order to make an accurate comparison between results to be effected by the rates fixed by the Senate substitute and existing law, based upon the importations of 1887, it would be necessary to ascertain how many pounds of woolen cloths valued at below 40 cents a pound were imported in 1887 and what amount of duty was collected upon them. This would also be true of the grade between 40 and 60 and above 60.

When the statement which I now have under consideration was first brought to my attention in the columns of a Democratic newspaper several days before it was submitted to the Senate, I immediately addressed a note to the Chief of the Bureau of Statistics and asked him to furnish me the data upon which this estimated effect of the Senate substitute upon woolen cloths was based. Late on Monday night I received by special messenger a statement from him, in which he says that as all the woolen cloths imported valued at less than 80 cents per pound averaged 63.8 cents per pound in value, therefore he had concluded that all woolen cloths were valued above 60 cents a pound, and had computed them all at the highest rate of duty assessed by the Senate bill.

Some Senator upon the other side may ask, are there any woolen cloths imported that are valued below 60 cents a pound? I will answer this by reading from a statement made by the Commissioner of Labor in his first annual report to Congress, which I venture to say has appeared and reappeared in many scores of Democratic speeches in this body and in the other branch, as to the effect of a tariff upon woolen goods. In this statement he details twenty-eight different grades of woolen cloths, valued at less than 80 cents per pound, to illustrate the effect of the act of 1883. Of these twenty-eight, twenty-seven are below 60 cents a pound, thirteen are below 40 cents a pound, fourteen between 40 and 60 cents, and one from 60 to 80 cents.

This table, I say, has been in constant use in both Houses to illustrate the effect of the act of 1883, and it is certainly fair to assume that a considerable proportion of the goods imported in 1887 which were valued at less than 80 cents a pound were invoiced at less than 60 cents per pound. The Chief of the Bureau of Statistics, instead of saying frankly to the Senator from Missouri and the Senate I have no data—as he had none and could have had none—upon which to base an estimate of the effect of the Senate bill upon woolen cloths, computes all importation at the highest rate of duty and forwards this inaccurate

statement without an explanation, to be made the basis of the charge that we have largely increased the duty on woolen cloths.

This is also true as to rates on woolen shawls, which are included in the same clause in the present law and in the Senate substitute. In a speech recently made in Wall street, in the city of New York, the Speaker of the House of Representatives was reported by the New York World of the next day to have said:

> The tariff taxes upon the cheaper grades of shawls and woolen cloths are increased to more than 100 per cent., and the duties on knit goods, the underwear of the people, by a change of classification, are increased to more than 200 per cent. I know these may seem to be extravagant figures, but I am prepared to substantiate the truth of every one of them.

I do not mean to impeach the intelligence of the Speaker of the House of Representatives, but if he had read the Senate substitute at all or had any knowledge of its provisions he would have known that it not only does not increase the duty on the lower grades of woolen cloths and woolen shawls to 100 per cent., but that it does not increase these rates at all; that they remain in the Senate bill word for word, letter for letter as in the existing law.

Let us also examine for a moment Mr. CARLISLE'S statement in regard to knit goods, which he says are increased by the Senate substitute to 250 per cent., and compare his figures with those which are furnished by the Bureau of Statistics. According to the report of the bureau the duty on knit goods in 1887 was 62.80 per cent., and by the Senate bill it would be 71.90 per cent.

Mr. COCKRELL. What is the Senator on now?

Mr. ALDRICH. On knit goods. I am showing that by this Bureau of Statistics table which I have before me the duty under the present law is 62.80 per cent., while under the Senate substitute it would be 71.90 per cent., instead of 250 per cent., as stated by the Speaker of the House of Representatives.

Before leaving Mr. CARLISLE'S speech, I should say that by the Bureau of Statistics table the duty on woolen shawls in 1887, under the existing law, was 63.50 per cent., while their estimate of duty under the Senate substitute would be 68.27 per cent. This same Bureau of Statistics, by another table, shows that the duty on woolen shawls in 1887 was 88.44 per cent., and 65.41 per cent. as against an estimated duty under Senate bill of 68.27 per cent.; so that instead of increasing the duty according to Mr. CARLISLE to the extent of 100 per cent. upon the lower grades of woolen shawls the evidence of the Bureau of Statistics, whatever it may now be worth, shows that we have reduced the duty from 88.44 per cent. to 68.27 per cent.

This bureau table estimates that the Senate bill increases the rate of duty on yarns 64.71 per cent. above existing rates. By another table, prepared by the Treasury Department, which was submitted to the Senate on yesterday by the same Senator from Missouri who submitted the statement now under consideration, and which was intended to show the effect of the Senate bill upon all wool and woolens, the rate of duty on woolen and worsted yarns was stated at 102.38 per cent., while the table which I have before me estimates that the duty would be 113.83 per cent. The second table shows that the amount of duty collected under the Senate bill would be $1,789,000, while the first table shows $1,989,000.

Mr. COCKRELL. I do not see where the Senator gets his figures.

Mr. ALDRICH. If the Senator from Missouri will turn to page 10500 of the RECORD he will find under the first classification of yarns——

Mr. COCKRELL. Will the Senator just bear with me a moment? I am at it.

Mr. ALDRICH. He will find in the second table submitted by his colleague to the Senate as to the effect of the Senate substitute, that there would be collected upon the yarns $1,789,236; and if he looks at the first table submitted by him he will find that the amount is given one million nine hundred and some odd thousand dollars, or a difference of $200,000 between the two statements. Then if he will look at the amount which it is estimated would be collected from dress goods in the second statement, on page 10501, he will find the estimate to be $13,893,028.20, while under the first table the estimate is $13,419,025.95, or a difference of $474,000 in the single item between these statements submitted on successive days by the Senator from Missouri.

I understood the Senator when he presented these tables to say that they both came from the Treasury Department, and I infer that they were both prepared at the Bureau of Statistics.

It is true, as was stated by both the Senator from Ohio [Mr. SHERMAN] and the Senator from Iowa [Mr. ALLISON], that upon the higher grades of woolen goods and upon worsted goods of all kinds we have proposed an increase of rates by the Senate bill. The committee had three reasons for making such an increase. The first was the inadequate duties which were imposed in 1883 upon many classes of woolen and worsted goods. That is evidenced, as the committee show in their report, by the large and rapidly increasing importations from year to year of woolen and worsted manufactures.

The second was the anomalous duties which, under the decision of the Treasury Department, are now levied upon worsted goods. The Secretary of the Treasury, in his last annual report, calls the attention of Congress to this inequality, and says:

> There is much reason to believe that the manufacture of worsted cloths must soon cease in this country, unless the tariff law in this regard is amended.

I shall not stop to read the whole of his statement, but it is conclusive upon this point.

Under existing law worsted goods, and the yarns imported in 1887 were largely worsted yarns, pay 10, 12, 18, and 24 cents a pound compensatory specific duty, while scoured wool from which the yarns and cloth are made pays 30 cents a pound specific duty. Based upon the estimate that it takes 1 pound and one-third of scoured wool to make a pound of worsted yarn, the specific duty upon the wool is 40 cents a pound, while the duty upon the yarn cloth is only 10, 12, 18, and 24 cents a pound as I have stated.

This is a direct discrimination against the worsted manufacturers of the country, and it is not surprising that the Secretary of the Treasury should call the attention of Congress to it. But by providing a remedy for the inequality and by fixing the same rates of duty upon woolen and worsted cloths and woolen and worsted yarns we are unjustly subjected to the charge that we have increased duties 100 per cent. Instead of manfully saying that the increase is right, and that it is necessary for the preservation of important industries, the Senator from Missouri says "You have increased the duties upon necessaries of life more than 100 per cent. by this provision of the bill."

The Committee on Finance in the Senate substitute have divided cotton cloths into five classes for the purpose of assessing duties; the first class includes cloths containing not exceeding 50 threads to the square inch, the second containing above 50 and not exceeding 100, the third above 100 and not exceeding 150, the fourth above 150 and not exceeding 200, and the fifth exceeding 200.

Upon the first and second classes the committee recommend a reduction of one-half cent per yard upon those goods upon which a specific duty is levied, and on those upon which an ad valorem rate is assessed a reduction from 40 to 35 per cent. ad valorem.

On the third class, between 100 and 150 threads to the square inch, the duties remain the same in the Senate substitute as in existing law. In the higher classes, the fourth and fifth, we have increased the rate upon those which bore a specific rate half a cent a yard, and we have increased the ad valorem rate from 40 to 45 per cent. ad valorem.

It will be observed that under the existing law all cotton cloths not exceeding two hundred threads to the square inch and above a certain limit in value pay an ad valorem rate of 40 per cent. The committee propose that two-fifths of these shall pay 35 per cent., one-fifth 40 per cent., and one-fifth 45 per cent. By the statement under consideration all classes are computed at 45 per cent.

The cotton cloths, between one hundred and two hundred threads to the square inch, upon which a specific rate is now levied, pay a duty respectively of 3, 4, and 5 cents a square yard. Under the Senate substitute one half of these, say from one hundred to one hundred and fifty threads, pay the same rate. The other half, from one hundred and fifty to two hundred, pay an additional half cent a yard. In this Treasury estimate they are all computed at the highest rate.

The allowance is made for the reductions in duties which are effected, but additions are always made in case of an increase. The effect of the table, therefore, if it had any, would be to convince the people of this country that we had increased the duty upon all cotton cloths, while we have reduced the duty upon the two lower grades, left it without change upon one, and increased it only on the two higher grades.

I have already stated that the goods upon which we have made the reductions in duty are the goods largely in use by all classes of our people, while the classes upon which we have made an increase are described in a report of the Treasury Department as "articles of cotton which are so elaborately manufactured as to become more articles of luxury than many articles of silk which are classed as luxuries." They are goods bought largely by the wealthier classes of our people. They are a class of goods of which the importation is constantly increasing, and owing to the large percentage of labor employed in their production the present rate of duty is inadequate.

The Senator from Missouri, following in the footsteps of other Senators, took occasion to say that these high rates on cotton goods were for the benefit of New England manufacturers.

Mr. COCKRELL. I wish the Senator would explain that he is referring to my colleague, who is now absent.

Mr. ALDRICH. Yes, I am referring to the junior Senator from Missouri [Mr. VEST], who is not now in the Senate, I am sorry to say.

If I had the time, I should like to make a comparison between the rates of duty fixed upon these fine cotton cloths and the rates fixed by the Senate bill upon some crude products of Missouri.

I would even like to compare them with the rates fixed by the House bill upon lead, lead ore, zinc, plate-glass, and half a dozen of the leading products of Missouri. The House bill, for instance, levies 152 per cent. upon plate-glass, while the highest rate of duty fixed by this bill upon cotton goods is 45 per cent.

I will put into the RECORD as part of my remarks a statement showing the great reduction which has taken place in the rates upon cotton cloths by the act of 1883 and those proposed by the Senate substitute; and I will say supplementary to it that there is not one schedule in

the whole tariff where the rates have been so greatly reduced by recent legislation as in the schedule of cotton cloths.

Table showing the duties prior to 1883, the reductions made in 1883, and the changes in the cotton schedule proposed by the Senate substitute to House bill (H. R. 9051), 1888.

	Duties prior to 1883.	Reductions made in 1883.		Changes proposed by the Senate substitute, 1888.		
		Rate.	Reduction.	Rate.	Reduction.	Total reduction.
Not exceeding 50 threads to sq. in.:		Cents.	P. ct.	Cents.	P. ct.	P. ct.
Brown	5 to 6 cts	2½	55	2	20	75
Bleached	5½ to 6½ cts	3½	42	2½	28	70
Printed, etc	5½ to 6½ cts., and 10 per cent.	4½	30	4	11	41
50 to 100 threads:						
Brown	5 to 6 cts	2½	55	2½	10	65
Bleached	5½ to 6½ cts	3½	42	3	14	56
Printed, etc	5½ to 6½ cts. and 10 per cent.	4½	30	4	11	41
100 to 150 threads:						
Brown	5 to 6 cts	3	46	No change.		46
Bleached	5½ to 6½ cts	4	33	....do		33
Printed, etc	5½ cts. and 20 per cent. to 6½ cts. and 15 per cent.	5	29	....do		29
					Advance per cent.	
150 to 200 threads:						
Brown	5 to 6 cts	3	46	3½	16½	29½
Bleached	5½ to 6½ cts	4	33	4½	12½	20½
Printed, etc	5½ cts. and 20 per cent. to 6½ cts. and 15 per cent.	4	29	5½	10	19
Over 200 threads:						
Brown	5 to 7 cts	4	33	4½	12½	20½
Bleached	5½ to 7½ cts	5	23	5½	10	13
Printed, etc	5½ cts. and 20 per cent. to 7½ cts. and 15 per cent.	6	25	6½	12½	12½

Reductions in 6 clauses = 15.66 per cent. Advances in 6 clauses = 12.36 per cent. No changes in 3 clauses.

I will also put in the RECORD a statement showing the increasing importations of fine cotton cloths since 1883.

Importations of cotton cloth, in yards, under present tariff.

Description.	1883, before present tariff.	1884.	1885.	1886.	1887.	Totals.
BROWN.						
Not over 100 threads to square inch	140,434	28,780	62,121	245,835	160,118	496,854
100 to 200	34,600	68,277	129,241	776,915	1,229,612	2,204,045
Over 200	5,040	694,302	174,833	328,264	653,403	1,850,802
Exceeding 200, valued 10 c. or less		380,606	316,175	100,794	134,825	932,400
Exceeding 200, valued over 10 c		397,848	53,454	56,892	98,678	606,872
	180,074	1,569,813	735,824	1,508,700	2,276,636	6,090,973
BLEACHED.						
Not over 100 threads	9,766,330	751,524	1,081,269	1,401,586	1,325,342	4,559,721
100 to 200	151,976	6,835,378	8,065,116	6,715,489	4,389,972	26,005,955
Over 200	70,852	1,147,564	1,659,688	3,164,109	1,861,345	7,832,706
Exceeding 200, valued 12 c. or less		2,360,000	1,842,903	1,610,419	1,304,760	7,118,082
Exceeding 200, valued over 12 c		1,350,972	4,826,889	1,878,114	734,649	8,799,624
	9,999,148	12,454,438	17,475,865	14,769,717	9,616,068	54,316,088
COLORED.						
Not over 100 threads	390,906	655,622	1,047,404	1,535,616	1,493,152	4,731,794
100 to 200	10,970,270	3,293,516	2,901,359	3,815,872	4,536,834	14,547,581
Over 200	896,152	1,609,828	1,993,647	4,452,263	6,418,006	14,473,744
Exceeding 200, valued 15 c. or less		1,428,278	1,153,800	2,418,308	2,184,598	7,184,984
Exceeding 200, valued over 15 c		5,893,483	6,299,050	3,616,413	3,502,375	19,311,321
Total	12,257,328	12,880,727	13,395,200	15,838,472	18,134,965	60,249,424

The next item referred to in this wonderful table is "brown and bleached linens, etc.," by which the Bureau of Statistics undertake to show that $2,138,412.78 more duty would be assessed under the Senate substitute than under the House bill. The chief of the bureau has already called my attention to a clerical error in this item of $100,000, but this is of slight consequence compared with the error in the classification which the statement contains.

Under the Senate substitute all brown and bleached linens exceeding one hundred threads to the square inch are dutiable at the same rate as by existing law, namely, 35 per cent. ad valorem, while classes counting below one hundred threads to the square inch are dutiable at 40 per cent. ad valorem.

The committee were led to believe by men who are most thoroughly acquainted with the manufacture of flax—and upon this point the evidence was regarded as conclusive—that but a small proportion of the brown and bleached linens which are now imported would be advanced in rate by the provisions of the Senate bill. Yet the Bureau of Statistics, without any data before them whatever, compute all importations at the highest rate of 40 per cent.; this upon $13,589,000 in value increases estimated duties over $650,000 in one item alone, and all for the purpose of establishing an increase of duties which does not exist.

The next item of necessaries of life which, according to the bureau table, the Senate bill increases the rate upon is "linen laces and embroideries," upon which we have increased rates from 30 to 50 per cent. The Secretary of the Treasury in a communication within a year, I think—the Senator from Iowa reminds me that it was a statement made by Secretary Manning—called the attention of Congress to the anomalous rate of duties which was fixed upon linen laces and embroideries, which was 10 per cent. less than the rate fixed upon cotton laces and embroideries, and advised Congress to increase the rate.

The next item is steel in forms not specified. Under the present law all steel not specifically enumerated, valued at less than 4 cents a pound, pays an ad valorem rate of 45 per cent. By the Senate substitute we have fixed six different classes of specific rates, depending upon the value of the steel, to take the place of the one ad valorem rate of 45 per cent.

There can not be any evidence in the hands of the Treasury Department or of the Bureau of Statistics to show what number of pounds of any of those grades were imported in 1887, or what the effect of the Senate substitute would be upon importations, and yet we are confronted by a statement assumed to be mathematically accurate and which states that the Senate bill would increase the duties $873,695.09.

I think the mathematical character of this bureau table is best exemplified by the last two items on the list, "tin-plates" and "needles," which are placed by the House bill upon the free-list. Under the head of the excess of duties by the Senate substitute over the House bill, showing the percentage of increase of the Senate rates over the House rates, we have:

Duties under the House bill on tin-plate and needles, nothing.
Percentage of increase by the Senate bill, 100 per cent.

Why "100 per cent.?" Why is $5,706,000 100 per cent. of nothing? Why not say a thousand per cent., or 10,000 per cent.? The average rate of increases effected by the Senate substitute would have been much larger. Our Democratic friends could then have shown that the rates on the necessaries of life had been increased to an indefinite extent. Yet the table is presented in the Senate of the United States with the stamp of official approval by the Chief of the Bureau of Statistics. It is evident that the mathematical expert of the bureau must have been absent when the table was prepared. It bears the impress of the same blundering hand that prepared the House bill.

The Speaker of the House of Representatives in the same speech to which I have alluded called attention to the fact that we had increased the duty on Havana cigars, and this statement was repeated by the senior Senator from Missouri [Mr. COCKRELL], who is now in his seat. He stated that the Senate bill increased the duty upon Havana cigars worth $10 per thousand. It is a favorite—I was going to say trick, but I think that would be a little too harsh—but it is a favorite device of tariff reformers and free-traders to assume some impossible low value for imported goods, and to claim that the specific rate imposed would be equivalent to some very high ad valorem rate.

For instance, I noticed recently in a free-trade newspaper a statement that among the enormities which the Senate substitute proposed was a duty of 300 or 400 per cent. upon shotguns. In order to establish this they assume double-barreled breech-loading shotguns worth $3.25 each, and that the Senate rate of duty is more than 300 per cent. on this value. Why say three dollars and a quarter? Why not say $3 or $2 or 25 cents? If double-barreled breech-loading shotguns were worth 25 cents each, the duty fixed by the Senate bill would be an enormous one; the equivalent ad valorem rate would be among the thousands. The assumption is just as fair and equally as reasonable in one case as in the other.

But I think it unnecessary to pursue this subject further. I was desirous that the people who might read the Treasury statement which I hold in my hand and the remarks which were made by the Senator from Missouri in presenting it, or who might have heard or read the speech of the Speaker of the House of Representatives, might not be misled by the character of the statement, and I felt it due to the Senate and due to the people that the utterly worthless and inaccurate character of what purports to be an official statement of the effects of the Senate bill should be exposed.

Mr. FRYE. Mr. President, I do not wish to make a tariff speech, but I desire to correct one impression which seems to prevail very ex-

tensively among the Senators and Members of the House from the South.

I took occasion last night to look over quite a number of Democratic speeches, and I found the burden of the song to be the enormously rich manufacturers of New England, the fearful monopolies they owned and carried on, and the enormous profits they produced at the expense of labor.

I found in one speech a statement that cotton-mills were making 35 per cent. net profit, and I found it to be proven by figures from the census of 1880. For instance, the capital of all the cotton-mills in the country was given, then the cost of all the raw material, then the cost of wage labor, then the value of the product. Then the wages and the material were added together, subtracted from the value of the product, and it left a balance that was the net profit.

I have heard that stated in the United States Senate by Senators from the South over and over again. I have heard as distinguished and intelligent a Senator as the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BECK], who is now absent, make that same statement here on the floor of the Senate. I was at the time in the chair presiding. I heard the other Senator from Kentucky, now retired, Mr. Williams, make the same statement. At this very Congress it has been made twice in the National House of Representatives by Southern members.

Why can not Senators from the South see the utter absurdity of that statement? It figures out anywhere from 25 to 35 per cent. net every time you try it. You may try it on woolen goods, on cotton goods, on silk, on linen, and it will prove every time the net profit our manufacturers are making to be from 25 to 40 per cent.

Is there a Senator from the South who makes this statement who really believes it? It certainly would be unkind to charge that he made it on the floor of these two Houses and did not; but look at the utter absurdity of it.

There are over a billion of dollars to-day in the saving-banks of the North not drawing over 4 per cent. interest. Do you suppose this money would remain in these savings-banks drawing 4 per cent. interest if you could invest it in a cotton mill or in a woolen mill or a linen or a silk mill and draw your 35 per cent. or 30 per cent. or 20 per cent. net? There are millions and millions of dollars invested in United States bonds drawing not over 3 per cent. interest. Does any Senator dream that the Secretary of the Treasury would have the slightest difficulty in redeeming United States bonds if a man could take his money and invest it in manufacturing in New England and make 25 per cent.? I should think the absurdity of this statement itself would be its own refutation in the mind of any gentleman, and it is beyond my conception how a Senator or a Member of the House can in his place in either of these bodies make such an egregious and absurd statement.

What is left out in the statement of those gentlemen? Let me show once for all. There is the power. It is either steam or water. In almost every large manufacturing city there is a water-power which is owned by a separate corporation, and the other corporations hire it at so much a horse-power. They pay so much a year. Where it is steam, of course it is created by coal or by wood, and must cost something. That in that statement is left out entirely. What next? Fuel is left out entirely. What next? Gas. What next? Insurance. What next? Taxes. What next? All supplies.

Mr. COCKRELL. Supplies, not material?

Mr. FRYE. Supplies outside of materials. What next? All salaried officers are left out entirely. It is only the wage labor included. Not a single salary goes into that senseless computation. What next? Commissions on sales left out. What next? Freight truckage, storage, insurance, and like charges. What next? Salary of the treasurer, who is hardly ever a resident of the city where the factory is running. What next? Interest. What next? Depreciation of the mill property. What next? Depreciation of machinery.

The items left out in every single instance, whether relating to cotton, wool, or silk, equal the item named for wages in this computation.

Mr. DOLPH. And bad debts.

Mr. FRYE. "Bad debts" is suggested, but I leave that out as an uncertainty. I can make what I am saying absolutely certain.

I have in my hand a transcript from the books of a cotton mill running from 51,000 to 54,000 spindles, about which there can be no mistake whatever. I will give the items for a year, and I trust that after this I shall not hear repeated in the Senate any such statements as I have heard so many times before.

The capital stock of this mill is $1,000,000. The value of the product is $679,644.73. This is for the year 1882, an average good year for the last ten, less the cost of bleaching, which, of course, the statement does not deal with, $42,643.40, making net value of the product $637,-001.33.

Cost of wage-labor, $148,890.81.

Power, $2,762.51.

No power costing less than that can be found in the United States, within my certain knowledge. It is water-power, and the cheapest in America to-day, a great deal cheaper than steam.

Fuel, $4,652.54.

Gas, $2,503.05.

Insurance, $6,714.35.

Taxes, $15,901.89.

Sundries, including supplies, ordinary repairs, salaried officers' pay, $47,770.04.

Cotton, $297,289.83.

Commissions on sales, $10,420.68.

Freight, truckage, storage, insurance, and other charges on goods, $7,037.09.

Treasurer's salary and office expenses, $8,625.32.

Interest, $9,018.13.

Net profits for the year, exclusive of any allowance for depreciation, $75,415.09.

Now, what is the depreciation in machinery alone in this mill? The best cotton manufacturers allow for this 50 cents a spindle to a dollar. Some say that 50 cents in a well-conducted mill will cover the depreciation in machinery; others insist that it will take a dollar a spindle. I call it 75 cents a spindle. At that rate it leaves the net profit of this year, 1882, in this mill—one of the best conducted ones of this whole country—$39,000. That is 3.9 per cent. on the capital, and the capital has not been watered; it is actual money paid in.

Now, the free-trade formula would state the case of this mill for 1882 as follows: Capital, $1,000,000; labor, $148,890; materials, $297,289; making in all for labor and material $446,179; product, $637,000. Deduct the material and labor from the product and it leaves $190,821, leaving for the year's profit a little over 19 per cent. As a matter of fact it was 3.9 per cent.

There is no escape from that statement. I am a stockholder myself, to a very small amount, in that mill. I know that the average net profits for the last ten years have not been over 5 per cent. annually. I know that there is one cotton-mill in my city which has failed, and has been lying still for three years. I know there is another cotton-mill, as good a mill as can be found, that has not run an hour for over six years. I know that the average net profits of well-conducted cotton-mills in my city, paying less for power than any other mills in this country, have not netted 5 per cent. annually for ten years. One of our largest mills has not paid a dividend for ten years, and its stock is 60 per cent. below par.

Mr. PUGH. What kind of goods do they manufacture?

Mr. FRYE. Common goods. Nearly all nice bleached sheetings. A variety of goods, neither the coarser grades nor the finer embroideries, laces, etc.

I know further, that the woolen mills of this country have been worse off the last ten years than the cotton. I know that nearly one-half of the worsted mills in the United States to-day are idle, doing nothing absolutely. I know that you may take it through New England, and for ten years the woolen mills have not netted 4 per cent. profit—I mean 4 per cent. per annum for ten years.

There should not be these gross misstatements made in a matter of this kind where reasonable certainty can be arrived at.

Mr. TELLER. I should like to supplement what the Senator from Maine has said by calling the attention of those Senators who believe that the manufacturers are making so much money to the character of securities that are sold now and the prices at which they are sold. It must be apparent to everybody that if our manufacturers are making anywhere from 15 to 45 per cent. as claimed, the money of the country would go into manufactures, because we have not reached the point in manufactures where we entirely supply the American market. Of course things like woolen goods and cotton goods and hardware and iron and glass ware and earthenware and things of that kind for ten years, $237,000,000 a year has been the importation of that class of goods—goods that can be manufactured by almost any class of labor. I hold in my hand the Commercial and Financial Chronicle of October 13, 1888, authority, as a standard everybody knows, which gives the securities dealt in, their prices, the interest they bear, etc., and there will be found in this about three hundred classes of railroad bonds—I now speak of railroad bonds particularly—that are selling at 100 or above. In about three hundred there are only three that sell for less than 100. Of course I do not mean to say that a great many bonds do not sell for less, but any bond that bears 7 per cent. interest or 6 per cent. interest, where the road is in good condition, will sell for above 100.

The bonds of the Chicago and Northwestern Railroad Company, whose road leads from Chicago to the Northwest, due in 1915 and bearing 7 per cent. interest, are worth 130½, or were last week, on the 12th instant. Another bond of the same company, their sinking-fund bonds, due in 1929 and bearing 6 per cent. interest, are worth 117.

The Chicago, Rock Island and Pacific 6 per cent. bonds, due in 1917, were worth 131½ on the 5th of October, and on the 12th they were worth 132¼. During the month of June they were up to 134.

You may take also the Chicago, St. Paul, Minneapolis and Omaha Railroad, and their 6 percents are worth 120½ to 121¾, and they were as high as 123½ last May.

The Cincinnati, Columbus and Cleveland 7 percents were selling on the 5th of this month for 131, and in May and July they sold for the same.

The 7 per cent. bonds of the Denver and Rio Grande Railroad Company, due in 1900, are bringing 120.

The Erie first consolidated, gold, 7 percents, due in 1920, are worth 136, and sold in August for 138½.

The Houston and Texas 7 percents were worth on the 5th instant

123½, and on the 12th, 123½. Several of their bonds of different classes all run above 100.

The Lake Shore consolidated coupon first seven percents, due in 1900, are worth 127¾; and the second seven percents, due in 1903, are worth 125½. So you might go through the list until you strike some others that are still higher.

The Delaware and Hudson Canal seven percents are worth 146¾ to 149.

Mr. EUSTIS. How does that happen?

Mr. TELLER. I will tell the Senator how it happens.

Mr. EUSTIS. How does it happen that so many of these securities are owned in New England?

Mr. TELLER. I will tell the Senator why they are owned in New England if he wants me to tell him. It is because the people of New England, living upon a soil not particularly attractive to agriculture, turned their attention to something else than the farms of New England, and it is owing to that fact that New England became a manufacturing country. The farms there will not produce one-fourth of the crops that the farms of the State the Senator represents will produce, but they are worth from three to five times as much per acre, and why? Because they have got the market at their doors, and the Senator's State has got its market somewhere else. The Senator prefers to buy his goods in Europe and transmit the products of his soil to Europe to pay for them. The people of New England propose to manufacture their goods on their own soil and to feed the manufacturers with the products of their home farms, and invariably that has made a rich people; and the history of the world is, without exception, that a purely agricultural people have always been a poor people.

Mr. FRYE. We made a good deal of money in New England in manufactures during the war.

Mr. EUSTIS. Does the Senator admit that?

Mr. TELLER. I admit that they have made money by manufacturing. If they had not made money by manufacturing I should not be so particularly anxious that manufactures should be continued. It is because I want the manufacturing done in this country, because whoever manufactures, whether he be capitalist or whether he be laborer, he receives compensation from it that he can not get from the pursuit of one class of labor alone.

Mr. ALDRICH. I think it should be stated that where the people of New England have made a dollar in manufacturing they have made at least a hundred dollars, I think, and probably a thousand dollars, in building railroads and in conducting enterprises in Louisiana and in Iowa.

Mr. EUSTIS. I ask the Senator where did they get the money to build all these railroads in the West and in the South?

Mr. ALDRICH. They earned it and they saved it while the people in some other sections were doing neither.

Mr. EUSTIS. How did they earn it?

Mr. ALDRICH. They earned it by the sweat of their brows in an honest and proper way.

Mr. TELLER. Why, Mr. President, it is very simple. Of course, the New England manufacturers made a great deal of money during the war. There is no question about that. Prices went up very greatly in this country. While the Senator and his associates and his citizens were engaged in other pursuits not so profitable, while they were practically engaged in destroying, not simply the Government, but the property of the country, the New Englander with his thrift, furnishing his full quota of people for the field, as he always did, was engaged in producing and in saving and in creating.

Mr. DOLPH. Will the Senator from Colorado yield to me for a moment?

Mr. TELLER. Certainly.

Mr. DOLPH. I think it ought also to be stated that the money that is made by New England in manufacturing is not made alone by the stockholders who own the plant, for instance, of a cotton-mill similar to those just referred to by the Senator from Maine. I asked the Senator from Maine how many persons were employed in the cotton-mill he referred to and he told me there were probably two thousand persons there employed. While the cotton manufacturer, while the company that owns the mill, were making less than 5 per cent.——

Mr. FRYE. Three per cent.

Mr. DOLPH. Say less than 4 per cent. for themselves on the capital invested, they were making money for every one of these two thousand employés by giving them steady employment the year round at remunerative wages; and I will guaranty that if you go into this New England town you will find that these two thousand employés own more of these railroad bonds than the stockholders in that company. Therefore the manufacturers of New England are making money for the common people, for the laborers of the country.

While I am up I desire, if the Senator from Colorado will permit me, to make a further suggestion.

Mr. TELLER. Go ahead.

Mr. DOLPH. In regard to the bonds of the Northwestern Railroad Company, I believe the Senator said they were drawing 7 per cent. interest and selling for 130, payable several years from now. I have just made a computation to find out how much interest that would be on the present cost of the bonds as they are selling from day to day in the markets. I find it would be a little under 5.4 per cent. on the cost of the bonds—that is to say, you pay $130 for a hundred-dollar bond drawing 7 per cent. At that price the investor would receive a little less than 5.4 per cent. interest on his money. But we must take another thing into consideration, and that is that the bonds are taxable, and not only is the bond itself taxable, but the interest upon it is taxable, and the taxes, including State, municipal, and county taxes, are probably from 2 to 3 per cent. You may take that as the average, and certainly they are all taxed to the extent of 2 per cent. So the net income upon that investment would be less than 3.4 per cent., which is less than the amount received by the manufacturer on his money.

Mr. TELLER. If the Senator from Louisiana, when he asked why these New England people loaned the money, supposed that I meant in reply to say that the manufacturers owned these securities, I beg to assure him that I did not.

Mr. EUSTIS. I did not mean to criticise or anything of that sort. The Senator from Maine was representing that they were making no money from manufactures. For instance, take the State of Massachusetts. That State has no shipping.

Mr. TELLER. She has some shipping.

Mr. EUSTIS. That State has no coal mines, no iron mines; that State has no agricultural wealth whatever, and yet there is such enormous wealth in that State that it is almost impossible to make an estimate of what it is.

I know that in regard to one railroad the other day the fact was disclosed that five hundred thousand shares of stock of that railroad were owned by capitalists of Boston. We know that a large majority of the stock of the Union Pacific Railroad is so owned. What puzzled me was, inasmuch as they have no other source from which wealth is created if they are not making money by their manufacturing, where in the world do they get the money?

Mr. TELLER. Let me tell the Senator where they get the money. In the first place he says Massachusetts has no shipping. Why, the people of Massachusetts made immense fortunes in the China and the West India trade and other trades.

Mr. EUSTIS. At the present day, I mean.

Mr. TELLER. They laid the foundation of their great fortunes, many of them, in the foreign trade.

Mr. EUSTIS. The Chinese trade is in the hands of a few families.

Mr. TELLER. Comparatively few. That is true. Then they went into manufacturing. Then when they got money they saved it. Then they put it into these enterprises in the West and all over the country. They are a saving, frugal people, and they make more money out of the sterile hills of New England, acre for acre, than the Senator's constituents make in the fertile lands of the Mississippi Valley.

Mr. EUSTIS. The Senator is mistaken when he makes that statement.

Mr. TELLER. They do, acre for acre, the State over. There are exceptions of course, but they have made it by their home market. They have got valuable products, but they can not compete with the world in the products of their gardens, their hay, vegetables, and such things; and so they have diversified their industries in New England.

It does not follow that the manufacturers get this money. There are more than $1,000,000,000 in the banks of New England belonging to the men who toil. The State of Connecticut, little as it is and small as its population is, as I understand, as stated here on the floor the other day, has more than $300,000,000 in its savings-banks, largely the property of men who labor. They own their own houses and their own gardens. They are the most independent laborers in the world.

The trouble with the Senators who are advocating a departure from the economic plan of the American people is that they are unacquainted with the laborers of this country. They are not familiar with their habits, with their methods. That is the trouble.

Does the Senator suppose when money is going begging, as it is now in this country, that if the manufacturers were making such immense profits there would not be a rush to build up manufactories all over the country? When you can sell railroad bonds that bear 7 per cent. interest for 145 to 149, when that is considered good investment, does not the Senator suppose, if it could be shown that the manufacture of cotton goods or of woolen goods paid 10 per cent., everybody would put his money in it? Why not? Of course they would.

Mr. EUSTIS. Why should they not put their money into the brewery business, which is enormously profitable?

Mr. TELLER. There is a limit to the brewery business.

Mr. EUSTIS. And there is a limit to manufacturing.

Mr. TELLER. We have not reached the limit; that is the trouble. I know that some of the free-traders have asserted that the machinery of the United States was capable of producing in six months enough to supply all the wants of the people for a year. I tell you that in ten years on the coarser materials we have paid out for European products $2,237,000,000. If that had been paid to labor in this country, according to the lowest computation made even by free-traders who are honest and intelligent, it would amount to $1,700,000,000, or it would have given labor to four hundred and fifty thousand people year in and year out, at a dollar and a half a day for every day that they worked.

That is what we have been buying abroad, and the trouble with the Senator from Louisiana is that he wants to buy more abroad. He is not satisfied to send across the water $200,000,000 and more per year

to build up foreign manufacturers and support foreign labor, but he wants to open the door for all foreign productions and put all the American laborers where Mr. MILLS recently asserted they would be put, on an equality with European laborers.

Mr. EUSTIS. Will the Senator allow me a word?

Mr. TELLER. Certainly.

Mr. EUSTIS. I do not believe that protection protects American laborers.

Mr. TELLER. I know the Senator does not. That is where his fallacy lies.

Mr. EUSTIS. I did not expect the Senator to pass such hasty judgment on my convictions as that.

Mr. TELLER. I will reserve my judgment then.

Mr. EUSTIS. The reason why it does not is—perhaps the Senator is not acquainted with the statistics on the labor quesion——

Mr. TELLER. Possibly not.

Mr. EUSTIS. Does he know that in the city of Boston, which is a manufacturing city and the center of manufacturing interests, there are 89,783 more children of foreign parentage than of Massachusetts parentage? So long as your doors are open to the lowest pauper class of labor of Europe, whether it be the Russian Jew or the Polish Jew or the Scandinavian or the Irishman or the Englishman—and when I use the words "pauper labor" of course I do not intend to cast any reflection upon any class of people; I mean those people who in their own countries work for small wages—how can protection protect American laborers? How can it do so when in the city of Boston itself you find that enormous aggregation of foreigners? There is nothing to attract foreigners to Boston that I know of.

Mr. TELLER. I can tell you why.

Mr. EUSTIS. Certainly it is not their Sunday laws. There is nothing but the simple fact that that is a manufacturing city.

Mr. TELLER. That is it.

Mr. EUSTIS. And your doors are wide open, and they not only admit, but they invite that cheap labor from Europe; and I say it is absolutely incredible to suppose that such a fact is correct. When I repeat to the Senator that 89,783 children of Boston are children of foreign parentage in excess of the children of Massachusetts parents, I should like to have the Senator explain to me how it is that protection protects American artisans and American operatives. I will add that that does not include the enormous immigration from Canada into the State of Massachusetts.

Mr. TELLER. The trouble with the Senator from Louisiana is that he proposes to consider in his treatment of public affairs as Americans only those who were born on American soil.

Mr. EUSTIS. No, I do not.

Mr. TELLER. That may be possibly some of the old, lingering know-nothing notion of Louisiana, that several years ago was pretty powerful in that State.

Mr. EUSTIS. I deny that.

Mr. TELLER. I do not say he participates in it, but he treats the matter in that way. I, myself, treat every man who comes to this country and intends to make his home with us, and to cast his lot with us, as an American whenever he so decides. I consider the Irishman, the Englishman, the German, the Russian, the Scandinavian, or any man who comes here to make this his home, comes here by the invitation extended to him years and years ago before the Republican party came into power, comes here rightfully, and when he comes here he is entitled to the same consideration and the same protection as if he had been born here.

I consider all such persons entitled to the same protection that I am who boast of as long a line of American ancestry as any man in this country, having no foreign blood that has come into my family since the landing of the Mayflower. I say that they have the same right that I have, and when I legislate I legislate for them as I would for my own children; and I am astonished that the Senator should suggest to me that the fact that there are eighty-nine thousand children in Boston of foreign parentage has anything to do with the question. I will tell the Senator that in one of the Southern States of this Union 70 per cent. of the entire population are either foreign born or the children of foreign-born parents, a State where they have sent out one of their executive officers to seduce men from the Republican ranks upon the theory that free trade will give to the laboring men of Wisconsin more comfort, more happiness, than the protective system under which they have been prospering and the blessings of which he admits himself they came here to enjoy. Because protection raises the price of labor in this country, it undoubtedly induces immigration; but can any man say that we have suffered by immigration? It may be possible that the time has come or may come when it will be necessary to restrict immigration; but the 9,500,000 men who have come here since 1860 have added immensely to the strength and to the wealth of this nation. One of the great causes of our prosperity is that we have been able to absorb and take into our community and assimilate them with ourselves and furnish them employment. We have furnished nine and a half millions of men employment in twenty-seven years.

There is not in the annals of history any such remarkable thing as that. No other nation was ever able to receive such a great flow of people, provide them labor, provide them homes; and every one of them to-day is a hundred per cent. better off than when he landed on our shores, if he has been here any length of time, not only in money, but in manhood, in intelligence, and in virtue. That is what we have done for the people of the world, and we have taken good care of our own people at the same time.

The Senator says protection does not protect. Sir, it has protected us and protected nearly the whole world that wanted to come to us. We to-day pay more to labor than any other people in the world. We give to our laborers more comfort, more independence, a better position, than any people ever did in the history of the world. No man can point to any time, or any period, or any country where laborers were so well rewarded, so honestly treated, so respectable, so powerful, as they are here. To what do you attribute it if not to the system that has enabled every man who came here to get labor at remunerative wages? The Senator knows and everybody knows that the American laborer demands what no other laborer ever gets, comforts, pleasures, luxuries, leisure, opportunities for his children and for himself, such as no other laborers get anywhere else in the world.

Mr. PUGH. Will the Senator allow me to ask him if the employers of the laborers in this country do not make more money out of them than the employers anywhere else in the world?

Mr. TELLER. They do, Mr. President. This prosperity is not confined to one class of people in this country. That is the beauty of it. It pervades all classes of society. The distribution of wealth in this country is the most equal in the world. We have some very rich men, but we have millions and millions of men in this country who are comfortably off. We have, I repeat, the best fed and the best clothed and the best housed and the most independent labor on the face of the earth. What does the Senator propose, and what do the advocates of free trade propose? That we shall open the doors of this country not simply to the men to whom he objects, but to the products of men abroad? He complains that we open the door to every man who desires to make a home on American soil, but he is willing to open the door to the product of every man abroad who will stay at home and who will manufacture for us. He denies that the men should come here and should enter into our society, should pay part of our own taxes, and support our churches and schools and society, and become part and parcel of our nation. He would deny to them that privilege, but he would say "if you stay at home in Europe, live on coarse fare and wear coarse clothing, live as you have been accustomed to live, and work cheaply, we will buy your products." What will become of the American laborer then, whether he be foreign born or whether he be native?

Mr. President, protection does protect. You may argue, you may bring a Daniel Webster here against that proposition, but there is before the American people the patent fact, which can not be denied, that there is prosperity in all our borders; that we have grown in wealth, we have grown in intelligence, we have grown in moral worth and virtue under this system, and why should we want to abandon it? To-day we are the richest people in the world, the happiest people in the world, the freest people in the world, the most intelligent people in the world, the strongest and most powerful nation on the face of the globe; and all this has been accomplished within a hundred years. Why should we want to change a policy that has more than trebled our wealth in twenty-five years, notwithstanding the ravages and wastes of war? We have advanced from $14,000,000,000 to $62,000,000,000 within twenty-seven years, and we put into the field immense forces of men to destroy and not to create. We destroyed before we began this career of prosperity nearly one-half of the accumulated wealth of this country, and in twenty-seven years we have not only resuscitated ourselves, but we have added immense stores of wealth. I repeat all that would go for nothing to me, I do not care whether the wealth was piled mountain high, if with it there had not come other blessings greater than money—comfort, happiness to the laboring men, independence, strength, manhood, intelligence, and virtue.

I repeat that it has no parallel in the world, and yet the Senator tells me that protection does not protect. Where do you get this great and growing prosperity, this increasing prosperity, if it does not come from our system of political economy? The proof is in our prosperity.

Mr. EUSTIS. Mr. President, I did not intend to take part in this discussion, but I shall be perfectly frank with the Senator from Colorado.

The most extraordinary spectacle that I have witnessed in my legislative career is to hear a Senator who represents an agricultural and a non-manufacturing constituency make a protection speech. I can understand that Senators from New England, who represent the true interests of their constituencies, are in favor of the protective system existing to-day. It has inured to their benefit; it has increased their wealth; it has increased their prosperity. They may pretend to be paupers.

I was very much moved by the statement read by the Senator from Maine [Mr. FRYE] as to the very small dividends that one particular company in one particular year had been able to declare. I admire the political sagacity of the representatives of New England. If I were not afraid of using an offensive term, I would say that I also admire their audacity, their coolness, and their complacency under the circumstances, when since 1862 they have been taxing the remainder of the people of the United States for their own enrichment, hav-

ing succeeded in creating in this country a system so artificial that even a suggestion from the President of the United States or any high authority that there should be revision of that system in order to know whether the tax-payers of this country have not sufficiently long endured this oppressive and onerous taxation, creates an alarm. Who ever heard in the history of the civilized world where a monarch or a President announced to the people that it was time to reduce taxation, that that proclamation should not be received with universal rejoicing by the people who were taxed? Why, sir, it would be almost equal to the declaration of one of the crowned heads of Europe that the time for disarmament had arrived and that the monarch was to relieve the people who had been oppressed by these large standing armies. We know what gladness and what rejoicing such tidings would bring to every heart in the land; and yet in this country, I say, so artificial has the system become, with all its ramifications and with all its enticements, that, incredible to believe, we hear protection speeches from the Senator from Colorado telling his people that they ought to thank God that they have the opportunity of being taxed for everything that they wear, and everything that they use, and everything that they consume, in order to pour their earnings into the rich coffers of the wealthy capitalists of Boston and New England!

Does the Senator doubt, does he not know that that is a simple operation, taking place annually, that so long as this system of taxation exists in this country his people are the sufferers and the people of New England are the beneficiaries? Why, Mr. President, if old Tom Benton could rise from his grave and appear in this Chamber and hear a protection speech made by a Western Senator he would be glad to get back into that grave as soon as possible.

There is not an article that is used by a Western man for the purpose of making his cabin, of building his fence, of cultivating his farm, which that man is not taxed for the privilege of using, for the benefit of some New England manufacturer. And this, Mr. President, is the more incredible from the fact that when the Senator from Colorado, as he has often done with such power and eloquence, has appealed in this Chamber for financial measures of relief upon the silver question and other financial questions, he has found the Southern brigadier shoulder to shoulder with him upon those questions of affording relief to the great agricultural constituencies of this country, but he has found every time every New England Senator voting "No!" "No!" "No!" on those questions.

So it was when he asked that by legislation he should be protected from Chinese immigration. The Southern Democrats voted with him and his colleagues to exclude the Chinese, and until this last vote was given every New England Senator had always voted to allow the Chinese to overrun his constituents notwithstanding his protest.

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. Blaine was one of the greatest champions we ever had in this Chamber.

Mr. EUSTIS. He was an exception, of course. We all understand how disinterested his vote was.

Mr. MITCHELL. He was a Senator then.

Mr. EUSTIS. Therefore, Mr. President, I was glad to hear the Senator from Colorado give his reasons why he is a protectionist, because protection protects American labor. I wish that I could believe that. I know perfectly well that it will be impossible for a great many years to reduce duties on imports so that there shall be any conflict between American labor and European labor; that the difference between the wages in the two countries will have to be maintained on account of the great expenditures of the Government, and so on; but when I asked the Senator to explain to me why the protection system as a system protects American labor, he simply made an anti-Know-Nothing speech. I am not a Know-Nothing.

Mr. TELLER. No; I did not mean to say so.

Mr. EUSTIS. The reason why I asked the question was this: In the testimony taken before the Ford committee in New York City, which I regret has not been published yet for the information of the country, a large number of witnesses testified there, and the most startling evidence was given upon this question.

Now you take the poor American sewing girl. Certainly no persons in this country ought to excite or do excite as much sincere sympathy as that class of people. No matter whether a man is a free-trader or a protectionist, I say that that class of people are deserving of not only personal but legislative sympathy.

What was the evidence before that committee with reference to those poor women? Why, sir, they are engaged in making all sorts of underclothing. They are engaged in making shirts, they are engaged in sewing clothes, and so on, and they all testified that within the period of five years their wages had been decreased 50 per cent. Mark you, everything that they made was protected by law. There was a high duty on everything that they worked upon. Their wages were reduced 50 per cent., and what was worse, even at those starving wages one-half of them were not able to get employment at all, because the Polish and Russian Jews were landed by the thousands at Castle Garden, and because those Polish and Russian Jews, who can live on probably 10 or 15 cents a day, have taken the place of those unfortunate women. That is not my impression; it is not my opinion; it is the positive testimony of witnesses before a committee of Congress.

Mr. ALDRICH. If the Senator will allow me just a moment——

Mr. EUSTIS. Wait one moment. I am dealing with the Senator from Colorado. What I want him to explain is, how does protection protect, when, under your system of protection—which Heaven knows is high enough—such a condition of things can be brought about? In other words, although you may make a law prohibiting the introduction of pauper labor, what does that law amount to, or what does your protection amount to, if the moment these people land in this country the manufacturers can employ them and do employ them? That is the reason I give you those figures about Boston in Massachusetts. It was not to reflect on any class of people. It was merely to show that, in my judgment and according to my conception, protection *per se*, what you call protection, does not necessarily protect the American laborer, and now a new field of cheap labor has been discovered—I refer to Southern Russia and to Poland—what is to prevent these people from superseding and driving out of the factories the American operatives?

Mr. TELLER. If the Senator will allow me, I should like to ask him what remedy he proposes? Is it free trade?

Mr. EUSTIS. That is not the question. You tax the people of the United States under the pretext that you are accomplishing protection to the American laborer. I do not believe it. I am in favor of relieving them of that tax, because I do not believe that protection does protect. From what I have said the Senator seems to admit now that protection does not protect.

Mr. TELLER. No, I do not.

Mr. EUSTIS. Explain, then, to me how it does protect. That is what I want to know.

Mr. TELLER. The Senator seems to be very much astonished that a Senator, representing a Western State, a non-manufacturing State, should be a protectionist. Mr. President, I have not the same reason for being a protectionist that the Senator has for being a free-trader. He was brought up under free-trade influences and in a free-trade atmosphere undoubtedly, and so was I just exactly as he was. I am a protectionist from conviction. I represent the youngest State in the Union, a State composed of people from every State in the Union, and from every country under the sun where civilized men live. I doubt whether it would be possible to select any civilized country on the face of the earth that does not have its representative in Colorado.

At the coming election when they vote in November the number of men who were born on the soil of Colorado will be comparatively insignificant. They will be unnoticeable. The people of Colorado are people who understand their wants and their wishes, and they are people broad enough in their sympathies to look beyond their State lines. They recognize the fact that what is for the general good of the people is for their good; what promotes happiness all over the country promotes happiness in Colorado; what promotes wealth all over the country promotes wealth in Colorado.

I want to say to the Senator from Louisiana now that the issue will be made in Colorado on this tariff question as sharply as it will be made in Connecticut or in Massachusetts or in any State of the Union with a people that, I think, I can safely say on this floor have no superiors in the world for intelligence, for aggressiveness of character, for independence of thought, and they will give in proportion to their vote a greater majority in defense of American protection than any other State in the Union, Pennsylvania not excepted. They will give a bigger percentage, I repeat, than any State, and they will do it not upon the theory that it is solely for their benefit, but that it is for the benefit of all the country.

The Senator complains that there are sewing women in New York who do not get employment. Why, Mr. President, no country will be without something of that kind, but we have less of it than any other country. That is what I contend.

Mr. EUSTIS. Their wages have decreased 50 per cent.

Mr. TELLER. Their wages may have decreased in the city of New York owing to the influx of labor.

Mr. ALDRICH. Will the Senator from Colorado allow me to make one statement right here?

Mr. TELLER. Certainly.

Mr. ALDRICH. The Senator from Louisiana has referred to testimony taken before a House committee in New York. I want to refer to testimony taken before the Senate committee of which I am a member. The representatives of an association of people engaged in the manufacture of clothing appeared before the Senate Committee on Finance and stated that the rates of duty fixed by the present law upon clothing were entirely inadequate for their protection, and they asked us to increase the rates; and this statement was supplemented by a further statement that they had asked the committee of the House of Representatives to give them a hearing on the subject, which that committee refused to do. They stated to us that they believed this House committee thought the rates were altogether too high now. The House committee so stated, and these people attributed the condition of affairs to which the Senator from Louisiana is now alluding to the fact that the present duties upon clothing are inadequate.

Mr. EUSTIS. Who testified to that?

Mr. ALDRICH. Some ten or twelve different people.

Mr. EUSTIS. Operatives?

Mr. ALDRICH. Operatives and manufacturers of clothing.

Mr. EUSTIS. Of course if these people now work at present wages it is because your protection does not protect them.

Mr. ALDRICH. Nobody ever pretended that inadequate duties protected them.

Mr. EUSTIS. How much higher would you make them?

Mr. ALDRICH. We have added 5 cents per pound and 5 per cent. ad valorem. If we find that is insufficient we will make it higher, if we can.

Mr. EUSTIS. There is no doubt of that.

Mr. TELLER. I was about saying when interrupted by the Senator from Rhode Island that it was possible that an influx of a large number of laborers of a particular kind in a city may disturb for a time the course of trade; but in a country like ours, where labor is well rewarded, it always, like water, seeks its level, and if it is dammed up in New York City too much, it will flow off into other sections of the country in a little while, and we shall have a uniform rate.

I admit that there are isolated cases; but what will the Senator say to me if I tell him of the want and the destitution and the distress in free-trade England? Is the Senator aware that one-fifth of the population of Great Britain in one single year have received assistance from public charity? Is he aware that a country having half the population, or about that, of ours has eight times as many paupers and poor all the time as we have? It is a startling statement to be made. Is he aware of the fact that every fifth man who dies in the city of London goes to a grave paid for by the public authorities? Is he aware that a distinguished Englishman recently declared that one-fifth of the whole population were toeing the line of pauperism? Did he hear the statement made here by the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. SPOONER] the other day, taken from the official publications of Great Britain? If he did not, I commend him to look at a later report, to look at a report that came out in June, of the royal commission now in session, where they report as to the destitution, the poverty, and the lack of business. Let him look at that report and go over it and see the different societies that testify that they are supporting their poor in Great Britain, their associates who are out of labor—not paupers, but members of associations. The proof before that commission was, as the Senator from Wisconsin stated the other day, that one society had paid $100,000 in a year to keep its members who were unable to get work. It was in proof before that commission that some of these societies had been compelled to double their rates; it was in proof that a number of the societies had been compelled to disband because so many of their members were out of employment, and they were absolutely compelled to surrender and to cease to make any efforts to protect their associates who could not get labor.

Does the Senator from Louisiana believe that the poor sewing-women of New York will get more labor when he puts them in competition with all the world? They are in competition now only with Americans practically, or would be if this duty was what it ought to be. When they are put in competition with Americans they find it sharp and difficult to live. The Senator says, put them in competition with all the world. Will that cure the evil? How absurd, Mr. President. I do not mean to be offensive when I say "absurd," but I mean to say that can not possibly relieve the difficulty of which the Senator complains.

Mr. President, the Senator inquires how much you would raise the duty. I should like to tell the Senator how much I would raise the duty. I would start by a duty on the importation of everything that could be made in this country. That is protection. I would take my chances that the manufacturers would get no more than fair profits. When money can be borrowed in the markets of New York, as it can to-day, for 2 per cent. per annum, I would risk that they would not make any great amount of money by the manufacture of woolens, or cotton cloths, or any other article. When the manufactories can be built and a profit returned of 4 or 5 per cent. to men who are now willing and glad to get 2 per cent. on their money, they do not rush to manufacturing. Five per cent. is regarded as a profitable and fair investment anywhere now in this country.

There was a time when we did not have money and when a tariff so high as to be prohibitory might have been used by the few manufacturers to extort from the people. There is no danger of that now. I would give this $2,237,000,000 of money that I spoke about that has gone out of the country in ten years and divide it up, and I would divide it amongst American laborers who get 72 per cent. of it. I would give the Government 5 per cent. more, for that is the rate of taxation of the whole, and then I would let the capitalists have the balance, and I think it would be better for the country than to send it abroad to support foreign laborers and foreign capitalists.

Mr. EUSTIS. Does the Senator know the profit of the manufacturer on the suit of clothes the Senator himself now wears?

Mr. TELLER. The Senator inquires if I know how much profit the manufacturer makes on the suit of clothes I have on. I do not. I simply know that the man who made this suit of clothes got at least three times as much as he would in almost any other country in the world, and in any other country save Great Britain. That I know. I know that the man who raised the sheep off whose back the wool came that made the coat I have on was protected in his industry. I know that the men who sheared the sheep and the men who carded the wool and who spun it and who wove it, all got from 50 to 100 per cent. more than they get in other countries where they have cheap clothes. I do not want to repeat a trite thing, but cheapness is not the main thing; cheapness is not the great desideratum of life.

What good does it do to have cheap clothes if you do not have the money to buy them? What good is it to the laborer if he can say, "I can buy the supplies of my family for a week for a dollar, but I have not a nickel?" He will not have the nickel unless he has labor. I do not want cheap goods at the expense of cheap labor in this country, and there is where we part with our brethren from the South. They have got cheap labor. They want cheap labor, and I have no doubt that very many men in the North want cheap labor. I have no doubt that very many of the manufacturers want cheap labor, but it is our duty to see that they do not get it at the expense of the laboring men of this country.

Mr. COCKRELL. Mr. President——

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. Will the Senator from Missouri yield while the Chair lays before the Senate a joint resolution from the House of Representatives?

Mr. COCKRELL. Certainly.

PAY OF EMPLOYÉS.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The Chair will lay before the Senate a joint resolution from the House of Representatives, the title of which will be read.

The joint resolution (H. Res. 232) making appropriations to enable the Secretary of the Senate and Clerk of the House of Representatives to pay session employés of the Senate and House for the full month of October, was read twice by it title.

Mr. ALLISON. I ask that that may be immediately considered.

By unanimous consent, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the joint resolution.

The joint resolution was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The Chair lays before the Senate another joint resolution from the House of Representatives, which will be read by its title.

The joint resolution (H. Res. 231) authorizing the Secretary of the Senate and Clerk of the House of Representatives to pay to the officers and employés of the Senate and House of Representatives, borne on the annual rolls, their respective salaries for the month of October on the 20th day of said month was read twice by its title.

Mr. ALLISON. I ask that that joint resolution may be considered at this time.

By unanimous consent, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the joint resolution.

The joint resolution was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

REVENUE LAWS.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 9051) to reduce taxation and simplify the laws in relation to the collection of the revenue.

Mr. COCKRELL. Mr. President, I confess I am very much astonished at the onslaught that has been made by the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. ALDRICH] upon the Chief of the Bureau of Statistics touching the tables presented to the Senate by my colleague [Mr. VEST], now absent, and printed in the RECORD of October 16.

I happen to know something about those tables. Before the Senate bill was reported I had a table prepared in the Bureau of Statistics, having made out myself the headings so as to show the information I desired. I hold the table in my hand now. It shows opposite each schedule the value of merchandise dutiable under the present law, the value of merchandise dutiable under the House bill, and the rates of duties, etc.

About the time that was completed the Senate bill was reported, and I requested that it should be included in the statement, so that we should have a statement showing the value of the dutiable merchandise imported in 1887 under the existing law, the value of that same merchandise that was dutiable under the House bill, then the value that was dutiable under the Senate bill, then the average ad valorem rate of duty under the existing law on the whole importation, and then the average ad valorem rate of duty under the existing law on the articles that were dutiable under the House bill, and also upon the articles dutiable under the Senate bill, and then the average ad valorem rate of duty with the amount on the free-list.

I requested also that the table "woolens, cotton, flax, hemp, iron, and steel," should be made out for a special purpose. It was made out and furnished to me before it was ever in print. These tables were made by Mr. Emil J. Keferstein, who was born in Prussia and was appointed in the civil service of the Government from the District of Columbia.

I have not gone further back than 1879 to ascertain the date of his appointment. His name appears in the Official Register of the Treasury Department for 1879. He has been there ever since that time. He made this table as all tables are made. As to the beginning of it, I gave him the headings or points that I wanted, and he went to his house and made it, and it is a correct table, and the figures are correct,

except that there are one or two errors in the calculations and one error that he pointed out and one that he did not point out.

Mr. ALDRICH. I have no doubt there are many that have not been pointed out.

Mr. COCKRELL. No, there are not. The Senator criticises in regard to wood and woodenware. He says that the average ad valorem rates of duty are under the present law 18 per cent., under the House bill at the House rates 29.32 per cent., and under the Senate substitute at the Senate rates 18.88 per cent. There is no trouble about that. There is no conflict there, and there is no error. There it is, a plain mathematical proposition.

Mr. ALDRICH. I did not say there was any error.

Mr. COCKRELL. You criticised that, and that was one of the matters you pointed out as a humbug in the figures to show that there was nothing in them, and you tried to create the impression that the figures were wrong.

Mr. ALDRICH. I did not. I stated distinctly that the figures were right, but that the deductions that were drawn from them were wrong.

Mr. COCKRELL. The deductions are not wrong. The first column under the present law is the average ad valorem rate of duty upon all wooden wares dutiable under the present law, and that is 18 per cent. The House bill puts a large number of those articles dutiable under the present law on the free-list to the value of $6,679,202.12. There is the amount of existing dutiable merchandise put on the free-list.

Now take the merchandise that is left and apply the existing rates to it, and it makes the 31 per cent., because the dutiable articles having the highest rates of duty are left on by the House bill. Lumber is taken off and other articles, and that makes it. Now, then, you apply the House bill rates of duty to those articles now dutiable and still left on the dutiable-list by the House bill, and the average is 29.32 per cent. It is a considerable reduction.

Now take the Senate substitute. I have not compared the articles, but the same rate of duty exists under the Senate bill on the dutiable articles that exists under the present law. There is no change in that respect, but the Senate rates increase the duties to 18.88 per cent., and the Senate puts nothing on the free-list from that schedule.

So you may take any of the other schedules, and the figures are correct and are made upon a correct basis. They show just what they pretend to show and nothing else, and there is no misrepresentation about them, and any one who will look at them in a fair and candid light can see that there was no intention in the preparation of these figures to mislead or deceive anybody, but to get at the truth, and they do give the truth.

That table shows in the first column the dutiable merchandise under the present law imported in 1887 belonging to each schedule. That is not disputed, is it? In the next column it shows the value of the dutiable merchandise under the House bill which was imported in 1887. In the next column it shows the value of the merchandise dutiable under the Senate bill imported in 1887.

Now, what is the basis? The basis is that all these laws were in existence and applicable to the importations of 1887. You may say that is an incorrect basis. It is the only kind of a basis that you have to go upon. It is the only basis by which you can compare a law that exists or has existed with one that you propose. It may not be in every respect mathematically correct. Why? Because the Senate substitute proposes confusion. You have been afraid yourselves to make a calculation upon it. You take an article dutiable in 1887 at a specific rate and you make an additional ad valorem rate.

Nobody but your manufacturers, who are interested in this bill, who have caused it to be framed in the way it has, know the exact values of these articles upon which you lay a specific duty. The Government has not got them, and they have not been imported by values. They have been imported as specific articles, and the Government has taxed them accordingly under the existing law. Now you put on a compound duty. You not only maintain and retain the specific duty, but you add an ad valorem duty besides. The Government has nothing there by which it can tell exactly what would be the prices of these articles, and consequently can make no calculation, and the notes to this table explain this.

Mr. ALDRICH. I will say to the Senator from Missouri, to avoid any misapprehension on his part, that there is not a case of that kind in this bill, and he can not find one.

Mr. COCKRELL. These notes explain exactly how this table was made. There was no deception and there is none in it and it is correct, with very few mistakes, which have been made, probably, some in printing and some in other ways; but not nearly as many as in the statement which the committee have submitted.

The next column is duties collected on merchandise dutiable under the present law. There is the amount of duties paid. How do you tell what would be collected under the House bill and under the Senate bill? You take the rates proposed in the Senate bill and take the rates in the House bill and apply them to the merchandise imported in 1887. You take the rates proposed in the Senate bill and apply them the best way you can. There is confusion there in the rates, as I have said, and for that reason there may be inaccuracies in getting at either the rates of duty where compound or the value of the article. But these figures are based upon that and are correct.

Then we take the House bill and the duties under that. Take the present law, at the present rates, then under the House bill, and then the Senate substitute at present rates. Now, we have all the figures upon which you can take the percentages.

Mr. MITCHELL. May I ask the Senator a question?

Mr. COCKRELL. Certainly.

Mr. MITCHELL. Does your table show the difference in the percentage of the duty between that now levied under existing law and that levied by the House bill? Does your table show that?

Mr. COCKRELL. Certainly.

Mr. MITCHELL. What is the difference, according to your table?

Mr. COCKRELL. They are all in there.

Mr. MITCHELL. The Senator can state.

Mr. COCKRELL. No, I can not, without sitting down and making a calculation.

Mr. MITCHELL. You can not state?

Mr. COCKRELL. The rates are all given, and it is supposed any intelligent man can add or subtract, as the case may be.

Mr. MITCHELL. Can you or not now from your table state the difference in the per cent. of duty between the present duties under existing law and the Mills bill?

Mr. COCKRELL. You mean the total of the bill?

Mr. MITCHELL. Yes. What is the difference?

Mr. COCKRELL. I can tell you. You take the present law applied to the imports of 1887, and the average ad valorem rates of duty were 47.10 per cent.

Mr. MITCHELL. Under what law?

Mr. COCKRELL. Under the present law.

Mr. MITCHELL. The existing law?

Mr. COCKRELL. Wait a moment. I will give you the figures. You take, then, the articles dutiable under the existing law and also the articles dutiable under the House bill and apply the present law to those articles, and the average ad valorem rates of duty are 50.60 per cent. Now, you take the House bill and apply it to the same articles, and they are 42.77 per cent.

Mr. MITCHELL. But take all the articles.

Mr. COCKRELL. That is all there is.

Mr. MITCHELL. Take all the articles that are now subject to duty under existing law, and what is the difference between the per cent. of duty on those articles and the per cent. of duty on all those articles under the House bill?

Mr. COCKRELL. I never made that calculation, because there is $70,443,012.64 placed upon the free-list under the House bill.

Mr. MITCHELL. In other words——

Mr. COCKRELL. Wait a moment. I apply the average ad valorem rates to the articles dutiable under the existing law and the House bill.

Mr. MITCHELL. Is it not the fact, then, that in all the statements made in the Senate on the other side of the Chamber, to the effect that the difference is only very slight between the duties under the Mills bill and under the existing law, you leave out of consideration the free-list?

Mr. COCKRELL. Not at all. I have here the free-list; 28.7 per cent. is the present average rate on that. Here are the figures for that, and any man can see them; $70,443,012.64 of dutiable merchandise under the existing law are placed on the free-list by the House bill, and the present average ad valorem rates on those articles are 28.7 per cent. As a matter of course, you put them in and it would reduce and make it applicable to the others, which would make a less average all around. There is no doubt about that. But they are taken off the dutiable-list and put on the free-list. The only controversy is, shall they go on the free-list? That is the question of the hour.

Then what are the duties levied by the House bill on the other articles that are dutiable under the present law? That is the controversy. We have nothing to do with what has gone on the free-list. We do not propose to retain them on any average ad valorem rates. We put them on the free-list and take them out of the dutiable list entirely. The controversy is as to whether they shall go on the free-list. That is the point.

Then what is the controversy as to the other matter? The controversy is as to the reduction of duties upon those articles. We say that taking the goods imported in 1887 and dutiable under the present law and applying the House bill to them, the average ad valorem rates would be 42.77 per cent. We say apply the present law and it will be 50.60 per cent.

Mr. ALLISON. I would like to have the Senator state what his investigation shows the average ad valorem under the Senate substitute to be?

Mr. COCKRELL. I have stated that it would be 42.75 per cent.

Mr. ALLISON. Just the same practically.

Mr. COCKRELL. Practically the same. There is .02 per cent. difference only.

Mr. ALLISON. So that the bills are practically the same thing?

Mr. COCKRELL. Certainly. There is no doubt about that. The figures here show it. There is no concealment about it. You have made enormous reductions on some articles, but you have made large increases on others.

Now, Mr. President, I want to make the statement in regard to these tables that they are correct and the percentages are correct and the basis of the calculation is correct, and it is the only kind of a calculation that you or anybody else can make. That is all there is about it.

In regard to the second table, that is part of the same calculation. While this first table was made out just as it was finished and furnished to be copied by Mr. Keferstein and his assistants, who were detailed for that purpose—and whom I never saw until they commenced working on these tables—under no instructions, who were asked for nothing, and they made them out just as they would have made them out for the Senator from Rhode Island or the Senator from Iowa, and I suppose both those Senators know these employés better than I do. I never saw them before we commenced on this work that I have any knowledge of. Mr. Keferstein has been employed there ever since 1879.

The other table, as to the percentages, is on page 10448 of the RECORD, and was also submitted by my colleague. When that was furnished to me I ran over the figures myself to see that the calculations were correct, and to see the principle upon which the figures were made, the basis on which the percentages were derived. I found that on yarns, under the schedule of "woolens," according to my calculations and the figures which I had, the percentage in the last column under the House bill ought to have been 184.57 instead of 186. That is the way I made the division. The other figures were correct.

I have been furnished by the chief of the Bureau of Statistics a letter, which gives an explanation of the basis upon which these figures were made and which was furnished to the Senator from Rhode Island, and which he did not take the liberty of reading. This comes from the Bureau of Statistics. This is a copy of the explanation that was furnished to the Senator from Rhode Island, and I will now read it.

Notes explanatory of bureau table of October 11, 1886, *showing the operations under the present tariff laws, under House bill* 9051, *and under the Senate substitute on importations of certain manufactured articles.*

[Prepared in reply to inquiries by Hon. N. W. Aldrich, of the Committee on Finance, United States Senate.]

	Quantity.	Value.	Value per unit.
1. Woolen cloths:	*Pounds.*		
Imported	1,117,564.40	$713,315.94	$0.638
	7,689,699.02	9,309,054.73	1.24
Total	8,807,263.42	10,022,370.67	1.138

Paragraph 354, Schedule K, Senate substitute, provides the following rates of duty on woolen cloths valued at above 60 cents per pound, 40 cents per pound plus 40 per cent. ad valorem.

That is paragraph 354, Schedule K, which I read:

354. Woolen cloths, woolen shawls, and all manufactures of wool of every description, made wholly or in part of wool, worsted, the hair of the goat, alpaca, or other animals, not specially enumerated or provided for in this act, valued at not exceeding 40 cents per pound, 35 cents per pound, and in addition thereto 35 per cent. ad valorem; valued at above 40 cents per pound, and not exceeding 60 cents per pound, 35 cents per pound and 40 per cent. ad valorem; valued at above 60 cents per pound, 40 cents per pound, and in addition thereto 40 per cent. ad valorem.

The same applies in regard to flannels, etc.

All of the above being over 60 cents per pound, the amount of estimated duty in the table of October 11,* is placed at	$7,531,853.64
House bill 9051 provides 40 per cent. ad valorem, which computes on above	4,008,948.26
Showing excess under Senate substitute as	3,522,905.38

There is no record of the importation of any woolen cloths valued at less than 60 cents per pound.

Mr. ALDRICH. Does the Senator think that a fair statement, or does he understand that the Chief of the Bureau of Statistics meant to be understood that there were no importations of any woolen goods below 60 cents a pound?

Mr. COCKRELL. The Chief of the Bureau of Statistics, as the Senator well knows, can have no personal knowledge of all these details of business; no human being can; he acts upon what his subordinates in the office furnish him after they have gone through with all these details. He says that there is no record in his office of the importation of any woolen cloths valued at less than 60 cents per pound.

Mr. ALDRICH. I only speak of the chief of the bureau as the responsible head of the office. What I asked the Senator is whether he himself believes that is a fair statement. Here are the importations of woolen goods valued at below 80 cents a pound under the classification of the present law.

Mr. COCKRELL. We have nothing to do with that. This is 60 cents a pound.

Mr LDRICH. Then the Senator does not understand the statement from which he is reading. The present law makes a division line at 80 cents a pound, and all goods valued below 80 cents a pound are subject to a rate of duty of 35 cents a pound and 35 per cent. ad valorem, and the average value of the goods imported in 1887 was 63 cents and a fraction a pound. The Chief of the Bureau of Statistics says, as there is no record in his office of any below 60 cents a pound, he therefore assumes that there were no importations below 60 cents a pound, and he puts them all at the higher rate. I say that statement or computation was made in the most dense ignorance or else it was purposely made unfairly.

Mr. COCKRELL. I can say that the statement was made by the gentleman I have referred to, and was made from the information he had that was furnished to that bureau, and I have no reason to believe, and do not believe, that he had any interest, directly or indirectly, or remotely, to make any misstatement about it, because he knew the statement would be relied upon; he knew it would be quoted here; he knew it would be subject to criticism, and there could be no motive in the world for any misrepresentation.

Mr. ALDRICH. It must be apparent to the Senator from Missouri, if it was not to this clerk that he speaks of in the bureau, that there were large quantities of woolen goods imported in 1887, upon which there was a value of less than 60 cents a pound placed.

Mr. COCKRELL. I am not familiar with that question, I say frankly, and I have not given any opinion on it. I am simply going by the statement here. The letter of the Chief of the Bureau of Statistics proceeds:

2. Brown and bleached linens, etc.
3. Steel, in forms not specified.

The titles used in bureau table of October 11, 1888, "Brown and bleached linens, etc.," and "Steel, in forms not specified," are not intended to apply to any special class of articles enumerated in Senate substitute, but are abbreviations of classes of articles well known in the publications of this bureau, namely:

"Brown and bleached linens, etc.," stands for brown and bleached linens, ducks, canvas, paddings, cot-bottoms, diapers, crash, huckabacks, handkerchiefs, and lawns, of flax, jute, or hemp, or of which flax, jute, or hemp shall be the component material of chief value.

"Steel, in forms not specified," stands for steel ingots, cogged ingots, blooms and slabs, by whatever process made; die blocks or blanks; billets and bars, and tapered or beveled bars; steamer, crank, and other shafts; shafting; wrist or crank pins; connecting rods and piston rods; pressed, sheaved, or stamped shapes; saw-plates, wholly or partially manufactured; hammer molds or swaged steel; gun-barrel molds, not in bars; alloys used as substitutes for steel tools; all descriptions and shapes of dry-sand, loam, or iron-molded steel castings; sheets and plates not specially enumerated or provided for; steel in all forms and shapes not specially enumerated or provided for.

The proviso of paragraph 335, Schedule J, Senate substitute, for "brown and bleached linen cloth containing not less than one hundred threads to the square inch, counting the warp and filling," is not contained in the present law, and for this reason no record exists of the importations of this class of linens. All brown and bleached linens were, therefore, with the other commodities named, classed as dutiable under the provisions of paragraph 333, Schedule J, Senate substitute.

Mr. ALDRICH. If the Senator will pardon me——

Mr. COCKRELL. Let me read this paragraph. I read paragraph 333:

333. All manufactures of flax, hemp, jute, or other vegetable fiber, except cotton, or of which flax, hemp, jute, or other vegetable fiber, except cotton, is the component material of chief value, not specially enumerated or provided for in this act, valued at 5 cents per pound or less, 2 cents per pound; valued above 5 cents per pound, 40 per cent. ad valorem.

Mr. ALDRICH. That paragraph does not apply to the articles under consideration at all.

Mr. COCKRELL. Paragraph 335 is as follows:

335. Brown and bleached linen cloth containing not less than one hundred threads to the square inch, counting the warp and filling, 35 per cent. ad valorem.

He says that they have no importations under this paragraph.

Mr. ALDRICH. He does not say they have any importations.

Mr. COCKRELL. He does not say they have any importations, but they have no description of that kind in the present law, and therefore the imported merchandise that may be included in that paragraph is not designated in the present importations. Then he says that he places them under the paragraph which I read, paragraph 333.

Mr. ALDRICH. Before the Senator leaves that point I wish to suggest to him the effect of that. The Chief of the Bureau of Statistics not having the information upon which he can base an intelligent judgment as to how much of one or the other of these articles would be imported, places them all at the highest rate. That is what I find fault with in this statement. If the Chief of the Bureau of Statistics had appended to the table which the Senator from Missouri presented a statement that it was simply a guess as to how much of one kind or how much of another was imported, if he had ever made the partial explanation which he makes in the letter the Senator is now reading, I should have had no occasion to rise in my seat and find fault with that officer. But he sends it here as though it were positive information based upon facts, and he now says that he knows nothing about it himself, and not knowing anything about it he has placed the whole of these importations at the highest rate of duty, which is certainly manifestly unfair.

Mr. COCKRELL. The Chief of the Bureau of Statistics accompanied these tables with a full explanation, for which the Senator will not give him credit. I read from the notes printed here in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, page 10449. He says:

Notes: This table shows a deficiency of $380,050.37 in the value of, and $220,791.41 in the duty collected on dutiable merchandise in 1887, as reported in the

* Prepared by this bureau in regard to the present tariff law, House bill, and proposed Senate substitute.

annual report of the Chief of the Bureau of Statistics. This difference is principally due to the omission from this table of dutiable merchandise ($177,909.59) withdrawn free of duty from warehouse and of merchandise not dutiable under any of the schedules. If these amounts had been included, the average ad valorem rate of duty under the present laws would be 47.10 instead of 47.07 per cent.

The interpretation of House bill 9051 is that of the Committee on Ways and Means, House of Representatives, as published by the clerk of that committee, and of the Senate substitute that of the Senate subcommittee on tariff.

The values and duties under both House bill and Senate substitute are computed on the importation of 1887, without speculating upon any possible increase or decrease consequent upon a decrease or increase in the rates of duty imposed by the proposed bills. The computations have been made as accurate as practicable, but in many cases under the Senate substitute a calculation was made impossible by the change from an ad volorem to a specific rate of duty. In such cases no account has been taken of the proposed change.

WM. F. SWITZLER,
Chief of Bureau.

TREASURY DEPARTMENT,
Bureau of Statistics, October 9, 1888.

Mr. ALDRICH. The last statement the Senator read shows conclusively that the chief of the bureau did not intend to be understood as the Senator now understands him in regard to his explanation. He says where these changes have been made no account has been taken of them. That is why I find fault with him, that where a change was made so that neither the bureau nor anybody else could tell the exact provision of law, he sends that statement here as though no change had been made, and as though he had accurate information on which to base it, and accompanies it by no explanation and no statement that it was simply an estimate.

Mr. COCKRELL. I proceed to read the explanation of the Chief of the Bureau of Statistics. He says:

The amounts of duty carried out in bureau table of October 11, as estimated under House bill and Senate substitute, are correct, but the excess of Senate bill printed as $2,138,412.78 should read $2,038,412.78—per cent., 60.

Which is an excess, according to this table, of just $100,000, and the increased percentage is reduced to 60 instead of 62.94.

4. Attention is called to a typographical or other error on page 107 of the volume entitled "Comparison of Tariff Schedule, etc., prepared under the direction of the Senate Subcommittee on Tariff." The quantity of steel rails dutiable under the present law at $17 per ton (on first line of page 107) reads 40,509.863 tons instead of 49,509.863 tons.

That is, that much dutiable was imported in 1887. The correction of this error will change it to 49,509.863, only an error of 9,000 tons in the amount of the dutiable importation of steel rails in 1887.

The correction of this error will change the bureau table of October 11 on line "railway bars" to read—

This is not the fault of the bureau in getting the column opposite "railway bars" wrong. It was the fault of the committee that those figures were made incorrectly.

Mr. ALDRICH. We are not engaged in carrying on a bureau of statistics.

Mr. COCKRELL. That is all very true; but the calculation was made upon your own figures.

Mr. ALDRICH. So far as railway bars are concerned.

Mr. COCKRELL. As to railway bars, and you made a mistake.

The correction of this error will change the bureau table of October 11, on line "railway bars," to read—

	Amount.	Per cent.
Duties collected—		
Under House bill	$545,853.04	54.57
Under Senate bill	777,672.29	77.74
Excess of duties—		
Over present laws	65,675.20	7.79
Over Senate bill	231,819.25	42.47

W. F. SWITZLER, *Chief of Bureau.*

TREASURY DEPARTMENT,
Bureau of Statistics, October 15, 1888.

I desire to state that I made that correction yesterday. I discovered it yesterday and I made that correction in this table of percentages as it was published in my remarks.

Mr. ALLISON. It was undoubtedly an error in printing, making an 0 instead of a 9.

Mr. COCKRELL. I desired simply to make these statements. The Senator complains of the percentages on woolen cloths. There is an increase and a decrease. So it is in cotton cloths. That necessarily changes the percentages; but I insist that these figures are correct, based upon the best interpretation that could be given to the law.

INVESTIGATIONS BY FINANCE COMMITTEE.

Mr. ALLISON. I ask unanimous consent to offer a resolution for present consideration.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The resolution will be read.

The Chief Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Finance be authorized and directed to continue, during the recess of Congress, the investigation of such revenue matters, including House bill 9051, as have been referred to it by resolutions of the Senate, subject to the authority conferred by said resolutions.

Mr. ALLISON. I will say briefly——

Mr. COCKRELL. Let that go over until to-morrow. I will see the Senator about it.

Mr. ALLISON. If the Senator will allow me——

Mr. COCKRELL. Oh, certainly. Make your explanation.

Mr. ALLISON. My explanation is simply this. There are some matters that the Committee on Finance desire to investigate further respecting trusts. Two or three investigations we could not complete before reporting the bill, and that is one of them. Then the plate-printing matter is only half finished. The subcommittee hope to take testimony before we convene here again. The resolution is for the purpose of authorizing these two things to be done.

Mr. COCKRELL. Let it come up in the morning. I will see the Senator and talk with him about it.

Mr. ALLISON. Very well.

Mr. COCKRELL. I wanted to ask the Senator about the testimony that has been taken. I have been furnished with one volume. Will there be another volume out soon?

Mr. ALLISON. I think the whole is in print now.

Mr. ALDRICH. Two volumes are now ready.

Mr. ALLISON. It will all be ready for distribution in a very short time, probably to-morrow.

Mr. COCKRELL. I am exceedingly anxious to get it so as to send it to the public bindery to have it bound.

Mr. ALDRICH. It is in the folding-room of the Senate to-day.

Mr. ALLISON. I can assure the Senator that he will get it to-day or to-morrow.

Mr. COCKRELL. The resolution goes over.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The Senator from Missouri objects to the present consideration of the resolution. It lies over under the rules.

Mr. ALLISON. I move that the Senate adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 55 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until to-morrow, Friday, October 19, 1888, at 12 o'clock m.

CONFIRMATIONS.

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate October 12, 1888.

PROMOTIONS IN THE NAVY.

Medical Inspector Michael Bradley, a resident of Pennsylvania, to be a medical director in the Navy, from the 19th of June, 1888.

Surg. Theoron Woolverton, a resident of New York, to be a medical inspector in the Navy from the 19th of June, 1888.

Passed Asst. Surg. Howard Wells, a resident of Pennsylvania, to be a surgeon in the Navy from the 19th of June, 1888.

Medical Inspector Adrian Hudson, a resident of the District of Columbia, to be a medical director in the Navy from the 10th of July, 1888.

Surg. Charles H. White, a resident of Massachusetts, to be a medical inspector in the Navy from the 10th of July, 1888.

Passed Asst. Surg. James H. Gaines, a resident of Maryland, to be a surgeon in the Navy from the 10th of July, 1888.

Medical Inspector Newton L. Bates, a resident of New York, to be a medical director in the Navy from the 1st of September, 1888.

Surg. George W. Woods, a resident of California, to be a medical inspector in the Navy from the 1st of September, 1888.

Passed Asst. Surg. Daniel N. Bertolette, a resident of Pennsylvania, to be a surgeon in the Navy from the 1st of September, 1888.

Surg. Frank L. DuBois, a resident of Pennsylvania, to be a medical inspector in the Navy from the 15th of September, 1888.

Passed Asst. Surg. Ezra Z. Derr, a resident of Maryland, to be a surgeon in the Navy from the 15th of September, 1888.

Surg. George H. Cooke, a resident of Pennsylvania, to be a medical inspector in the Navy from the 15th of September, 1888.

Passed Assist. Surg. Frank B. Stephenson, a resident of Massachusetts, to be a surgeon in the Navy from the 15th of September, 1888.

Paymaster George A. Lyon, a resident of Pennsylvania, to be a pay inspector in the Navy from the 15th of September, 1888.

Passed Assistant Paymaster John W. Jordan, a resident of Florida, to be a paymaster in the Navy from the 19th of June, 1888.

Assistant Paymaster R. T. Mason Ball, a resident of Virginia, to be a passed assistant paymaster in the Navy from the 19th of June, 1888.

Lieut. Commander John K. Winn, a resident of Massachusetts, to be a commander in the Navy from the 31st of March, 1888.

Lieut. Clifford H. West, a resident of New York, to be a lieutenant-commander in the Navy from the 31st of March, 1888.

Lieut. Frank J. Milligan, junior grade, a resident of Tennessee, to be a lieutenant in the Navy from the 31st of March, 1888.

Ensign Philip V. Lansdale, a resident of Maryland, to be a lieutenant, junior grade, in the Navy from the 31st of March, 1888.

Lieut. John P. Merrell, a resident of Michigan, to be a lieutenant-commander in the Navy from the 28th of May, 1888.

Lieut. Albon C. Hodgson, junior grade, a resident of Georgia, to be a lieutenant in the Navy from the 28th of May, 1888.

Ensign Horace W. Harrison, a resident of the District of Columbia, to be a lieutenant, junior grade, in the Navy from the 22d of May, 1888.

Ensign William S. Benson, a resident of Georgia, to be a lieutenant, junior grade, in the Navy from the 28th of May, 1888.

Lieut. James M. Helm, junior grade, a resident of Tennessee, to be a lieutenant in the Navy from the 1st of June, 1888.

Ensign William V. Bronaugh, a resident of Kentucky, to be a lieutenant, junior grade, in the Navy from the 1st of June, 1888.

Lieut. Joseph G. Eaton, a resident of Massachusetts, to be a lieutenant-commander in the Navy from the 19th of June, 1888.

Lieut. William G. Cutler, junior grade, a resident of Nevada, to be a lieutenant in the Navy from the 19th of June, 1888.

Ensign Frank M. Bostwick, a resident of Wisconsin, to be a lieutenant, junior grade, in the Navy from the 19th of June, 1888.

Lieut. Cameron McR. Winslow, a resident of Massachusetts, to be a lieutenant, junior grade, in the Navy from the 1st of July, 1888.

Ensign Walter M. Constant, a resident of Indiana, to be a lieutenant, junior grade, in the Navy from the 1st of July, 1888.

Lieut. Charles Laird, a resident of Ohio, to be a lieutenant, junior grade, in the Navy from the 28th of September, 1888.

Ensign James H. Oliver, a resident of Georgia, to be a lieutenant, junior grade, in the Navy from the 28th of September, 1888.

Passed Assistant Engineer George E. Tower, a resident of New York, to be a chief engineer in the Navy from the 30th of June, 1887.

Passed Assistant Engineer Hugh H. Cline, a resident of Maryland, to be a chief engineer in the Navy from the 2d of December, 1887.

Assistant Engineer Theodore F. Burgdorff, a resident of New Jersey, to be a passed assistant engineer in the Navy from the 22d of June, 1886.

Assistant Engineer William R. King, a resident of Maryland, to be a passed assistant engineer in the Navy from the 17th of March, 1887.

Assistant Engineer Frank H. Eldridge, a resident of Ohio, to be a passed assistant engineer in the Navy from the 30th of June, 1887.

Assistant Engineer Charles C. Kleckner, a resident of Pennsylvania, to be a passed assistant engineer in the Navy from the 30th of June, 1887.

Assistant Engineer Edgar T. Warburton, a resident of Pennsylvania, to be a passed assistant engineer in the Navy from the 1st of July, 1887.

Assistant Engineer William B. Dunning, a resident of New York, to be a passed assistant engineer in the Navy from the 2d of December, 1887.

Assistant Engineer Robert I. Reid, a resident of Pennsylvania, to be a passed assistant engineer in the Navy from the 19th of June, 1888.

Executive nomination confirmed by the Senate October 18, 1888.

UNITED STATES CONSUL.

E. P. Earle, of Alabama, to be consul of the United States at Cognac.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

THURSDAY, *October* 18, 1888.

The House was called to order at 12 o'clock m. by Hon. S. S. Cox, who directed the reading of the following communication:

WASHINGTON, D. C., *October* 18, 1888.

SIR: Hon. S. S. Cox is designated to preside as Speaker *pro tempore* at the session of the House to-day.

J. G. CARLISLE, *Speaker.*

Hon. JOHN B. CLARK,
Clerk House of Representatives.

Prayer by Rev. J. H. CUTHBERT, D. D.

THE JOURNAL.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore.* The Clerk will read the Journal of the proceedings of yesterday.

Mr. FARQUHAR. Mr. Speaker, before the Journal is read, I desire to call the attention of the Speaker *pro tempore* to paragraph 1 of Rule I.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore.* The Chair will direct the Clerk to read the paragraph of the rule referred to by the gentleman from New York.

The Clerk read as follows:

The Speaker shall take the Chair on every legislative day precisely at the hour to which the House shall have adjourned at the last sitting, immediately call the members to order, and on the appearance of a quorum cause the Journal of the proceedings of the last day's sitting to be read, having previously examined and approved the same.

Mr. FARQUHAR. Mr. Speaker, I merely call the attention of the present occupant of the chair to the language of the rule, in the absence of the Speaker of the House, that on the appearance of a quorum the Journal of the preceding day shall be read. I am unwilling that certain members of this House shall absent themselves from its sessions while other members, like myself, have sat here and been in attendance day after day since the session began in last December. We have had one or two motions presented looking to the adjournment of this body. They have been treated somewhat captiously, I take it; and I think it is now time that we should come to some reasonable arrangement and definite conclusion as to whether we shall be parties to a waiting political game or adjourn the House properly and in order, there being no quorum present.

I believe the Speaker of the House, whatever his engagements elsewhere—and there is no reason because of illness for his absence—ought to preside over the deliberations of this skeleton House as long as the members present are willing to sit here doing a skeleton business.

Mr. RICHARDSON. I rise to a question of order.

Mr. FARQUHAR. I feel, and I state that it is not only a disgrace, but it is an affront to the intelligence of the Congress, to have two insignificantly attended bodies, as are now in session, kept in attendance here waiting patiently on the movements of parties.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore.* The gentleman from Tennessee rises to a question of order, and will state it.

Mr. RICHARDSON. I make the point of order that the gentleman does not present a question of privilege. There is nothing to disclose the absence of a quorum, and I make the point of order that he is out of order.

Mr. FARQUHAR. Mr. Speaker, with all due deference, I think I do present a question of the very highest privilege. The Chair will bear witness——

Mr. RICHARDSON. I demand the regular order.

Mr. FARQUHAR. The Chair will bear me witness——

Mr. RICHARDSON. I call the gentleman from New York to order. I have demanded the regular order.

Mr. FARQUHAR. I have called the attention of the Chair to the rule.

Mr. RICHARDSON. I ask a decision of the point of order I have made.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore.* The Chair will decide the question.

Mr. FARQUHAR. Very well.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore.* The Chair does not count the House, and can not tell officially whether a quorum is present or not.

Mr. FARQUHAR. But, Mr. Speaker, when the attention of the Chair is called to the fact that a quorum is not present, is it not the duty of the Chair to determine that question before the Journal is read?

The SPEAKER *pro tempore.* There is no record to disclose the absence of a quorum, attention having been merely called to the rule, and no objection being made to the reading of the Journal. The present occupant of the chair would not like to rule upon such a question to change the uniform custom and practice of the House. If the gentleman from New York would make that point of order when Mr. Speaker CARLISLE is present perhaps he would entertain the question.

The regular order is demanded, which is the reading of the Journal. The Clerk will read the Journal.

Mr. FARQUHAR. Do I understand that the Chair has not the affirmative right to determine whether a quorum is present by a count of the House?

The SPEAKER *pro tempore.* The Chair would not undertake to decide upon such a question under such unusual circumstances and adversely to the usage.

Mr. BAYNE. But is it not the duty of the Chair, when the question is raised, to count the House for himself and ascertain officially whether a quorum is present?

The SPEAKER *pro tempore.* The regular order is demanded, which is the reading of the Journal.

Mr. BAYNE. But when the attention of the Chair is called to the fact, is it not the duty of the Chair to count the House before the Journal is read?

The SPEAKER *pro tempore.* The Chair would not undertake to change the uniform custom of the House.

Mr. FARQUHAR. Is custom entitled to greater consideration than the rule of the House?

The SPEAKER *pro tempore.* The custom of the House is sometimes a rule unto itself, and controls in the absence of a rule.

Mr. BAYNE. But the custom of the House can not stand in the face of the rule where attention is called to the rule. If the custom has permitted the reading of the Journal in the absence of a quorum, and the rule prohibits it, if attention is called to the rule, the question should be decided.

Mr. McMILLIN. Mr. Speaker, on the point of order raised by the gentleman, I would state that the presumption is in favor of the presence of a quorum until the contrary is shown affirmatively by the record. Furthermore, as to the criticisms of the gentleman from New York, I will state that in ten years of service in this House, or nearly that length of time, I have seen no such question raised, although there is frequently no quorum present in the morning when the Journal is read, even when there is a full attendance of members in this city. Members are often tardy about coming in in the early morning.

The gentlemen themselves will admit that their proceeding is unheard of and their criticism unprecedented.

Mr. FARQUHAR. I will take my own means of criticising my own motives and my own ——

Mr. McMILLIN. I do not criticise the gentleman's motives.

Mr. RICHARDSON. I call for the regular order.

Mr. FARQUHAR. I do not intend anything captious in this matter, but we had better bring it to a decision at once.

Mr. McMILLIN. It is not my purpose to be captious.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore.* The Clerk will proceed to read the Journal.

The Clerk read the Journal of yesterday's proceedings.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore.* Without objection, the Journal will be approved.

Mr. EZRA B. TAYLOR. There is objection.

Mr. FARQUHAR. I object.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. For what purpose does the gentleman object?

Mr. EZRA B. TAYLOR. I object to the confirmation of the Journal.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. Does the gentleman move to amend the Journal?

Mr. EZRA B. TAYLOR. I simply object; and I suppose that makes it a matter for a vote.

Mr. BAYNE. There must be a motion to approve the RECORD, as it has been done by unanimous consent.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The Chair will put the question on the approval of the Journal. [After putting the question.] The ayes seemed to have it.

Mr. EZRA B. TAYLOR, Mr. FARQUHAR, and Mr. BAYNE. Division.

The House divided.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The Chair will announce the result as ayes 15, noes 9, but——

Mr. EZRA B. TAYLOR and Mr. FARQUHAR. No quorum.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. On consideration, the Chair would say that the Speaker should approve the Journal; and in the opinion of the Chair it was unnecessary to submit formally to a vote of the House the question of approval, no error being suggested and no correction proposed. The Clerk will read the rule relating to that matter. [Laughter.]

The Clerk read clause 1 of Rule I, as follows:

The Speaker shall take the chair on every legislative day precisely at the hour to which the House shall have adjourned at the last sitting, immediately call the members to order, and on the appearance of a quorum cause the Journal of the proceedings of the last day's sitting to be read, having previously examined and approved the same.

Mr. FARQUHAR. "On the appearance of a quorum." The Chair will not rule on custom which is opposed by the law and the rules. As I understood the Chair, he ruled that the custom should be carried out. I call attention to a positive rule, and now the Chair takes the rule as against the custom.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The Chair did not decide as to the rule. The Chair thought the custom was uniform, and did not undertake to change it. No member objected formally to the reading of the Journal, and the want of a quorum had not been disclosed by any proceeding of the House prior thereto.

Mr. FARQUHAR. I make it as a broad assertion that there is not a quorum here, and it has been evidenced by this vote. I care nothing about the discussion of it.

Mr. RICHARDSON. I rise to a question of order, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. RICHARDSON. I understand the Chair to decide that the Journal is approved by the Speaker.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The rule seems to require it and the Chair so holds. No attempt has been made to change or amend the Journal.

Mr. RICHARDSON. Then I call for the regular order.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. There is no question before the House, and the regular order is demanded, which is the call of committees for reports.

The committees were thereupon called for reports.

CITROUS WATER COMPANY.

Mr. HUDD. Mr. Speaker, I was absent when the Committee on Indian Affairs was called, and I ask unanimous consent to non-concur in the amendments of the Senate to a House bill in relation to a right of way across an Indian reservation.

The Clerk read the title of the bill, as follows:

A bill (H. R. 7843) granting to Citrous Water Company right of way across Papago Indian reservation in Maricopa County, Arizona.

Mr. HUDD. I ask unanimous consent that the amendments of the Senate be non-concurred in, and that a conference be requested.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The question is on non-concurring in the Senate amendments, and agreeing to the conference asked. Is there objection?

There was objection.

The question was put, and the Speaker *pro tempore* announced that the ayes seemed to have it.

Mr. FARQUHAR. Division.

The House divided; and there were—ayes 23, noes 1.

Mr. FARQUHAR. No quorum. I simply want to emphasize that, Mr. Speaker, and not to discuss it any further.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The Chair will appoint as tellers the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. HUDD] and the gentleman from New York [Mr. FARQUHAR].

The tellers reported—ayes 10, noes 1.

Mr. FARQUHAR. I call for the yeas and nays.

After the count,

Mr. HUDD. The other side. [After a pause.] I withdraw the call for the other side.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The yeas and nays are ordered, a sufficient number having arisen.

The Clerk proceeded to call the roll; but before the completion of the call, by unanimous consent, the demand for the yeas and nays was withdrawn, further proceedings under the yeas and nays were dispensed with, and the motion of Mr. HUDD to non-concur was agreed to.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore* appointed as conferees on the part of the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the bill H. R. 7843 Mr. HUDD, Mr. PEEL, and Mr. NELSON.

EXTRA COMPENSATION TO HOUSE EMPLOYÉS.

Mr. MILLIKEN. I ask unanimous consent to take up the resolution providing for an extra month's pay to the employés.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The Clerk will report the resolution, after which the Chair will ask for objections.

The joint resolution was read, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives, etc., That the Secretary of the Senate and Clerk of the House of Representatives respectively are hereby directed to pay to the officers and employés of the Senate and House of Representatives (including the Capitol police), who are now borne on the annual and session rolls of their respective Houses, one month's extra pay at the compensation now paid them by law; and a sum sufficient to pay the same is hereby appropriated out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, which sum shall be immediately available.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

Mr. MCMILLIN. Mr. Speaker, I think the resolution should be limited to the House employés. Not that I would do injustice to any other class, but resolutions so limited have been passed heretofore, the limitation being put upon the ground that the Senate employés are already paid a larger compensation than the House employés. Then, too, the resolution just read embraces a class of employés who have not been embraced heretofore in such resolutions. The gentleman has made his resolution broad beyond precedent in that regard, and therefore I suggest that it be modified. I can realize that, from the great length of this session, there is a class of our employés who would be done injustice to if we did not allow them some extra compensation, but I think the resolution should be properly guarded. Then, as to another class of officers of the House, we have already, I believe, made an appropriation of $1,000 extra to each of the Official Reporters by way of reimbursement of extra clerk hire, and I do not think they ought to be included now. The resolution seems to me quite loosely worded, and, if the gentleman will pardon the criticism, I suggest that be make it conform to resolutions heretofore passed concerning extra compensation for employés of the House.

Mr. MILLIKEN. I suggest that the gentleman offer an amendment.

Mr. MCMILLIN. As the gentleman has moved in the matter, I suggest that he modify his resolution himself.

Mr. HOOKER. I think that the gentleman who offers this resolution in regard to extra compensation for employés of the House ought to make the amendments suggested by the gentleman from Tennessee, and it seems to me particularly appropriate that it should be amended so as not to include that very worthy corps of officers for whom extra compensation has already been provided. I mean the Official Reporters of the House.

Mr. MCMILLIN. All of them except one have been voted $1,000 each. One has not, but he has not been here during the whole session. I have no suggestions to make beyond stating the facts.

Mr. HOOKER. Well, if these officers have received extra compensation, it seems to me that they should not be included in a general resolution of this kind. I say if that be so, because although I know there was a proposition before the House to make them such an allowance, I do not know whether it became a law or not. This has certainly been a very protracted session; and as to the other officers and employés of the House, especially the reading clerks, the journal clerk, and all the other clerks of the House who have necessarily been in attendance at the night sessions which have been so numerous during this Congress, I think it is very appropriate that we should pass a resolution of this character giving them some extra compensation. If there ever was a time when it would be appropriate for the House to grant additional compensation, this seems to me to be the time. I know that when I had the honor to be here as a Representative from my State some years ago, it was not an infrequent occurrence to adopt a resolution of this character even at the end of an ordinary session.

It has been announced elsewhere, and I believe it is true, that this is the longest session of Congress that has ever occurred since the organization of the Government. Hence, if there ever was a time when the employés of the House who have not already been compensated on account of their extra service, should be provided for in a resolution of this kind, it seems to me this is such an occasion. I heartily sanction the purpose of this resolution, and hope it will meet the concurrence of the House.

Mr. MILLIKEN. I have sent up an amendment which I desire the Clerk to read.

Mr. FARQUHAR. Will the gentleman permit a remark in reference to the compensation of the stenographers?

Mr. MILLIKEN. Certainly.

Mr. FARQUHAR. Mr. Speaker, attention has been called to the fact that in one of the appropriation bills $1,000 was voted to each of the stenographers of this House. The remarks made this morning by

the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. MCMILLIN] would seem to imply that this was a bonus or gratuity. I wish to say that instead of this appropriation of $1,000 being anything in the nature of a bonus to these stenographers, it will barely pay, and possibly will not pay, the extra expenses which have been imposed upon them at this session for clerk-hire in the copying of their notes, etc.

Mr. MCMILLIN. I was not criticising the action of the House in making that appropriation, but only calling attention to the fact that already two months' extra pay, or a little more than two months' extra pay, had been given to that class of officers, whereas no such provision had been made for these other officers.

Mr. FARQUHAR. All I desired was simply to call attention to the fact—and I know the gentleman from Tennessee on examination must concur with me—that the excessive length of this session has caused to the official stenographers extra expenses which the $1,000 voted to each of them in a bill which has not yet become law will not cover.

I wish to say further that when Mr. Edwards, one of the corps of Reporters, died, I did all I could to have some little compensation voted for the family of that man who gave his life in the service of this House during our protracted debates on the tariff bill; but not one dollar of appropriation could I get into the appropriation bill. I hope at the short session we will make amends for our omission in this matter.

Mr. HOOKER. I ask the gentleman from New York whether the family or legal representatives of Mr. Edwards were not included in the proposition giving additional compensation to the stenographers?

Mr. FARQUHAR. As I understand, the proposition I have in mind was met by way of objection by the suggestion that there had already been this $1,000 appropriated.

Mr. WHITE, of New York. The amount voted to the Reporters was not in fact extra compensation for their services, but mere remuneration for excessive outlay of money to which they were subjected.

Mr. SOWDEN. I would like to have this resolution reported again. I am not sure that I understood it correctly.

The resolution was again read.

Mr. SOWDEN. I would like to know the exact amount of money this resolution involves in the event of its adoption.

Mr. MILLIKEN. If the resolution passes in the form in which it was originally offered it will involve an expenditure of about $40,000.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The amendment sent to the desk by the gentleman from Maine [Mr. MILLIKEN] will be read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Add to the resolution the following:
"Not to include the Official Reporters, whose compensation for extra services is provided for in the deficiency bill now pending in conference."

Mr. SOWDEN. I did not exactly catch the statement of the gentleman from Maine as to the amount involved in his resolution, on account of the confusion prevailing.

Mr. MILLIKEN. I said that if the resolution should pass as originally presented the amount involved would be about $40,000.

Mr. SOWDEN. Then, if it involves that sum, I shall have to object to its present consideration.

Mr. MILLIKEN. I hope the gentleman will allow me a moment before he objects. There is an amendment pending excluding the Official Reporters, and I propose to accept the amendment suggested by the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. MCMILLIN], which will exclude from the resolution everybody except employés of the House.

Mr. MCMILLIN. That has been the custom.

Mr. HOOKER. If the gentleman from Maine [Mr. MILLIKEN] will allow me a moment, I wish to make a remark in connection with what I said a few moments ago, in order that this matter may be properly understood. The sum which was attempted to be provided in the deficiency bill for the stenographic corps (it has not yet become a law, I understand) was intended to reimburse to that corps the expenditures they are required to make, they being the only officers of the House who make personal expenditures in connection with the discharge of their official duties. They are required to pay the expenses of transcribing their short-hand notes, the expenses connected with attendance on their rooms, etc., and, as I understand, the sum heretofore voted by the House was designed simply to reimburse the actual outlay necessarily incurred by the reporters in reducing the short-hand notes to the form in which they appear in the RECORD. If, therefore, we vote, as I think we should, this additional month's pay, I do not know that there would be any justice in excluding the stenographers from the operation of the resolution. I deem it proper to make this remark in view of the suggestion I made before.

Mr. MILLIKEN. Mr. Speaker, I wish to say that when I drew this resolution I understood the circumstances just as they have been stated by the gentleman from Mississippi, and that is why the language included the Official Reporters. If I could have my own way, I would be glad to have the resolution passed in the shape in which I originally presented it; but if it can not be passed without the amendments indicated by gentlemen who have spoken, then, rather than have the resolution defeated, I will accept their amendments.

Mr. MCMILLIN. I wish to restate, Mr. Speaker, my original proposition, which was to the effect that a custom had originated, by reason of a difference in pay between the employés of the House and the Senate, to make some such provision as this at the close of the sessions of Congress for the House employés.

Mr. MILLIKEN. I so understood.

Mr. MCMILLIN. That custom, however, ceased or fell into disuse in the last Congress; and I believe in the preceding Congress, too, it was refused when it was proposed to pay the month's extra compensation.

I realize, however, that this has been a most extraordinary session. I also take great pleasure in bearing testimony to the uniform efficiency, vigilance, untiring service, and courtesy of our officials in this most trying session. I called attention, first, to the fact that the custom has been, where this has prevailed at all, to make the appropriation proposed by this bill, not a month's extra compensation to the Senate and House employés, but to the House employés, in order to cover the difference between the pay of the two bodies, that being the original foundation of this action; secondly, I thought it but proper to direct the attention of the House to the fact that an appropriation has been embodied in the deficiency bill to reimburse the stenographers of the House for actual payments made by them; third, that it had not been the custom heretofore for the House to inaugurate a proposition providing payment for a class of employés that belong neither to the Senate nor to the House, but who are controlled by joint action.

Having made this statement I am willing to leave the question to the House to determine, and merely suggested to the gentleman from Maine to include only the employés of the House, as has been the custom heretofore.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE, of Kentucky. I desire to offer an amendment in the nature of an additional resolution, if that is now to be considered.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved also, That the Clerk of the House be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay out of the contingent fund of the House to John Prater, for services rendered in the House cloak-room, at the rate of $50 per month for the present session of Congress.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE, of Kentucky. I am informed that he has performed services without compensation; and we all know, at least on this side of the House, that he has performed his services exceedingly well. Having received no pay, if the resolution proposed by the gentleman from Maine passes, I think it only right and proper that he should be paid for the services actually rendered by him.

Mr. SOWDEN. Mr. Speaker——

Mr. MILLIKEN. Will the gentleman from Pennsylvania allow me a moment, and I will afterwards yield the floor to him?

Mr. SOWDEN. Certainly.

Mr. MILLIKEN. I offer what I send to the desk as an amendment to the amendment already offered.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. Two amendments are now pending, and this would not be in order at this time. It may be read, however, for information.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Clerk of the House be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay to the officers and employés of the House borne on the annual and session rolls on the 30th day of September, 1888, one month's extra pay at the same compensation then paid them by law, said sum to be immediately available.

Mr. MILLIKEN. I offer that as a substitute for the resolution and amendment already offered.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

Mr. SOWDEN. Mr. Speaker——

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The Chair hears no objection.

Mr. SOWDEN. I object.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. Then there is nothing before the House.

Mr. SOWDEN. I desire to be heard.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The Chair will recognize the gentleman for that purpose.

Mr. SOWDEN. As I understand, Mr. Speaker, the amendment or substitute offered by the gentleman from Maine [Mr. MILLIKEN], providing for an additional month's pay to the annual as well as the session clerks or employés of the House, involves some $20,000 now, instead of $40,000 or more under the original proposition. It seems to me, sir, whether this has been the custom in the past or not, that it is a vicious one, and that the time has come when it should be broken up. Here we have a number of annual clerks or employés whose salaries are fixed by law, every one of whom on receiving an appointment to the office he holds knew in advance exactly what the law provides for the services he is called upon to perform.

Under the law he receives a compensation for twelve months' service, for an entire year's service, and the proposition now is not only to pay him for the twelve months' service when he renders less than eleven, but to pay an additional month's compensation, or, in other words, to give him pay for thirteen months, when as a matter of fact he rendered less than eleven months' service.

Again, so far as the session employés are concerned, instead of being a hardship upon them they are to be congratulated, for they are largely

benefited by the prolongation of the session. I know that the pages of the House, these little boys, who are receiving $2.50 a day while the session lasts, are greatly benefited by its unusual length, and there is no reason, and certainly no argument has thus far been advanced by the gentleman from Tennessee or any one else, that furnishes any ground for giving additional pay to these employés as proposed. Every employé of the Senate and the House should be gratified, and would no doubt be pleased if the session continued for the full twelve months, since he would be correspondingly benefited. So, I repeat, I can see no good reason why we should make this additional plunge into the public Treasury and abstract therefrom $20,000 to $30,000 to pay for services which were never rendered and the Government never received. I repeat, therefore, that the time has come when we should put a stop to it, and I think this is as good a time as any to break up this custom. Let us break up this vicious and expensive system. Let us give every man every dollar that he honestly earns, and pay them the salaries legally due them, but do not let us take the people's money and vote a gratuity to them that is unwarranted by law and pay them for services never rendered.

Mr. MILLIKEN. Mr. Speaker, I desire to say this resolution is offered for the very purpose of paying to the employés of this House what they have earned, and what they have richly earned. As I suggested in some remarks I made a few days ago upon this subject, we have kept them here. We could have got up and gone at any time we chose; but they have not the slightest control over the time; they are required to stay here.

Now, I have further to say, Mr. Speaker, that extra pay has been given for extra service to the employés of the Government Printing Office; and extra pay has been given for extra services in the Adjutant-General's Office. Clerks in the Departments are allowed a month's vacation with pay during the time they are gone. Now, these young men, and these old men who are at work here, as my friend from Tennessee [Mr. MCMILLIN] suggested, have been doing an unusually large amount of work; and we have caused them to do it. This thing is not done without precedent. On the contrary, until last Congress, just such a resolution as this has passed at every session since I have been in Congress, and for a long period prior to that. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SOWDEN] suggests that these employés knew beforehand what they were to receive, because the law fixed the rate of compensation.

They also knew beforehand that it had been the custom to vote them this extra month's pay, and that that custom had existed so long that it had really become almost a law; and considering the amount of work they have done and the length of time they have been confined here I think it is nothing more than just. I have heard gentlemen stand up in the House time and again during this session and talk of the hardships of laboring men and say we should liberally compensate the laboring men. Now, if there are anywhere in this country any men who labor more assiduously than the men whose names are included in this resolution, I should like to see them produced.

Mr. SOWDEN. I object to the consideration of this resolution at this time, for the reasons already given by me why it should not pass.

Mr. MILLIKEN. I hope the gentleman from Pennsylvania will let them have consideration of their bill, and that they should have the voice of the House upon its passage.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. Does the gentleman insist upon his objection?

Mr. SOWDEN. I insist upon the objection.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

A message from the Senate, by Mr. JOHNSON, one of its clerks, announced to the House that the Senate had passed a resolution fixing the date of final adjournment on Saturday, the 20th day of October, 1888, at 1 o'clock p. m., in which it requested the concurrence of the House.

EXTENSION OF LEASE OF BUTLER BUILDING.

Mr. SHAW. I ask unanimous consent for the consideration of the resolution now in the hands of the Clerk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That the Select Committee on Indian Depredation Claims and the Committee on the Eleventh Census be authorized to continue the occupancy of the rooms now used by them in the Butler Building during the remainder of the present Congress, and that the Clerk of the House is hereby directed to pay rent for the same out of the contingent fund of the House at the rate now being paid.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

A message from the Senate, by Mr. NEWELL, one of its clerks, informed the House that the Senate had passed without amendment a bill (H. R. 11599) to authorize the Postmaster-General to rent a suitable building in the city of Washington to be used as a mail-bag repair shop, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate had agreed to the report of the conference committee on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (H. R. 8074) to provide for allotment of land in severalty to United Peorias and Miamies in the Indian Territory.

EXTENSION OF LEASE OF BUTLER BUILDING.

Mr. SHAW. Mr. Speaker, in explanation of that resolution I will state that the House some time ago authorized the lease of these rooms for these respective committees during the present session of Congress, and the lease, unless it be extended by the House, will terminate with the present session. The House also authorized the furnishing of these rooms, which has been done at an expense of $400. The rooms were carpeted and provided with the necessary furniture. Of course, if this lease is not extended the furniture will have to be removed; and the Clerk has informed me that he has no place to store it. In addition to that, these committees will have duties to discharge during the next session of this Congress; and it seems to me it would be good policy to extend the lease, as there is but a short time intervening.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. Is there objection to the present consideration of this resolution? The Chair hears none.

The resolution was agreed to.

ORDER OF BUSINESS.

Mr. MCMILLIN. I call up the resolution just received from the Senate.

Mr. HOOKER. Before you do that I want to ask leave of absence for my colleague——

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The Chair will recognize the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. STONE].

PAYMENT OF EMPLOYÉS FOR OCTOBER.

Mr. STONE, of Kentucky. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the resolution I send to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of the Senate and the Clerk of the House of Representatives be, and they are hereby, instructed to pay the officers and employés of the Senate and of the House of Representatives, including the Capitol Police, for the month of October, 1888, on the 20th day of said month.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. Is there objection to the present consideration of this resolution? The Chair hears none.

The resolution was adopted.

Mr. STONE, of Kentucky, moved to reconsider the vote by which the resolution was adopted; and also moved that the motion to reconsider be laid on the table.

The latter motion was agreed to.

COMPENSATION OF EMPLOYÉS.

Mr. FARQUHAR. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the joint resolution (H. Res. 232) which I send to the desk.

The resolution was read, as follows:

Be it resolved, etc., That the Secretary of the Senate and the Clerk of the House of Representatives be, and they are hereby, authorized and directed to pay to the session employés of the Senate and the House of Representatives salaries for the full month of October, and that the amount of money necessary to carry out the provisions of this resolution be, and the same is hereby, appropriated out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated.

Mr. FARQUHAR. Mr. Speaker, this simply covers the unexpired portion of the present month. The amount required to make the payment will be quite small, and I do not believe there can be any objection to the resolution.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. Is there objection to the consideration of this joint resolution?

Mr. SOWDEN. I would like to hear the resolution reported again

The joint resolution was again read.

Mr. SOWDEN. I see no objection to that.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time; and being engrossed, it was accordingly read the third time, and passed.

Mr. FARQUHAR moved to reconsider the vote by which the joint resolution was passed; and also moved that the motion to reconsider be laid on the table.

The latter motion was agreed to.

COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS.

Mr. FORNEY. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the resolution which I send to the desk.

The resolution was read, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Appropriations, or such subcommittee as they may designate, are hereby authorized to sit during the vacation, for the purpose of considering and facilitating the business of the committee in advance of the next regular session, to be convened at such time as the chairman of such committee may order.

The resolution was agreed to.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. WALKER, indefinitely, on account of important business.

To Mr. PEEL, indefinitely, on account of important business.

To Mr. BARRY (on motion of Mr. HOOKER), indefinitely, on account of indisposition.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED.

Mr. KILGORE, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that they had examined and found duly enrolled a bill of the following title; when the Speaker signed the same:

A bill (H. R. 11599) to authorize the Postmaster-General to rent a suitable building in the city of Washington to be used as a mail-bag repair-shop, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT SINE DIE.

Mr. McMILLIN. Mr. Speaker, I call up for present consideration the resolution which has just been received from the Senate, and ask that it be reported by the Clerk.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The Chair will lay before the House the concurrent resolution on final adjournment, which will be read.

The resolution was read, as follows:

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES, *October* 18, 1888.

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives declare their respective Houses adjourned without day on Saturday, the 20th day of October, at 1 o'clock p. m.

Mr. WHEELER. I desire to offer an amendment.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. McMILLIN] has the floor.

Mr. McMILLIN. Let the amendment be read for information.

The amendment was read, as follows:

Resolved, That this Congress take a recess from Saturday, October 27, at 5 p. m., until 12 o'clock noon, November 12, 1888.

Mr. McMILLIN. Mr. Speaker, the resolution received from the Senate and just read looks to the closing of this extraordinarily long session of Congress, and I think that a few remarks concerning the session, the work that was before it, what has been proposed by the House, and what by the Senate, are not inappropriate on this occasion. I shall therefore ask the indulgence of the House briefly.

One of the great questions that came before this body on its assembling was the reduction of taxation, a reduction which the business interests of the country demanded, which the people themselves, in their individual capacity as tax-payers, demanded, and which the best interests of the Government, in every sense, demanded. More revenue was being collected than was necessary, and how to reduce that revenue was the question to which the House addressed itself until it passed the bill reported from the Committee on Ways and Means, and is the question to which the Senate has addressed itself since that time. Each body has proposed a measure of relief, or what it claims to be a measure of relief. Those members of the Ways and Means Committee who were here thought it necessary to make an investigation into the merits of the proposition reported by the Senate so as to determine what relief it would probably afford and what its real effect would be. Through the very efficient work of the clerk of that committee, Mr. Henry Talbot, and Mr. Doyle, of the Treasury Department, aided by such other assistants as were deemed necessary, we have come to a conclusion as to what the effect of the Senate bill would be; and with the indulgence of the House I will now make a very brief comment upon it, taking as the basis of what I say the results developed by this investigation.

The Senate bill has changed the rates of duty and the classifications so extensively and in such ways that it is difficult to make the calculations as to what will be its operations; but from the best data that can be obtained and the most accurate calculations that could be made the following may be given as a summary of the effect of that bill upon the revenues, should it pass.

There are fourteen of these schedules, and out of these fourteen schedules the duties on eleven will be increased by the Senate bill, according to the importations of the last fiscal year. Taking these as a basis of calculation the changes proposed by the Senate would increase the duties on eleven of these fourteen schedules.

Mr. EZRA B. TAYLOR. The gentleman will allow me to ask this question: Is not the increase of duties liable to reduce revenue?

Mr. McMILLIN. I will state to the gentleman that it is possible to make import duties absolutely prohibitory, and thereby increase the taxes of the people and utterly cut off revenue for the Government. That can be accomplished; and if the gentleman confesses that to have been the object of the Senate, there is no doubt that they have accomplished their object in a wonderfully successful degree.

Mr. EZRA B. TAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, I deny that it has been the object of the Senate to increase the taxes of the people. This whole business has been gone over so much that if the gentleman favors the passage of this resolution he had better make his remarks short.

Mr. McMILLIN. If it does not increase the revenues and does not increase taxation——

Mr. EZRA B. TAYLOR. I mean just what I have said.

Mr. McMILLIN. Now, Mr. Speaker, what will be the effect of these proposed changes? I think it proper the country should know. Take, first, chemicals——

Mr. BAYNE. Mr. Speaker, I desire to inquire of the gentleman whether an opportunity will be given this side of the House to reply to the observations he is now making?

Mr. McMILLIN. I will state to the gentleman that I do not propose to occupy all the time of the House. It is, of course, at all times within the discretion of the House to determine what course it will take with any resolution which may be offered.

Mr. BAYNE. I have no objection whatever to the gentleman elaborating his views upon the question of adjournment; but, of course, I shall insist that this side of the House shall be given an opportunity to reply.

Mr. PETERS. I will simply state now for the information of the gentleman, that unless——

Mr. McMILLIN. I can not yield further; the gentleman will have his time.

Mr. PETERS. I was going to make this suggestion——

Mr. FARQUHAR. I rise to a parliamentary question: Is the gentleman from Tennessee speaking in his own time for an hour?

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The gentleman has an hour to discuss the resolution. If the previous question should not be ordered, the Chair, at the conclusion of the gentleman's remarks, will recognize some gentleman on the other side for an hour.

Mr. McMILLIN. In chemical schedule A, according to the importations of 1887, the values imported were $5,041,574.51; the duties were $1,489,211.31. The estimated duties under the Senate substitute would be $1,409,932.01. The present rate of duty is 29.53 per cent.; under the substitute it would be 27.96 per cent. In that case there is a reduction of the revenues of less than $100,000.

In the earthen and glass ware schedule, the importations of 1887 were $6,322,000, the duties $3,516,000. The estimated duties under the Senate substitute are $3,282,000. The present rate is 55.60 per cent.; the rate under the substitute would be 51.92 per cent. But it is proper to say concerning this schedule that both the House bill and the Senate bill fix duties upon the coverings containing the importations, which, according to the Tariff Commission's report, amount to at least 9 to 11 per cent.; so that when you consider the change made as to coverings to meet the decision of the Supreme Court of the United States, there is actually no reduction, although I have given credit for a reduction in the statement just made.

In the metal schedule the importations were $17,660,000; the duties, $8,115,000. The estimated duties under the Senate substitute would be $9,743,000. The present rate is 45.89 per cent.; the proposed rate, 55.17 per cent. So that on the metal schedule, instead of the people getting that relief which they are entitled to receive, they get an increase of taxation to the extent of about 10 per cent. and an increase of revenue of over a million and a half of dollars.

In the woodenware schedule the importations were $1,060,000; the duties, $302,000. The estimated duties are $371,000. The present rate is 28.49 per cent.; the proposed rate, 35 per cent. This is the relief which is given on woodenware.

We come now to sugar, upon which there is a real reduction made. The importations were, in round numbers, $68,000,000; the duties, $56,000,000. The estimated duties will be $28,000,000. The present rate is 81 per cent.; the proposed rate, 41 per cent. But by a change of the schedule a greater benefit proportionally is given to the manufacturers who are engaged in the sugar trust than is given under existing law.

Mr. FARQUHAR. I will state to the gentleman that that matter was answered yesterday in the Senate quite thoroughly and effectually.

Mr. EZRA B. TAYLOR (to Mr. McMILLIN). Your speech has been printed before.

Mr. McMILLIN. With my friend's permission, I will take care of my speech. It is truth that I am uttering, and I do not care how often it is repeated. The Commissioner of Statistics has made computations, and arrives at substantially the same reductions stated here. The difference between the sugar duty and that on other things is that about nine-tenths of the increase of price added to sugar goes into the Treasury, whereas in some of these other schedules where there is an increase four-fifths of it goes into the pockets of the manufacturers, and not more than one-fifth into the Treasury.

Mr. FARQUHAR. It goes to Havemeyer & Co.; that is where it goes.

Mr. McMILLIN. I have just explained. I am glad my friend is aroused on that subject. Under the Senate schedule a greater benefit is given to the manufacturer than under the existing law or the Mills bill.

Mr. FARQUHAR. I wish to state that after an examination of all the reports made by the Committee on Ways and Means of the House and now reviewed by the Senate Finance Committee that the figures he gives are too old, having been corrected by later statistics.

Mr. McMILLIN. I can not yield to my friend, as I see some impatience manifested on the part of some members of the House as to the time I shall occupy. Therefore I decline to yield.

Tobacco: Importations, $10,955,123.03; present duties, $9,127,758.26; estimated duties under the Senate substitute, $11,507,718.23—an increase of rate from 83.31 to 105.04.

Provisions: Importations, $24,315,089.97; present duties, $6,192,126.83; estimated duties under the Senate substitute, $6,831,383.95, an increase of rate from 25.46 to 28.09. The increase of duties is over half a million.

Liquors: Importations, $2,549,662.24; present duties, $1,929,508.77; estimated duties under the Senate substitute, $2,396,231.96, an increase of rate from 75.06 to 93.98.

Cotton: Importations, $24,726,037.70; present duties, $10,152,993.44; estimated duties under the Senate substitute, $10,356,856.42, an increase of rate from 41.06 to 41.89.

It will be observed on comparison of the schedules which have been prepared and which have been printed that the increase has been greater upon the cheaper goods worn by the people in the ordinary avocations of life than on the finer commodities.

Hemp, flax, and jute: Importations, $17,301,413.04; present duties,

$5,858,031.30; estimated duties under the Senate substitute, $6,785,-723.10, an increase of rate from 33.85 to 39.22.

Wool and woolens: Importations, $46,212,247.11; present duties, $29,938,893.68; estimated duties under the Senate substitute, $34,322,-845.84, an increase of rate from 63.48 to 74.27. Some of these duties are raised so high they go from 100 to 225 per cent., the greater increase being on the ordinary and the lesser on the finer grade of goods. So, instead of giving cheaper woolen goods, the Senate bill proposes to increase the cost, and instead of allowing the manufacturer to have his wool at 10 cents a pound, as he gets it now, the Senate proposes to make the duty 11 per cent.

Silk goods and silk: Importations, $31,264,276.48; present duties, $15,540,300.70; estimated duties under the Senate substitute, $16,002,-094.04, an increase of rate from 49.73 to 51.18.

Books and papers, etc.: Importations, $35,724,436.31; present duties, $818,583.21; estimated duties under the Senate substitute, $893,-109.88, an increase of rate from 22.91 to 25.

Sundries: Importations, $10,568,347.25; present duties, $2,948,-510.12: estimated duties under the Senate substitute, $3,104,501.84, an increase of rate from 27.89 to 29.37.

I have gone through the schedule and the aggregate stands in this way: Total importations, $270,489,951.42; present duties, $152,456,-739.14; while under the proposed law, including sugar, there would be received $135,291,638.10; taking out sugar and computing the balance of the schedule there is an increase instead of a decrease of duties, so making the deductions of duties estimated by the Senate bill of $17,-165.101.04.

The duties remitted by the free-list on this bill are $5,828,074.65, and the duties remitted by the prohibitory features of the bill are $600,020, making in all a tariff reduction (instead of the bill we sent to the Senate), a proposed reduction of $23,593,195. And adding to that, Mr. Speaker, the free alcohol in the arts, the whole bill—that is if no more alcohol is used in the arts than is used at present—the whole relief afforded by the Senate bill in round numbers will not exceed $30,000,000, while in their report they themselves admit that the people are entitled to relief of from sixty-five to seventy-five millions of dollars. Instead of this they give but $30,000,000.

Mr. FARQUHAR. They make it the amount of the surplus.

Mr. McMILLIN. No, it is not. It disposes of the accumulations, but what becomes of the vast sum in the Treasury that ought to be gotten out, and the accumulations?

Mr. PETERS. Why, pay that out on the public debt.

Mr. McMILLIN. I admit that the only remedy, if the accumulation now in the Treasury is used in the demands of the Government and the increase hereafter, is in the payment of the public debt. But, Mr. Speaker, the people have a right while they are paying their honest debts to be exempt from additional payment of $29,000,000 for every $100,000,000 that is paid.

Mr. PETERS. But we have the 4½ per cent. bonds falling due in 1891, and they are only one-eighth.

Mr. FARQUHAR. And I hope the gentleman from Tennessee will not take away from the Secretary of the Treasury the credit for the saving he has made in bond purchases.

Mr. McMILLIN. But the people ought not to be required to pay $29,000,000 more as bonus on each $100,000,000 bonds paid for.

Mr. FARQUHAR. It is only a question whether you will continue the interest to coming generations or whether you will pay it off now when you have the money. Every business man who conducts his business properly will take up his notes and pay them off whenever he has the means in hand to do so.

Mr. McMILLIN. But the people ought not to be taxed at this high rate for the privilege of paying their debts. The remedy I was going to suggest is to stop the tax, and upon that question we join issue with gentlemen on the other side.

Mr. FARQUHAR. I hope the gentleman will not take issue with the Secretary of the Treasury in paying off the bonds.

Mr. McMILLIN. I hope the gentleman will permit me to proceed in my own way.

Mr. FARQUHAR. Certainly.

Mr. McMILLIN. The gentleman will have his own time.

I have stated that there was no remedy left to the Secretary of the Treasury with the present taxation system taking more money from the pockets of the people than ought to be required for the purposes of the Government; but I have also said that the real remedy ought to be applied here by a reduction of taxation.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the House of Representatives proposed to give to the workingmen of this country $6,000,000 of tin-plates free. It does not interfere with any industry in the country; it does not throw any laborer here out of employment. But the Senate say, "Oh, no; the tin-plates shall be taxed." By an artful change they are put into another schedule where, while they do not pretend to increase the duty, they do very largely increase it. Again, we said to the people by the House bill that they should have free lumber. The Senate say no, that the lumber manufacturers shall continue to derive their thirty millions from increase of cost while the Treasury gets but one million. And so I might go on through all of these schedules and show that the masses of the people get no benefit while the same remarkable state of affairs exists in the bill.

I will simply cite one illustration. Take the change in the tobacco schedule, or the proposition for a change there. Under the provisions of this bill reported by the Senate there is an increase of the tax on cigars worth $10 a thousand of $12.50, while on finer cigars, smoked by wealthy people, worth $250 a thousand, there is a decrease of the tax of $47.50. Then you take the ordinary table-ware. Take a poor article of knives worth 50 cents a dozen. The tax is increased from the present rate, 35 per cent., up to 70. Take knives worth $5 a dozen and the rate of duty is less, while on a knife worth $20 a dozen there is a still less reduction of duty; and when you come to the fine pearl-handle knives worth $40 a dozen, the duty remains as it is to-day.

Mr. FARQUHAR. Now will the gentleman allow me?

Mr. McMILLIN. If the gentleman will pardon me, I can not yield.

I might go on through all of these schedules in the same way. The gentleman from New York will have his time to make such statement as he desires.

I have cited facts, Mr. Speaker, which show this remarkable state of things, that this bill increases the taxation upon articles of necessity rather than upon luxuries.

I call the attention of the House to the following detailed statement showing the increases made by the Senate over the existing law. Leaving out the sugar schedule, the increase on the others is unprecedented, considering the circumstances surrounding us demanding a reduction instead of an increase.

The main effort of the Senate seems to have been to raise the rates of duty instead of lowering them. When the average tariff rate in 1882 was only 42 per cent., a tariff commission was appointed composed of men favorable to a protective tariff—most of them selected because they were the representatives of some one of the protected industries.

That commission recommended a reduction of 20 per cent., and said that a reduction of 25 per cent. could be safely made; but now, when the average rate of duty is more than 47 per cent., the Senate proposes an increase on all the schedules except three. Leaving out the sugar schedules, the revenues would be vastly increased by the Senate bill.

The recommendation of President Arthur and Secretary Folger for a reduction of taxes has not been heeded; the recommendation of President Grant for free raw materials has been disregarded; the recommendation of the Tariff Commission for a reduction of 20 per cent. on existing rates, which amounted to over 42 per cent., has been wholly disregarded; the promises made by the Republican platform adopted at Chicago in 1884 have been thrown to the winds, and above all and beyond all, the just demands of the people for a reduction of the revenues of the Government and the interests of an economical administration have been disregarded. And we are told that instead of reducing taxes they will increase them. The Senate say that instead of simplifying and reducing them, they will complicate them; instead of giving the people relief from tariff taxation of about $50,000,000, confessed to be right, their whole tariff reductions, as I have said before, amount to only about $23,500,000, including the free-list.

They seem to have adopted the idea that the way to increase prosperity was to increase taxation. The people have waited long for relief; they can be no longer deluded; they no longer believe that $47 is paid to labor for every hundred dollars' worth of goods manufactured; nor will they agree to this increase of the tax on the necessaries of life, while no corresponding increase, and in many cases a reduction is made on luxuries. With the utmost confidence in the intelligence of the people to see the right, and their integrity to do it, we place our cause in their hands, and are willing to abide the decision they may make. [Applause.]

Estimates of effect upon the annual customs revenues of Senate substitute for bill H. R. 9051.

[Prepared, by direction of the Committee on Ways and Means, by the clerk.]

SENATE TARIFF BILL.

To the Committee:

Your direction to examine the tariff rates of the substitute for House bill 9051, reported by the Committee on Finance to the Senate, has been complied with so far and with as much exactness as the limited time, numerous interruptions, new and involved classifications, and insufficient information would permit. It is believed the estimate is far too liberal in the computation of reductions, and that if an occasional reduction has been estimated at less than the facts justify, or an increase reckoned as yielding more revenue by the changed rate than further inquiry would have done, that ten may be found which err in the other direction, and that a strict investigation with the command of fuller data would demonstrate that the actual reductions effected by the proposed amendments to our present tariff legislation would not reach $15,000,000 on the dutiable-list.

Out of fourteen schedules under which all dutiable articles are arranged, eleven have rates increased, and of the other three, one, namely, earthenware and glassware, has been already explained to have been left practically with the same rates as under the present law, the reductions having been considered to be offset by the re-enactment of the dutiable-package clause, and by many it is claimed the package clause will increase rates in this schedule 10 per cent. while the reductions are but 5, which would in effect be an increase of 5 per cent. in this schedule. Without a more certain basis for calculation it was considered best to estimate the reduction as shown on the face of fixed rates, and it is so done in the tables. (See Tariff Commission Report, page 13, where it is claimed that a rate of 40 per cent. on these goods, with a duty on the packages, etc., is equal to a rate of 50 per cent. without such dutiable charges.)

In one other schedule, chemicals, a slight reduction is shown of $80,000, and even this would be lessened if various increased rates in paints and some other items could be calculated with any certainty.

The last schedule, and the only one of the fourteen which, taken as a whole,

shows any material reduction, is E, sugar, on which $28,000,000 are reduced, the raw sugars being reduced one-half and the refined sugars not quite so much.

In further explanation it may be said that the accompanying tables were taken from the schedule published by the Finance Committee, except that on wool, as explained elsewhere; and that their interpretations of rates and items imported under the various sections were, so far as possible, followed in this estimate. Where a striking difference was apparent, as in leaf-tobacco, now dutiable at 35 cents, which is shown by their schedule to be reduced to 20 cents, of course the true rate was used in the estimate. So far as possible articles and rates not affected were eliminated from the calculation.

SCHEDULE A.—*Chemicals.*

1. Acetic acid below 1.047 s. g. is reduced 25 per cent., while that above 1.047 is reduced 60 per cent., or to 4 cents per pound.

2. Boracic acid, pure, is left at the present rate, 59 per cent., while commercial boracic acid is raised to 100 per cent. ad valorem; and the importations of the commercial acid are ten times as much as the pure.

7. Perfumery is reduced from 63.25 per cent. to 38.25.

10, 11, 12. Ammonia is increased from 25 to 50 per cent. higher than in present law.

Roman and Portland cements are raised from 20 per cent. to 8 cents per cwt. The Wallkill Portland Cement Company, of New York, in a letter in 1884 and in 1888, said if the duty of 20 per cent. was retained and the package duty restored "it is probable that this industry will as rapidly increase here as in other countries."

This the House bill does.

The rate is not excessive on Portland cement, but putting the same specific rate on Roman cement worth only half as much (or less) than Portland makes the rate on Roman cement 50 per cent., nearly. It has sold in this country at 75 cents per barrel. Tax 32 cents by the substitute.

23. Oxide of cobalt for bleaching pottery is increased from 20 to 27 per cent. We import nearly three times as much as is manufactured here.

35. Glue is increased from 20 to 25 per cent.

38. Inks, writing, are changed from 30 per cent. to 40, 50, and 60 cents per gallon; decreasing rates on some inks and much increasing rates on cheaper kinds. Without data no difference is estimated in the tables.

45. Orange mineral is increased from 70 to 80 per cent.

59. Olive oil, increased from 25 to 38 per cent.

63-70. Paints, several new classes are named and rates changed from ad valorem to specific; some increased, but no data for calculation.

75. Plaster of Paris, increased from 20 to 21 per cent.

Castile soap also raised from 20 to 21 per cent.

98. Spirit varnishes are changed from $1.32 per gallon and 40 per cent. to $2 per proof gallon and 40 per cent. No data at hand from which to calculate the per cent. of increase which is evident.

SCHEDULE B.—*Earthenware and glassware.*

99. Brown earthenware is reduced from 25 per cent. to 20 per cent., a reduction reckoned at 20 per cent. in the Senate report on the House bill.

100. Chinaware, plain and decorated, and all other earthenware is reduced 8 to 9 per cent., counting the same way, while the re-enactment of the dutiable-package clause more than compensates for the reduction, but in the estimates no account is taken of the package clause and credit given for full amount of reduction claimed.

102. Encaustic tiles, now 35 per cent., are raised to 45 per cent., and all fire-brick or common brick, when glazed, also raised to 45 per cent.

107. Bottles, if holding less than 1 pint, are made dutiable at 1½ cents per pound, and none to pay less than 40 per cent.

112. Cylinder and crown glass, polished, 10 by 15, raised from 2½ to 4 cents per foot.

117. Beveled or ornamented glass, increased 10 per cent. in addition to rates fixed on plain, of the same kinds.

118. Plain flint or lime glassware, made 1 cent per pound whenever 1 cent per pound exceeds 40 per cent.; otherwise to pay 40 per cent. Taken together, there is an evident increase in duties to be received under this schedule; but not taking into account the package clause, and for lack of more certain data in other items, credit is given for the decrease as shown.

SCHEDULE C.—*Metals.*

134. Chains, less than ¾ inch in diameter, as trace-chains, etc., are raised from 44.37 per cent. to 53.57 per cent.

137. Cotton-ties and hoops for baling, .2 cent more than the hoop-iron from which it is made (1.1 cents), increasing the revenue over $240,000 and raising the duty from 35 per cent. to 108 per cent.

144. Sheets of iron or steel thinner than No. 9 and taggers iron are raised from 30 per cent. to above 60 per cent., more than doubling the duty, the increase following the thin sheets through the various processes of pickling, cold-rolling, etc.

146. Cold-rolled steel sheets, thinner than No. 29 wire-gauge, are increased from 41.60 per cent. to 75 per cent. ad valorem, and taggers iron, pickled, etc., from 39.18 per cent. to 61.11 per cent.

150. Fence wire rods of steel now paying 45 per cent. duty, smaller than No. 5, are raised to .6 cent per pound or 54 per cent. if No. 6, and 1½ cents if smaller than No. 6.

151. Iron and steel wire, worth over 10 cents per pound, are raised to 45 per cent. They now bear specific rates, but the rate proposed is ad valorem and higher in all cases.

153. Steel ingots, cogged ingots, blooms, slabs, die blocks or blanks, billets, now 45 per cent., are made five-tenths of a cent per pound when valued at 1 cent or less, an increase from 45 to 60 and 80 per cent., according to the value of the various descriptions. When the value reaches 4 to 7 cents the rate is left at 2 cents, above 30 per cent. on importations of 1887, but above 13 cents in value the rate is changed again to ad valorem, and made 45 per cent., more than doubling the present rate of 3½ cents per pound.

159. Circular-saw plates are increased from 37.32 per cent. to 45 per cent. (from 4 to 7 cents in value), though circular saws are left with only 30 per cent. duty.

163. Bronze powder, now 15 per cent., is made 15 cents per pound, equivalent to about 30 per cent. ad valor m. (See Appendix, House bill 9702, first session Forty-ninth Congress.)

172. Table knives, now 35 per cent. duty, are made 20 cents per dozen, when valued at $1 or less; valued at $1 to $3, to pay 50 cents per dozen; and valued at $3 to $8, to pay $1 per dozen; and valued over $8 per dozen, to pay $2 per dozen, and in addition 30 per cent. on all. It is impossible to accurately calculate the effect of this new classification, but it will be seen that knives worth 50 cents per dozen will under this provision pay 70 per cent.; those worth $1.50 per dozen will pay 63 per cent.; worth $5 per dozen, pay 50 per cent.; worth $20 per dozen, pay 40 per cent.; and after $40 per dozen value is reached the rate is less than at present. On the cheapest cutlery imported the rate will be far beyond 100 per cent.; the effect has been estimated at an increase of one-half or 52 per cent.

173. Penknives and pocket-knives, rate changed from 50 per cent. to 50 cents per dozen blades and 25 per cent., which leaves the rate unchanged when the import value is $8 per dozen on four-blade knives, but increased on lower grades. A boy's 10-cent knife of two blades would have the duty quadrupled; a cheap three-bladed knife would be raised 200 per cent., and the average knife in common use be much increased. It is estimated the duties on average imports are increased by this provision to 65 per cent., instead of 50 per cent.

181. Double-barreled breech-loading shotguns, rate changed from 35 per cent. to $10 each and 25 per cent. A $10 gun would thus pay 125 per cent. instead of $3.50, as now, while a $300 gun would pay $85 instead of $105 duty, as under present law. If average importations be valued at a little over $35 each, the increase in duties would be one-half, and on this basis the estimate is made.

191. Small screws, one-half inch and less, are increased from 44.59 per cent. to over 52 per cent.

194. Type metal changed from 20 per cent. ad valorem to 1½ cents per pound. In Senate majority report is a statement which would indicate an increase to more than 50 per cent. ad valorem. The estimate is based on the strength of statement in report, at 50 per cent. duty, an increase of 150 per cent., as calculations were made in same document on reductions in House bill.

SCHEDULE D.—*Wood and wooden ware.*

213. Manufactures of wood not especially enumerated. The principal increase in this is rattans, now paying 10 per cent., are raised to 35 per cent.

215. Sawed boards, of mahogany, rosewood, etc., made 15 per cent., and

216. Veneering and briar-root or briar-wood made 20 per cent.

SCHEDULE E.—*Sugar.*

217. Sugar below No. 16, Dutch standard, is reduced in rates one-half; and molasses below No. 56° polariscopic test is made free, which practically places all molasses on the free-list, and sugar drainings and sweepings, now 20 per cent. ad valorem, are made to bear the same rate as sugar or molasses, according to relative test. By reduction by adulteration these, too, may be included in free molasses.

All sugars above No. 16, Dutch standard, are reduced less than one-half, leaving the margin on refined sugars above raw sugars higher than at present. For instance, the rates on sugar of 90° below 13 Dutch standard and that on sugar above No. 20 are within a fraction of 84 per cent., while under the substitute the 90° sugar will be reduced to 42 per cent. and that above No. 20 to 47 per cent.

SCHEDULE F.—*Tobacco.*

226. Cigars, cheroots, etc. Rate changed from $2.50 per pound and 25 per cent. to $3.50 per pound; a reduction of $273,097 on importations of 1887. By this change cigars worth $10 per thousand, which now pay $2.50 per pound, or an average of $37.50 and 25 per cent., equal $40, would pay $3.50 per pound, or an average of $52.50 per thousand—an increase of $12.50 per thousand; while cigars costing $250 per thousand, which now pay $100 duty per thousand, would pay $52.50 per thousand under the substitute, the same as the cheap cigar—a reduction of $47.50 per thousand.

227. Leaf-tobacco, for wrappers, made 75 cents per pound, now pay 35 cents per pound, if less than 85 per cent. run one hundred leaves to the pound (Sumatra leaf). Under the substitute any leaf fit for wrappers condemns the whole package or bulk to 75 cents rate.

In 1885, 15,238,637.81 pounds of leaf-tobacco were imported, paying $5,333,523.25 duty. There are no returns to indicate the proportion of wrappers imported, but Mr. Hammerstein, editor of the United States Tobacco Journal, told the Committee on Ways and Means, in March, 1886, that 10,000 bales out of 50,000 bales of the Havana tobacco imported in 1885 were wrappers, or about 2,000,000 pounds Havana, and the same authority gave over 4,000,000 pounds importations of Sumatra wrappers. This would be a total of over 6,000,000 pounds wrappers out of a total of 11,000,000 pounds leaf imported in 1885.

With the same proportion 8,000,000 out of the 15,000,000 pounds of leaf in 1887, at 35 cents, would pay 75 cents, or a duty of $6,000,000, while the rest of the 15,000,000 pounds would be reduced to 20 cents, yielding a revenue of $1,447,000, a total of $7,447,000, or an increase of over $2,000,000 on leaf alone; and this would be much increased by the provision which makes any package or bulk subject to 75 cents duty if it contains any wrapper leaf.

SCHEDULE G.—*Provisions.*

232. Horses are made dutiable at $20 per head, cattle at $5 per head, and sheep and hogs at 50 cents per head.

Animals for breeding purposes have been free since 1816 through all tariffs, even including the war period. This provision would lay duties to the amount of nearly $400,000 on importations in 1887 of free breeding animals.

254. Extract of meat, now 20 per cent., is made dutiable at 35 cents per pound if solid, and 15 cents per pound if fluid, and the tin can made also dutiable at 15 cents per pound.

255. Grapes, from 20 per cent. to 1 cent per pound, or about 25 per cent., as estimated in Appendix to House Bill 9072, introduced by Mr. RANDALL, first session, Forty-ninth Congress.

260. Ginger and citron preserved, raised from 35 per cent. to 4 cents per pound. In Secretary Manning's Report on Revision of the Tariff, page 217, James A. Hays & Co., of Boston, say 2 to 3 cents is better than 35 per cent., and 4 cents is estimated in the table at 45 per cent.

273. Hops are increased from 42 per cent. to 53 per cent.

276. Macaroni and vermicelli, made free in 1883, are again placed on the dutiable-list at 2 cents per pound, or 35.40 per cent.

SCHEDULE H.—*Wines, liquors, etc.*

302. Still wines, etc., in casks are raised from 50 cents to 60 cents per gallon, or from 71 to 85 per cent. Champagnes which pay 51 to 54 per cent. are not increased. Still wines in bottles are in effect increased by making bottles and jugs dutiable at 3 cents each, an increase of over $30,000 on importations of 1887.

303. Compounds containing 50 per cent anhydrous alcohol, rate changed from $1 to $2 per proof gallon, as suggested by the Secretary of the Treasury.

311. Cherry juice or prune juice is increased from 20 per cent. to 55.97, if not over 24 per cent. alcohol; above that made $2 per proof gallon.

312. Lemonade and soda water increased from 20 per cent. to 25 cents per dozen, an increase of over 87½ per cent., as reductions are figured on House bill in Senate report.

The total increase of duties effected by the changes in this schedule on wines, bottles, alcoholic compounds, cherry juice, lemonade, soda water, etc., will, as nearly as may be estimated from data at hand, aggregate $466,723.19.

SCHEDULE I.—*Cotton manufactures.*

313. Cotton yarns worth from 25 to 60 cents per pound are increased 3 cents per pound, raising the rates to slightly over 50 per cent. in each class.

315. Cotton cloths are classified into five instead of three divisions, as in the present law—not exceeding 50 threads to the square inch, from 50 to 100 threads, 100 to 150 threads, 150 to 200, and above 200. Without returns as to nature of average imports, it is impossible to make anything like accurate calculations. In the table of estimates it is assumed that one-half the importations of each class divided will be entered in the new class.

321. Stockings, hose, half-hose, etc., fashioned by machinery, are changed from 40 per cent. to a compound rate of 60 cents per dozen pairs and 20 per cent., a reduction on the finer grades and an increase on the cheaper. It is believed it will increase the revenues, but to what extent it is impossible to calculate, and no increase is estimated in the tables.

322. Ready-made clothing is increased from 35 to 40 per cent.

323. Hamburg edgings and Egyptian and oriental laces are changed from 40 per cent. to 45 cents per pound and 15 per cent. ad valorem in a provision recommended by Secretary Fairchild to the Committee of Ways and Means in 1886, and estimated by him at prices of that date to be approximately the same rate as under the present law. The other section, covering other laces, lace window-curtains, etc., recommended by him at the same time, is omitted in the Senate bill, by which it would seem these articles are intended to be provided for in the basket clause at 35 per cent., instead of 40 per cent. as under the present law.

SCHEDULE J.—*Hemp and flax.*

333. Flax yarns, hemp yarns, and jute yarns, brown and bleached linens, grass cloth, sheetings, and all manufactures of flax, etc., are raised from 35 to 40 per cent., sail duck from 30 to 40, and seines and gilling twine from 25 to 40 per cent.

336. Linen, laces, embroideries, etc., are increased from 30 per cent. to 50 per cent.

337. Collars and cuffs for men's wear, if cotton, are raised from 35 per cent. to 15 cents per dozen pieces and 35 per cent.; if in whole or part of linen, 30 cents per dozen pieces and 35 per cent.

340. Oil-cloths for floors, now 40 per cent., are made dutiable at a compound rate not much higher as applied to the importations of 1887.

SCHEDULE K.—*Wool and woolen goods.*

The changes in classification and the aggregation of items bearing similar rates in the Senate schedule made it so difficult to compare rates that for the only time in the tables of estimates their arrangement is departed from and one exhibiting details of items substituted.

The names of articles are taken from the home-consumption statement and rates proposed by the substitute are added, so that the descriptions are those of the present law and the schedule numbers not consecutive, but the items affected are all included.

346. Clothing and combing wools are made 11 cents if in the grease, 22 cents if washed, and 33 cents if scoured, without distinction as to value.

348. Carpet wools, valued over 12 cents, are raised to 6 cents, making a total increase in raw wools of more than a half million of dollars with reckoning.

350. Top waste, garnetted waste, etc., made dutiable at 30 cents per pound, the present rate on most of the classifications.

352. Noils to pay duty as washed wool of the same grade, under ruling of the Secretary of February 25, 1887. They now pay duty as washed or scoured, according to condition.

354. Woolen cloths.—A new subdivision reducing the dutiable-value line to 40 cents per pound, at present rates, but raising those from 40 to 60 cents per pound in value to 35 cents per pound and 40 per cent.; that is, if valued at 42 cents per pound to pay 123 per cent. duty.

Valued over 60 cents per pound, to pay 40 cents per pound and 40 per cent., thus raising the average importations of all woolen cloths imported in 1887 of the class below 80 cents in value to 102 per cent. duty; total increase on woolen cloths, $476,000.

Shawls raised, the cheapest grade to over 100 per cent., and duties on all shawls increased nearly $50,000.

Woolen manufactures, the cheaper grades over 100 per cent. by the proposed rate, and nearly $60,000 increased duties.

355. Flannels increased over $30,000.

Blankets and hats changed in classification and rate; a blanket worth 65 cents per pound would under the proposed rate pay 100 per cent. duty.

358. Knit goods are classified with ready-made clothing at 40 cents per pound and 45 per cent., and the cheaper grade, which now pays 10 cents per pound and 35 per cent., is thus raised to 258 per cent., an increase of 193 per cent., as reductions of the House bill are counted in the Senate report. On this item of knit goods the increase in duties is $180,000. Balmorals are classed in the same way, and the rate on the cheaper grade raised to 154 per cent.

355. Yarns are not mentioned by name, and would seem, therefore, to fall in the basket clause; but in the Senate schedule they are classed as not changed, save in the higher grades; but even with this construction adopted, in the estimates over a quarter million increase is realized and the rate on yarns, between 60 and 80 cents per pound, raised to above 98 per cent.

354. Worsted goods are increased to 180 per cent. on the cheapest grade to 76 on the better, and the duties to be realized from the proposed rate over $1,000,000 above the present law.

356. Dress goods, etc., are increased in rate to yield over $700,000 above present duties, if composed partly of wool or worsted; and

357. Dress goods wholly of wool, etc., increased in rate to over 90 per cent. on the cheaper goods, and yield, by proposed rate on importations of 1887, $750,000 more than the present law.

358. Clothing, ready made, is increased in rate; as also

359. Cloaks, dolmans, etc., the latter to 45 cents per pound and 45 per cent., effecting an increase of over $100,000. The total increase upon the manufactures of wool alone aggregate nearly $4,000,000. The importations of manufactured woolen goods in 1887 has been repeatedly estimated at considerably less than one-third the consumption. If the theory that the domestic price is raised by the duty on all articles on which we depend for any considerable portion of our supply from abroad, then the augmentation of price of woolen goods effected by the proposed rates would aggregate $12,000,000, or about 20 cents per capita, or $1 to the head of each family of five persons.

SCHEDULE L.—*Silk and silk goods.*

The changes in the silk schedule involve a revolution in the system of classification and imposition of duty, and embodies in the main a schedule submitted by the then acting and present Secretary of the Treasury June 14, 1886, to Hon. William R. Morrison, chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means. This, the Secretary announced, was the result of a series of conferences at the Department with representative manufacturers, a committee of the Silk Association of America, and of the Dry Goods Importers' Association.

He further suggests:

"These rival interests were unable to agree as to rates or the basis of their adjustment."

These schedules were submitted to the appraisers of the leading ports, and on their views the Secretary further says:

"From their replies * * * it will be seen that these officers found objections more or less serious to each of the schedules submitted."

And commenting on the disagreement the Secretary said:

"I confess to much disappointment at the failure of the efforts thus made by the Department to secure the co-operation of the business interests most directly concerned in formulating a satisfactory measure for the imposition of specific duties on silk."

At the prices of silks at that date the rates were estimated to equal 40 to 50 per cent. As silks fall in price the rate would correspondingly increase. Schedule No. 376 is new and 377 also, the latter an increase to 60 per cent., including wearing apparel, etc., and taking the Senate schedule would increase the duties $461,793.34 on this item alone.

Books, papers, etc.

379. Blank-books and drawings are raised from 20 to 25 per cent. Books exclusively in any foreign language but English put upon the free-list will effect a decrease of revenue, and a definition of limitation on what shall constitute periodicals—already free—will have a tendency towards an increase.

380. Envelopes, now 25 per cent., are made 25 cents per 1,000—a reduction on the finest grades so low as to be nearly equivalent to placing on the free-list, but not on the cheapest grades. An average reduction is evident, and yet no data from which to determine how much, so it was left unchanged in the table, being so many times covered by the increase in

382. Surface-coated papers and lithographs and photographic papers from 15 and 25 per cent. to 35 per cent., for which evident increase no estimate is made, except as contained in manufactures of paper, which are only counted at 25 per cent.

It is believed that the increase will aggregate $75,000 upon this schedule at rates as fixed.

SCHEDULE N.—*Sundries.*

389. Brooms are increased from 25 to 30 per cent.

398. Ostrich feathers, and other feathers, birds, etc., reduced from 50 to 40 per cent.

399. Fire-crackers changed from 100 per cent. ad valorem to 8 cents per pound, about the same rate.

412. Calf-skins, tanned, and all other not enumerated are increased in rate, and

417. Leather manufactures increased from 30 to 35 per cent.

418. Shell manufactures increased from 25 to 40 per cent.

422. Matches changed from 25 per cent. to 10 cents per gross or 1 cent per thousand, but no data as to import prices from which to calculate effect of new rate.

429. Pipes, bowls, and cigar-holders have added 72 cents per gross to present rates, but no number of these articles imported returned from which to calculate increase.

432. Buttons, except silk, have added 2 cents per line per gross to present rates.

435. Freestone, granite, etc., rough, from $1 per ton to 14 cents per cubic foot; and

436. Dressed stone from 20 per cent. to 25 per cent.

FREE-LIST.

The principal items added to the free-list by the substitute are—

630. Molasses testing not above 56 degrees, yielding in 1887, $1,496,690. Sugar drainage and sweepings made dutiable as sugar or molasses, according to test, may in part, if not all, come in free under this provision.

487. Braids, laces, etc., for hats, bonnets, etc., paying, in 1887, $822,704 duties, are also made free.

678. Opium, crude, yielding a revenue of $468,153 is made free and opium prepared for smoking is prohibited, still further reducing the revenue by $600,000, as measured by the importations of 1887.

550 to 556. Jute, manila, and other fibers, and floor matting made free, decrease the revenues about $2,000,000.

544. Ostrich and other feathers paying $311,000 are made free.

510. Coal-slack or culm is placed on the free-list. Some controversy seems to have risen as to whether this would make all coal free, but in the copy furnished this committee, only culm or slack could be construed to be made free, and only $10,000 is estimated as the reduction effected by this section, and even this would be undisturbed if, as is announced, it is the purpose to restore all coal to the dutiable list.

Recapitulation.

Schedules.	Importations in 1887 of articles affected by the Senate substitute.		Estimated duties under the Senate substitute.	Average ad valorem rate.	
	Values.	Duties.		Present rate.	Substitute rate.
A.—Chemicals	$5,041,574.58	$1,489,211.31	$1,409,992.01	29.53	27.96
B.—Earthen and glass ware	6,322,113.81	3,516,159.62	3,282,446.50	55.61	51.92
C.—Metals	17,060,960.51	8,115,310.97	9,743,397.65	45.89	55.17
D.—Woodenware	1,060,542.32	302,226.39	371,179.31	28.49	35.00
E.—Sugar	68,940,157.07	56,527,124.54	28,284,208.17	81.99	41.02
F.—Tobacco	10,955,123.03	9,127,758.26	11,507,718.23	83.31	105.04
G.—Provisions	24,315,089.97	6,192,126.83	6,831,393.95	25.46	28.09
H.—Liquors	2,549,662.24	1,929,508.77	2,396,231.96	75.66	93.98
I.—Cotton	24,726,037.70	10,152,993.44	10,356,856.42	41.06	41.89
J.—Hemp, flax, and jute	17,301,413.04	5,858,031.30	6,785,723.10	33.85	39.22
K.—Wool and woolens	46,212,247.11	29,938,893.68	34,322,845.84	63.48	74.27
L.—Silk goods and silk	31,264,276.48	15,540,300.70	16,002,094.04	49.73	51.18
M.—Books, papers, etc	3,572,436.31	818,583.21	893,109.08	22.91	25.00
N.—Sundries	10,568,347.25	2,948,510.12	3,104,501.84	27.89	29.37
Grand total	270,489,951.42	152,456,739.14 135,291,638.10	135,291,638.10	56.36	50.02
Duties remitted by reductions		17,165,101.04			
Duties remitted by free-list		5,828,074.65			
Duties remitted by prohibition (opium)		600,020.00			
Total duties remitted		23,593,195.69			

Articles.	Schd. No. substitute.	Rates of duty.				Importations for fiscal year 1887.				Estimated duties under Senate substitute.
		Existing law.	Equivalent ad valorem.	Senate substitute.	Equivalent ad valorem.	Unit of value.	Quantity.	Value.	Duty.	
SCHEDULE A.—*Chemicals, drugs, etc.*										
Acetic acid	1	2 cts. per lb	17.73	1½ cts. per lb	13.30	.113	lbs. 842	$95.00	$16.84	$12.63
Acetic acid, exceeding 1.04	1	10 cts. per lb	88.46	4 cts. per lb	35.40	.113	lbs. 18,302	2,069.00	1,839.29	732.08
Boracic acid, commercial	2	4 cts. per lb	72.42	5 cts. per lb	94.34	.053	lbs. 376,184	19,885.00	15,334.74	18,809.20
Boracic acid, pure	2	5 cts. per lb								
Chromic acid	3	15 per ct. ad val	15.00	10 cts. per lb				5,571.00	835.65	835.65
Tannic acid	5	$1 per lb	196.97	25 cts. per lb	49.21	.508	lbs. 390	198.00	390.00	49.50
Alcoholic perfumery	7	$2 p. gal., and 50 p. c.	63.25	$2 p. gal. and 25 p. c.	38.25	15.091	gal. 15,670.94	236,487.60	149,585.68	90,463.78
Alcoholic compounds	7									
Alizarine assistant	8	N. e.; 25 p. c. ad val		3 cts. per lb	22.50					
Ammonia, carbonate	10	20 per ct. ad val	20.00	1½ cts. per lb	26.51	.066	lbs. 980,208	64,832.00	12,966.40	17,153.64
Ammonia, muriate	11	10 per ct. ad val	10.00	¾ ct. per lb	15.00	.050	lbs. 2,196,483	110,531.00	11,053.10	16,473.62
Ammonia, sulphate	12	20 per ct. ad val	20.00	½ ct. per lb	25.00	.020	lbs. 852,129	17,275.00	3,455.00	4,260.64
Blue vitriol, or sulphate of copper	15	3 cts. per lb	77.11	2 cts. per lb	51.28	.039	lbs. 462.50	18.00	13.88	9.25
Camphor, refined	18	5 cts. per lb	34.11	4 cts. per lb	27.39	.146	lbs. 307	45.00	15.35	12.28
Roman and Portland cement	19			8 cts. per 100 lbs	31.09	1.030	bbls. 1,070,400	1,101,994.41	220,398.88	342,528.00
Roman and Portland cement, in bulk	19	20 p. ct. ad val	20.00	7 cts. per 100 lbs						
All other cement	19		20.00	20 p. ct. ad val				538.00	107.60	107.60
Chalk, prepared, precipitated, French, or red	20		20.00	1 ct. per lb				15,038.00	31,007.60	31,007.60
All other chalk preparations	20			20 p. ct. ad val						
Chloroform	22	50 cts. per lb	41.67	30 cts. per lb	25.00	1.200	lbs. 5	6.00	2.50	1.50
Cobalt, oxide	23	20 p. ct. ad val	20.00	40 cts per lb	27.29	1.466	lbs. 28,681	42,034.00	8,406.80	11,472.40
Collodion and all compounds of pyroxyline	24	50 cts. per lb	5.17	30 cts. per lb	3.10	9.667	lbs. 6	58.00	3.00	1.80
Collodion, rolled or in sheets, not made up	24	60 cts. per lb	11.43	40 cts. per lb	7.62	5.250	lbs. 20	105.00	12.00	8.00
Collodion, in finished or partly finished articles	24	60 cts. per lb. and 25 p. ct. ad val	31.54	40 cts. per lb. and 25 per ct.	29.35	9.178	lbs. 120,937	1,110.00	350.06	325.87
Ether, sulphuric	31	50 cts. per lb	48.00	30 cts. per lb	29.76	1.008	lbs. 124	25.00	60.00	37.20
Ether, spirits of nitrous	31	30 cts. per lb								
Fruit, ethers	32	$2.50 per lb	229.40	$1.25 per lb		1.090	lbs. 334	364.00	835.00	417.50
Oil, cognac	32	$4 per oz	533.33			.750	lbs. 16	12.00	64.00	20.00
Ethers, not enumerated	33	$1 per lb	61.62	75 cts. per lb	46.21	1.623	lbs. 541	878.00	541.00	405.75
Extract, logwood, etc	34	10 per ct. ad val	12.55	1 ct. per lb	17.86	.056	lbs. 8,824,041	328,761.00	41,248.60	58,240.41
Extract, sumac	34	20 per ct. ad val								
Gelatine, glue, etc., not above 7 cts.	35	Gelatine, 30 per ct.	30.00	1½ cts. per lb				219,357.95	65,807.39	54,839.25
Gelatine, glue, etc., above 7 cents	35	Glue, 20 per ct	20.00				lbs. 5,038,609	479,756.00	95,951.20	119,939.00
Glycerine, unrefined of 1.75 specific gravity	36	2 cts. per lb	24.78	1 ct. per lb	12.39	.081	lbs. 10,245,356	8 6,745.00	204,907.12	102,453.56
Glycerine, refined	36	5 cts. per lb	47.18	4½ cts. per lb	42.45	.106	lbs. 1,786,748	189,339.00	89,337.40	80,403.66
Indigo, extracts or pastes of	37	10 per ct. ad val	10.00	¾ ct. per lb	10.56	.071	lbs. 1,528,632	109,131.00	10,913.10	11,465.12
Indigo carmined	37	10 per ct. ad val	10.00	10 cts per lb	8.83	1.132	lbs. 29,168	33,024.60	3,202.46	2,916.80
Ink, writing, in casks, bottles, or jugs of 1 pint or more	38	30 per ct. ad val	30.00	40 cts. per gal... 50 cts. per gal... 60 cts. per gal...				103,658.81	31,097.64	31,097.64
Writing-ink, in bottles or jugs of less than 1 pint	38									
Writing-ink, otherwise than in casks, etc	38									
Iodine	40	40 cts. per lb		30 cts. per lb						
Iodoform	41	$2 per lb	57.32	$1.20 per lb	34.11	3.489	lbs. 140.71	491.00	281.42	168.85
Acetate of lead, white	42	6 cts. per lb	131.11	5½ cts. per lb	120.19	.046	lbs. 36,589	1,674.42	2,195.34	2,012.40
Acetate of lead, brown	42	4 cts. per lb		3½ cts. per lb			No imports reported.			
Orange mineral	45	3 cts. per lb	70.00	3½ cts. per lb	81.69	.043	lbs. 1,621,803	69,513.00	48,654.09	56,763.10
Licorice	48	7½ cts. per lb	56.18	5 cts. per lb	37.45	.134	lbs. 1,068,115	142,602.00	80,108.00	53,405.75
Carbonate of magnesia	49	5 cts. per lb	57.93	4 cts. per lb	46.34	.086	lbs. 77,072	6,652.00	3,853.60	3,082.88
Calcined magnesia	50	10 cts. per lb	40.36	8 cts. per lb	32.29	.248	lbs. 3,721	922.00	372.10	297.68
Morphia or morphine	52	$1 per oz	58.52	50 cts. per oz	29.26	1.709	oz. 14,311	24,456.00	14,311.00	7,155.50
Castor-oil	53	80 cts. per gal	194.77	50 cts. per gal	121.73	.411	gal. 1,507	619.00	1,205.60	753.50
Cod-liver oil	54	25 per ct. ad. val	25.00	15 cts. per gal	28.19	.522	gal. 130,295.85	69,326.00	17,331.50	19,544.38
Croton-oil	55	50 cts. per lb	62.50	30 cts. per lb	37.50	.800	lbs. 22.50	18.00	11.25	6.75
Cotton-seed oil	57	25 cts. per gal	62.50	10 cts. per gal	25.00	.400	gal. 15	6.00	3.75	1.50
Olive oil	59	25 per ct. ad val	25.00	35 cts. per gal	38.85	.901	gal. 181,618	163,648.10	40,912.03	63,566.30
Seal, whale, and other fish oil	60	25 per ct. ad val	25.70	8 cts. per gal	27.75	.288	gal. 57,281	16,513.10	4,128.28	4,582.48
Blues, such as Berlin, Prussian, and Chinese	63	20 per ct.; 25 per ct.	20.33	6 cts. per lb				69,152.90	14,059.28	14,059.28
Blanc-fixe, or satin-white, or artificial sulphate	64	25 per ct. ad val	25.00	¾ ct. per lb	33.22	.023	lbs. 71,808	1,621.00	405.25	538.56
Chrome yellow, green, and other colors in which lead or bichromate of potash or soda enters	66	25 per ct. ad val		4½ cts. per lb			Classified with "all other paints."			
Ocher, ochery earths; sienna, sienna earths; umber, umber earths; not specially enumerated when dry	67	½ ct. per lb	45.59	½ ct. per lb	23.09	.011	lbs. 7,891,321	86,543.00	39,456.66	19,978.30
Ultramarine	68	5 cts. per lb	51.76	4½ cts. per lb	46.58	.097	lbs. 647,382	62,535.00	32,369.10	29,132.19
Wash blue containing ultramarine	69	20 per ct. ad val		3 cts. per lb			New class			
Vermilion, red, or containing quicksilver	70	25 per ct. ad val	25.00	12 cts. per lb			New class	10,141.00	2,535.25	2,535.25
Plaster of paris, ground or calcined	75	20 per ct. ad val	20.00	$1.50 per ton	21.40	7.000	tons 4,814.23	33,736.50	6,747.30	7,221.13
Essences, ethers, extracts, mixtures, spirits, tinctures, and medicated wines of which alcohol is component part	80	50 cts. per lb	207.12	40 cts. per lb	165.70	.241	lbs. 36,626.75	8,842.00	18,313.38	14,650.70
Pills, powders, cordials, liniments, lozenges, troches, vinegars, etc., not specially enumerated	81	50 per ct. ad val	40.09	25 per ct. ad val	25.00			235,474.80	117,737.41	58,868.70
Santonine	84	$3 per lb	174.36	$1 per lb	58.12	1.721	lbs. 68	117.00	204.00	68.00
Castile soap	85	20 per ct. ad val	20.00	1½ cts. per lb	21.80	.057	lbs. 3,654,321	209,469.39	41,893.87	45,679.01
Sulphur, refined, in rolls	93	$10 per ton	35.06	$8 per ton	28.05	28.523	tons 85,545	2,383.00	855.40	668.36
Sulphur, sublimed, or flowers of	93	$20 per ton	55.82	$10 per ton	27.91	35.827	tons 278,563	9,980.00	5,571.26	2,785.63
Spirit varnishes, containing alcohol	98	$1.32 per gal. and 40 per ct.	95.50	$2 per gal. and 40 per ct.	117.31	2.387	gal. 2,595.90	6,196.00	5,905.09	5,905.09
Total chemicals								5,041,574.58	1,489,211.31	1,409,932.91

Articles.	Schd. No. substitute.	Rates of duty. Existing law.	Equivalent ad valorem.	Senate substitute.	Equivalent ad valorem.	Importations for fiscal year 1887. Unit of value.	Quantity.	Value.	Duty.	Estimated duties under Senate substitute.
SCHEDULE B.—*Earthenware and glassware.*										
Brown earthenware, etc.	99	25 per ct. ad val.	25.00	20 per ct. ad val.	20.00			$40,287.48	$10,071.87	$8,057.49
Stoneware above 10 gallons										
China, etc., ornamented	100	60 per ct. ad val.	60.00	55 per ct. ad val.	55.00			3,608,464.53	2,165,078.67	1,984,655.40
China, etc., plain		55 per ct. ad val.	55.00	50 per ct. ad val.	50.00			955,837.55	525,710.65	477,918.77
All other earthenware	101	55 per ct. ad val.	55.00	50 per ct. ad val.	50.00			938,779.93	516,328.96	469,389.95
Tiles, roofing and paving	102	35 per ct. ad val.	35.00	45 per ct. ad val.	45.00			11,642.00	4,074.70	5,238.90
Tiles, encaustic*										
Fire-brick, plain	103	20 per ct. ad val.	20.00	$1.25 per ton				53,683.94	10,736.78	10,736.78
Fire-brick, ornamented		Not enumerated	*	45 per ct. ad val.	45.00		No data.			
Gas retorts	104	25 per ct. ad val.		$3 each			No data			
Green and colored glass bottles†	107	1 ct. per lb.	56.54	1 ct. per lb.	56.54	.018	lbs. 14,305,372	253,025.00	143,053.72	143,053.72
Plain green bottle glass		1 ct. per lb.	28.33	1½ cts. per lb.	42.50	.035	lbs. 2,748	97.00	27.48	27.48
Green glass filler	108	30 per cent.	30.00	40 per cent.	40.00			421,753.98	126,526.16	168,701.59
Cylinder and crown polished, 10x15	112	2½ cts. per sq. ft.	7.28	4 cts. per sq. ft.	11.66	.343	ft. 7,714	2,648.00	192.87	308.56
Beveled or ornamented‡	117			New class.						
Plain flint or lime glassware	118	40 per ct. ad val.	40.00	1 cent per pound				35,894.40	14,357.76	14,357.76
Total earthenware and glassware								6,322,113.81	3,516,159.62	3,282,446.50
SCHEDULE C.—*Metals.*										
Bar-iron, flats, 1 inch wide, ¼ inch thick	121	.8 of 1 ct. per lb.	58.34	.8 of 1 ct. per lb.	58.34	.014	lbs. 715,472	9,811.38	5,723.77	5,723.77
Round and square, ¼ inch diameter		1 ct. per lb.	48.16	.9 of 1 ct. per lb.	43.34	.021	lbs. 21,830	453.49	218.39	196.56
Bar-iron, less than above		1.1 cts. per lb.	69.86	1 ct. per lb.	63.51	.016	lbs. 64,996	1,023.49	714.96	629.97
Bars, n. s. e., and round in coils, $\frac{7}{16}$ inch	122	1.2 cts. per lb.	55.36	1.1 cts. per lb.	50.75	.022	lbs. 506,165	10,972.13	6,073.97	5,567.81
All other, and slabs, blooms or loops		35 per ct. ad val.	35.00	35 per ct. ad val.	35.00	.038	lbs. 808,312	30,948.00	10,621.80	10,621.80
Cast-iron pipe	123	1 ct. per lb.	28.88	.9 ct. per lb.	26.00	.035	lbs. 1,699	58.83	16.99	15.30
Cast-iron vessels	124	1½ cts. per lb.	30.78	1.2 cts. per lb.	30.00	.041	lbs. 693,322	28,154.82	8,666.62	8,319.86
Malleable castings	125	2 cts. per lb.	25.04	1¾ cts. per lb.	22.00	.080	lbs. 53,770	4,294.40	1,075.40	940.96
Anchors, mill-cranks, etc.	127	2 cts. per lb.	68.26	1.8 cts. per lb.	64.28	.023	lbs. 115,808	3,393.00	2,316.16	2,084.54
Axles and parts	128	2½ cts. per lb.	62.29	2 cts. per lb.	50.00	.040	lbs. 789,224	31,671.75	19,730.61	15,784.48
Blacksmiths' hammers, etc.	129	2½ cts. per lb.	15.81	2½ cts. per lb.	14.24	.158	lbs. 9,176	1,450.70	229.41	206.46
Beams, girders, etc.	130	1¼ cts. per lb.	102.75	1.1 cts. per lb.	91.66	.012	lbs. 13,513,672	164,403.00	168,920.93	148,650.39
Boiler and other plate, iron or steel	131	1¼ cts. per lb.	31.01	1 ct. per lb.	25.00	.040	lbs. 38,502	1,552.00	481.28	616.03
				1.2 cts. per lb.						
				1.6 cts. per lb.						
				2 cts. per lb.						
				2.8 cts. per lb.						
				3½ cts. per lb.						
				45 per ct. ad val.						
Boiler tubes or flues	132	3 cts. per lb.	70.97	2½ cts. per lb.	59.52	.042	lbs. 1,675,057	70,051.00	49,712.25	41,876.42
Other tubes or pipes		2½ cts. per lb.	20.12		22.32	.112	lbs. 419,744	46,934.46	9,444.26	10,493.66
Bolts and hinges	133	2½ cts. per lb.	59.78	2½ cts. per lb.	53.57	.042	lbs. 108,776.25	4,548.83	2,719.44	2,447.40
Chains, not less than ¾ inch	134	1¾ cts. per lb.	47.15	1.6 cts. per lb.	43.24	.037	lbs. 181,099	6,721.00	3,169.24	2,897.58
Chains, ¾ to ¾ inch		2 cts. per lb.	47.33	1.8 cts. per lb.	42.85	.042	lbs. 193,425	8,173.85	3,868.50	3,481.65
Chains less than ¾ inch		2½ cts. per lb	44.37	3 cts. per lb.	53.57	.056	lbs. 1,243,202	70,043.06	31,080.07	37,296.06
Forgings of iron or steel	136	2½ cts. per lb.		2.3 cts. per lb						
Hoop, band, or scroll iron to 8 inch. wide, ¾ inch to No. 10, 3 cents or less per lb	137	1 cent per lb.	39.00	1 cent per lb.	39.00	.026	lbs. 156	4.00	1.56	1.56
No. 10 to No. 20 wire gauge		1.2 cts. per lb.	47.21	1.1 cts. per lb.	44.00	.025	lbs. 1,337	34.00	16.05	14.70
Thinner than No. 20 wire gauge		1.4 cts. per lb.		1.3 cts. per lb.						
Hoops for baling, etc., (cotton-ties)‖		35 per cent	35.00	1.3 cts. per lb.	108.33	.012	lbs. 28,000,960	345,997.00	121,098.95	364,012.48
Cut nails and spikes	138	1½ cts. per lb	43.07	1 cent per lb.	34.48	.029	lbs. 25,735	746.80	321.67	257.35
Wire nails, 2 inches, not less than No. 12	140	4 cts. per lb.		2 cts. per lb.						
1 to 2 inches long, No. 12 to No. 16 wire gauge		4 cts. per lb.		2½ cts. per lb.						
Shorter than 1 inch, under No. 16 wire gauge		4 cts. per lb.		4 cts. per lb						
Railway bars, steel, over 25 lbs	141	$17 per ton	84.33	.7 cent per lb.	77.77	20.160	tons 49,509.863	998,096.00	841,667.63	776,224.65
Railway bars, iron, over 25 lbs.		$15.68 per ton	93.00		93.00	16.855	tons 12.459	210.00	195.30	195.30
Tee rails, not over 25 lbs.		.9 cent per lb.	74.48		58.00	27.068	tons 69.75	1,888.00	1,406.16	1,093.68
Flat rails, punched		.8 cent per lb.	58.01		50.81	30.857	tons 4.375	135.00	78.40	68.60
Railway fish-plates	142	1½ cts. per lb.	92.75	1 cent per lb	76.15	.013	lbs. 20,330	274.00	254.13	203.30
Rivets of iron or steel	143	2½ cts. per lb.		2½ cents per lb.			(incl'd with No. 133)			
Sheets of iron or steel, 10 to 20 wire gauge	144	1.1 cts. per lb.	46.38	1.1 cent per lb.	46.38	.024	lbs. 1,228,251	29,130.00	13,510.76	13,510.76
Sheets, No. 20 to 25 wire gauge		1.2 cts. per lb.	36.40	1.2 cent per lb.	36.40	.033	lbs. 1,752,659	57,782.00	21,031.92	21,031.92
Sheets, No. 25 to 29 wire gauge		1.4 cts. per lb.	42.15	1.4 cent per lb.	42.15	.036	lbs. 1,035,062	36,834.00	15,525.95	15,525.95
Sheets thinner than No. 29 wire gauge		30 per ct. ad val.	30.00	1.5 cents per lb	68.18	.022	lbs. 53,500	1,165.50	349.65	803.83
Taggers iron			30.00		65.21	.023	lbs. 6,241,437	145,709.47	43,712.84	93,621.55
Sheets, iron or steel, corrugated	145	1.4 cts. per lb.	25.00	1.4 cts. per lb.	25.00	.056	lbs. 21,161	1,185.00	296.26	296.26
Sheet-iron or steel, pickled and cold rolled, 1½-inch to No. 20, wire gauge	[Provided, etc.] 146	1.35 cts. per lb.	36.58	1.35 cts. per lb.	36.58	.067	lbs. 1,490	55.00	20.12	20.12
Sheets, No. 25 to No. 29		1.75 cts. per lb.	78.55	1.75 cts. per lb.	78.55	.022	lbs. 5,550	213.00	167.31	167.31
Sheets, thinner than No. 29		30 p.ct. and ½ ct. p. lb	41.60	1.4 cts. p. lb. & ½ c.	75.00	.022	lbs. 6,074	131.00	54.49	100.22
Boiler and other plate, pickled, etc		1½ cts. p. lb. and ¼ ct.	21.76	1½ cts. per lb.	18.11	.099	lbs. 62,038	4,276.00	900.57	775.47
Taggers iron, pickled and cold rolled		30 p.ct. and ½ ct. p. lb	39.18	1.4 cts. & ½ c. p. lb.	61.11	.027	lbs. 495,021	13,486.00	5,283.36	8,167.84
Spikes, nuts, washers, horseshoes	148	2 cts. per lb.	48.54	1.8 cts. per lb.	43.90	.041	lbs. 2,245	92.50	44.90	40.41
Ingots or blanks for wheels	149	2 cts. per lb.	101.22	1¼ cts. per lb.	87.50	.020	lbs. 493,111	9,743.00	9,862.22	8,629.44
Steel—										
Fence-wire rods not smaller than No. 5‖	150	.6 ct. per lb	33.00	.6 ct. per lb.	33.00	.013	lbs. 334,698,837	4,223,611.50	1,717,480.90	2,008,193.02
All other of steel		45 per ct. ad. val.	45.00		54.54					
		.6 ct. per lb		.6 ct. per lb.						

* Encaustic tiles 30 per cent. in H. R. 9051.
‡ 10 per cent. ad valorem additional by Senate substitute.
‖ Wire rods smaller than No. 6 classed as wire at 1¼ cts.
† There is no such division as pints in the law.
‖ Cotton-ties covered by provision.

Articles.	Schd. No. substitute.	Rates of duty. Existing law.	Equivalent ad valorem.	Senate substitute.	Equivalent ad valorem.	Importations for fiscal year 1887. Unit of value.	Quantity.	Value.	Duty.	Estimated duties under Senate substitute.
SCHEDULE C.—*Metals*—continued.										
Iron or steel wire not smaller than No. 10		1¼ cts. per lb		1¼ cts. per lb		.081	lbs. 1,082,488.50	$88,302.00	$16,237.38	$13,531.10
Iron or steel wire, No. 10 to 16		2 cts. per lb		1¼ cts. per lb		.079	lbs. 1,113,395	88,523.00	22,267.90	19,484.39
Iron or steel wire, No. 16 to 26		2½ cts. per lb		2½ cts. per lb		.065	lbs. 79,555	5,198.00	1,988.89	1,789.98
Iron or steel wire cloths, and wire nettings, 5 to 10		3½ cts. per lb	12.96	3½ cts. per lb		.270	lbs. 300	81.00	10.50	9.75
Iron or steel cloths and nettings, 10 to 16		4 cts. per lb	16.48	3½ cts. per lb		.243	lbs. 2,301.50	558.75	92.06	83.30
Iron or steel cloths and nettings, 16 to 26		4½ cts. per lb	100.75	4½ cts. per lb		.045	lbs. 6,045	270.00	272.03	256.91
Iron or steel cloths and nettings, galvanized, 5 to 10		4 cts. per lb	20.00	3½ cts. per lb		.200	lbs. 65	13.00	2.60	2.43
Iron or steel cloths and nettings, galvanized, 16 to 26		5 cts. per lb	114.21	4½ cts. per lb		.044	lbs. 20,650	904.00	1,032.50	929.25
Iron or steel wire, galvanized, 5 to 10		2 cts. per lb	66.67	1¾ cts. per lb		.030	lbs. 100	3.00	2.00	1.75
Iron or steel wire, galvanized, 10 to 16		2½ cts. per lb	111.18	2½ cts. per lb		.022	lbs. 55,145	1,249.00	1,378.63	1,240.76
Iron or steel wire, galvanized, above 26		3½ cts. per lb	89.94	3½ cts. per lb		.039	lbs. 6,244	243.00	218.55	202.93
Wire rope and strand of iron, 10 to 16		3 cts. per lb	44.54	2½ cts. per lb		.067	lbs. 18,545	1,244.00	556.35	509.98
Wire rope and strand of iron, 16 to 25		3½ cts. per lb	59.17	3½ cts. per lb		.059	lbs. 92,529	5,473.00	3,238.52	3,017.19
Wire rope and strand of iron, galvanized, 10 to 16	151	3½ cts. per lb	55.13	3½ cts. per lb		.063	lbs. 6,946	441.00	243.11	225.74
Wire rope and strand of iron, galvanized, 16 to 26	151	4 cts. per lb	62.38	3½ cts. per lb		.064	lbs. 7,813	501.00	312.52	292.98
Wire rope and strand of iron, galvanized, above 26	151	4½ cts. per lb	38.24	4½ cts. per lb		.118	lbs. 1,470	173.00	66.15	62.47
Wire rope and strand of steel, 5 to 10	151	3½ cts. per lb	25.30	3½ cts. per lb		.138	lbs. 13,875	1,919.00	485.63	450.93
Wire rope and strand of steel, 10 to 16	151	4 cts. per lb	51.83	3½ cts. per lb		.077	lbs. 293,400	22,642.00	11,736.00	11,002.50
Wire rope and strand of steel, 16 to 26	151	4½ cts. per lb	49.74	4½ cts. per lb		.090	lbs. 249,814	22,600.50	11,241.67	10,617.09
Wire rope and strand of steel, above 26	151	5 cts. per lb	30.78	4½ cts. per lb		.162	lbs. 17,339	2,817.00	866.95	823.51
Wire rope and strand of steel, galvanized, 5 to 10	151	4 cts. per lb	59.08	3½ cts. per lb		.068	lbs. 30,351	2,055.00	1,214.04	1,138.16
Wire rope and strand of steel, galvanized, 10 to 16	151	4½ cts. per lb	53.58	4½ cts. per lb		.084	lbs. 22,813	1,916.00	1,026.59	969.55
Wire rope and strand of steel, galvanized, 16 to 26	151	5 cts. per lb	40.12	4½ cts. per lb		.125	lbs. 665	83.00	33.30	31.63
Iron or steel wire valued above 10 cts., 16 to 26	151	2½ cts. per lb	13.86	45 per cent. ad val.		.181	lbs. 761,596.25	137,408.00	19,039.90	61,833.60
Iron or steel wire valued above 10 cts., smaller, 26	151	3 cts. per lb	10.97	45 per cent. ad val.		.273	lbs. 426,248.60	116,578.00	12,787.46	52,460.10
Wire covered with cotton, etc., above 10 cts	151	6 cts. per lb	12.00	45 per cent. ad val.		.500	lbs. 4	2.00	.24	.90
Wire covered with cotton, etc., 16 to 26	151	6½ cts. per lb	11.86	45 per cent. ad val		.548	lbs. 467	256.00	30.37	115.20
Wire covered with cotton, etc., above 26	151	7 cts. per lb	22.17	45 per cent. ad val.		.316	lbs. 1,232	389.00	86.24	175.05
Wire, galvanized, 16 to 25, above 10 cts	151	3 cts. per lb	15.40	45 per cent. ad val		.194	lbs. 139	27.00	4.17	12.15
Wire, galvanized, above 26	151	3½ cts. per lb	10.82	45 per cent. ad val.		.323	lbs. 22,915	7,413.00	802.04	3,335.85
Files, blanks, etc., of all kinds 9 in. to 14 in	152	$1.50 per doz	53.30	$1.30 per doz		2.814	doz. 2,096.25	5,899.30	3,144.38	2,725.12
Files above 14 inches in length	152	$2.50 per doz	63.29	$2 per doz		3.960	doz. 1,515.83	5,988.00	3,789.59	3,031.66
Ingots, blooms, slabs, billets, and in all forms not specially enumerated or provided for, 1 cent per pound or less	153	45 per cent. ad val	45.00	.5 ct. per lb	62.50	.008	lbs. 607,304,082	4,815,436.65	2,166,496.49	3,031,520.41
Above 1 ct., not above 1.4 cts	153	45 per cent. ad val.	45.00	.6 ct. per lb	44.73	.013	lbs. 34,633,095	447,882.00	215,046.90	213,798.57
Above 1.4 cts. and not above 1.8 cts.	153	45 per cent. ad val.		.8 ct. per lb						
Above 1.8 cts. and not above 2.2 cts.	153	45 per cent. ad val.		.9 ct. per lb						
Above 2.2 cts. and not above 3 cts.	153	45 per cent. ad val.		1.2 cts. per lb						
Above 3 cts. and not above 4 cts	153	45 per cent. ad val.		1.6 cts. per lb						
Above 4 cts. and not above 7 cts	153	2 cts. per lb	34.77	2 cts. per lb	35.08	.057	lbs. 1,722,350	99,062.00	34,447.00	34,447.00
Above 7 cts. and not above 10 cts.	153	2½ cts. per lb	30.07	2.8 cts. per lb	30.76	.091	lbs. 6,401,946	585,465.00	176,053.55	179,254.48
Above 10 cts. and not above 13 cts.	153	3½ cts. per lb	31.96	3½ cts. per lb						
Above 13 cts. per pound	153	3½ cts. per lb	19.58	45 per ct. ad val	45.00	.166	lbs. 687,420	114,053.00	22,341.49	51,323.85
Steel plates engraved, stereotyped plates, etc	154	25 per cent. ad val	25.00	25 per cent. ad val	25.00			34,419.54	8,604.89	8,604.89
Cross-cut saws	155	8 cts. per lin. ft	12.80	6 cts. per lin. ft	9.64	.622	ft. 6,858	4,267.00	548.64	411.48
Mill pit and drag saws not over 9 inches wide	155	10 cts. per lin. ft	22.50	8 cts. per lin. ft	18.01	.444	ft. 9	4.00	.99	.72
Mill pit and drag saws over 9 inches wide	155	15 cts. per lin. ft		13 cts. per lin. ft						
Circular saws	155	30 per cent. ad val	30.00	30 per cent. ad val	30.00			356.00	106.80	106.80
All other saws	155	40 per cent. ad val	40.00	40 per cent. ad val	40.00			20,795.50	8,318.20	8,318.20
Bars of iron or steel, cold rolled, 4 cts. or less	156	45 per ct. + ½ ct. lb	51.93	1.6 cts. p. lb. + ¼ ct	51.39	.626	lbs. 837,562	39,205.00	15,686.16	15,494.89
Valued at from 4 to 7 cts. per lb	156	2 cts. + ½ ct. lb	44.10	2 cts. p. lb. + ½ ct.	44.10	.051	lbs. 149,541	7,632.00	3,365.58	3,365.58
Valued at from 7 to 10 cts. per lb	156	2½ cts. + ½ cts lb	30.92	2.8 cts. p. lb. + ½ ct	31.44	.097	lbs. 807,793	78,364.00	24,233.79	24,657.68
Valued at above 10 cts. per lb	156	3½ cts. + ½ ct. lb	17.55	3½ cts. p. lb. + ½ ct.	18.84	.199	lbs. 131,375.50	26,207.00	4,598.15	4,926.56
Strips of iron or steel, 4 cts. or less per lb., cold rolled	156	45 per ct. + ½ ct. lb	52.63	1.6 cts. p. lb. + ¼ ct	56.06	.033	lbs. 1,666,868	54,597.00	28,735.83	30,727.05
Strips from 4 to 7 cts	156	2½ cts. lb. + ½ ct. lb	31.71	2.8 cts. p. lb. + ¼ ct	32.10	.095	lbs. 518	49.00	15.54	15.79
Strips from 7 to 10 cts	156	3½ cts. lb. + ½ ct. lb	12.43	3½ cts. p. lb. + ¼ ct	13.29	.282	lbs. 2,425	683.00	84.88	90.93
Sheet-iron, cold rolled, No. 25 to 29, wire gauge	159	1.5 cts. p. lb. + ¼ ct. lb	19.43	1.5 cts. p. lb. + ¼ ct	19.43	.090	lbs. 78	7.00	1.35	1.35
Sheet-steel, cold rolled, valued at 4 cts or less	159	45 per cent. + ½ ct. lb	52.05	1.6 cts. p. lb. + ¼ ct	52.85	.035	lbs. 115,222	4,084.00	2,125.86	2,131.60
Sheet-steel, 4 to 7 cts	159	2 cts. p. lb. + ¼ ct. lb	40.52	2 cts. p. lb. + ½ ct.	40.52	.056	lbs. 32,977	1,831.00	741.99	741.99
Sheet-steel, 7 to 10 cts	159	2½ cts. p. lb. + ½ ct lb	31.87	2.8 cts. p. lb. + ½ ct	32.44	.094	lbs. 20,810	1,959.60	624.30	634.70
Sheet-steel, above 10 cts	159	3½ cts. p. lb. + ¼ ct. lb	10.17	3½ cts. p. lb. + ¼ ct	10.99	.344	lbs. 75,848	26,099.00	2,654.70	2,874.30
Circular saw plates, 7 to 10 cts	159	3½ cts. per lb	37.32	4½ cts. per lb	45.00	.100	lbs. 617	62.00	23.14	27.76
Circular saw plates above 10 cts	159	4½ cts. per lb	33.72	4½ cts. per lb	35.71	.126	lbs. 508,882	61,135.00	21,627.53	22,899.69

Articles.	Schd. No. substitute.	Rates of duty. Existing law.	Equivalent ad valorem.	Senate substitute.	Equivalent ad valorem.	Importations for fiscal year 1887. Unit of value.	Quantity.	Value.	Duty.	Estimated duties under Senate substitute.
SCHEDULE C.—*Metals*—continued.										
Antimony as regulus or metal	160	10 per cent. ad val.	10.00	¾ cent per lb.	11.90	.063	lbs. 3,085,497	$192,902.00	$19,290.20	$23,141.22
Bronze powder	163	15 per cent. ad val.	15.00	15 cts. per lb.	30.00			472,842.00	70,926.30	141,852.60
Copper in ore	166	2½ cents per lb.	49.63	1½ cts. per lb.	25.00	.050	lbs. 4,149,412	209,005.00	103,735.32	51,867.66
Regulus of copper	167	3½ cents per lb.	70.57	1¾ cts. per lb.	35.00	.050	lbs. 29,094	1,443.00	1,018.30	509.15
Old copper, clippings, etc., and composition metal	168	3 cents per lb. / 13.83	51.57 / 13.83	1¼ cts. per lb. /	30.17 / 8.05	.058 / .217	lbs. 37,786 / lbs. 977	2,198.00 / 212.00	1,133.58 / 29.31	660.25 / 17.09
Copper in plates, bar, or pigs	169	4 cents per lb.	41.50	2 cts. per lb.	20.75	.096	lbs. 415	40.00	16.60	8.30
Table knives, forks, steels, hunting knives, kitchen, butter, fruit, painters', artists', etc.	172	35 per cent. ad val.		20 c. p. doz. and 30 p. c. / 50 c. p. doz. and 30 p. c. / $1 p. doz. and 30 p. c. / $2 p. doz. and 30 p. c.				454,984.30	159,244.51	238,866.76
Penknives and pocket knives	173	50 per cent. ad val.		50 cts. per doz. blades and 25 p. ct. ad val.				1,419,861.27	709,930.64	922,909.83
Gold-leaf	174	$1.50 per package of 500 leaves.	28.17	$2 per package of 500 leaves.	37.55	5.326	packs 1,099	5,853.00	1,648.50	2,198.00
Hollow-ware	175	3 cts. per lb.	47.36	2½ cts. per lb.	40.00	.063	lbs. 22,749.50	1,444.00	683.84	569.86
Lead ore and lead dross*	176	1½ cts. per lb.	59.27	1½ cts. per lb.	59.27	.025	lbs. 814,142	20,605.00	12,212.14	12,212.14
Lead in sheets, pipes, and shot	178	3 cts. per lb.	60.82	2½ cts. per lb.	51.02	.049	lbs. 19,260	950.00	577.80	481.50
Double-barreled sporting breech-loading shot guns	181	35 per ct. ad val.	35.00	$10 each and 25 per ct. ad val.				748,482.49	261,968.87	392,953.30
Nickel in ore	184	15 cts. per lb.		5 cts. per lb.						
Nickel in matte	185	15 cts. per lb.		10 cts. per lb. on the nickel.						
Nickel, nickel oxide or alloy	186	15 cts. per lb.	30.73	15 cts. per lb.	30.73	.483	lbs. 390,586	190,652.00	58,587.90	58,587.90
Quicksilver	190	10 per ct. ad val.	10.00	6 cts. per lb.	14.32	.419	lbs. 693,547	290,380.00	29,038.00	41,612.82
Screws, commonly called wood-screws, more than 2 inches in length	191	6 cts. per lb.	26.17	5 cts. per lb.	21.83	.229	lbs. 41	9.40	2.46	2.05
Screws, 1 to 2 inches		8 cts. per lb.	61.17	7 cts. per lb.	53.43	.131	lbs. 821.25	107.40	65.70	57.48
Screws, ¼ to 1 inch		10 cts. per lb.	54.05	10 cts. per lb.	54.05	.185	lbs. 11,744	2,173.00	1,174.40	1,174.40
Screws, ¼ inch or less		12 cts. per lb.	44.58	14 cts. per lb.	52.04	.269	lbs. 5,309.50	1,429.00	637.14	743.33
Cut tacks, brads, or sprigs, 16 oz. to M	193	2½ cts. per M.		2½ cts. per M.						
Cut tacks, etc., over 16 oz. to M		3 cts. per lb.	80.21	2½ cts. per lb.	74.32	.037	lbs. 129.50	4.85	3.89	3.56
Type metal	194	20 per ct. ad val.	20.00	1½ cts. per lb.				60,328.00	12,065.60	30,164.00
Zinc, in blocks or pigs	195	1½ cts per lb.	46.35	1½ cts. per lb.	54.69	.032	lbs. 7,432,490	240,535.00	111,487.37	130,068.57
Zinc, old and worn out	197	1½ cts per lb.	57.65	1½ cts. per lb.	48.07	.026	lbs. 416,499	10,837.00	6,247.52	5,206.23
Manufactures of metals†	198	45 per ct. ad val.		45 per ct. ad val.						
Total metals								17,666,960.51	8,115,310.97	9,743,397.65
SCHEDULE D.—*Wood and wooden wares.*										
Manufactures of wood not specially enumerated	213	10 to 35 per ct. ad val.	28.49	35 per ct. ad val.				1,060,512.32	302,226.39	371,179.31
Sawed boards of mahogany, rosewood, granadilla, etc	215	Not in present act.		15 per ct. ad val.						
SCHEDULE E.—*Sugar.*										
Sugar, Dutch standard, not above No. 13	217	Sugar, Dutch standard in color: Not above No. 13, tank bottoms, sirups of cane-juice or beet-juice, melada, concentrated melada, concrete and concentrated molasses, testing by the polariscope— *Cts. per lb.*		Not above 75 degrees seventy one-hundredths of one cent per pound, and for every additional degree or fraction of a degree shown by the polariscope test, two hundredths of a cent per pound additional.						
		Not above— 75 deg...lbs.	1.40	60.29		30.14	.023	17,920,047	416,091.00	250,880.61	125,440.30
		76 deg...do..	1.44	55.60		27.80	.026	5,059,259	131,020.00	72,853.32	36,426.66
		77 deg...do..	1.48	68.28		34.14	.022	1,251,835	27,135.00	18,527.01	9,263.50
		78 deg..do..	1.52	60.59		30.29	.025	8,644,792	216,862.10	131,400.83	65,700.41
		79 deg..do..	1.56	61.70		30.85	.025	15,126,069	382,446.00	235,966.67	117,983.33
		80 deg..do..	1.60	80.42		40.21	.020	74,444,274	1,481,186.71	1,191,108.38	595,554.19
		81 deg..do..	1.64	68.97		34.48	.024	22,458,585	534,002.80	368,320.78	184,160.39
		82 deg..do..	1.68	72.37		36.18	.023	34,134,039	792,344.77	573,451.88	286,725.94
		83 deg..do..	1.72	70.41		35.20	.024	21,232,102	518,674.40	365,192.14	182,596.07
		84 deg..do..	1.76	88.22		44.11	.020	293,616,530	5,824,375.72	5,167,650.92	2,583,825.46
		85 deg..do..	1.80	79.91		39.95	.023	132,114,329	2,976,063.78	2,378,057.89	1,189,028.94
		86 deg..do..	1.84	70.59		35.29	.026	40,123,191	1,045,899.26	738,266.69	369,133.34
		87 deg..do..	1.88	73.26		36.63	.026	66,627,404	1,709,857.13	1,252,595.19	626,297.59
		88 deg..do..	1.92	76.26		38.13	.025	58,515,435	1,473,226.94	1,123,496.35	561,748.17
		89 deg..do..	1.96	73.24		36.62	.027	49,227,902	1,317,350.84	964,866.88	482,433.44
		90 deg..do..	2.00	84.03		42.01	.024	525,903,782	12,515,940.47	10,518,075.64	5,259,037.82
		91 deg..do..	2.04	79.49		39.74	.026	25,803,437	662,244.42	526,390.11	268,195.05
		92 deg..do..	2.08	77.46		38.73	.027	19,711,380	529,298.00	409,996.70	204,998.35
		93 deg..do..	2.12	72.76		36.28	.029	15,513,934	393,760.00	286,495.40	143,247.70
		94 deg..do..	2.16	78.32		39.16	.028	42,64[illegible],837	1,176,032.48	921,042.10	460,521.05
		95 deg..do..	2.20	84.26		42.13	.026	1,112,543,601	29,047,723.95	24,475,959.21	12,237,979.60
		96 deg..do..	2.24	78.73		39.36	.028	108,341,553	3,082,513.25	2,426,850.79	1,213,425.39
		97 deg..do..	2.28	79.65		39.82	.029	77,274,745	2,211,871.81	1,761,864.17	880,932.08
		98 deg..do..	2.32	83.45		41.72	.028	13,260,140	368,631.00	307,635.25	153,817.62
		99 deg..do..	2.36	86.17		43.08	.027	1,235,193	33,829.00	29,150.56	14,575.28
		100 deg..do..	2.40								

*By this provision silver ore is made dutiable if it contains lead, and the lead must pay $336,000 if 10,000 tons were imported. See House debate.

† If copper component material of chief value, 35 per cent. (see 170), or 1¼ cts. per lb. (see 168); if not chief value, 45 per cent.

Articles.	Schd. No. substitute.	Rates of duty. Existing law.	Equivalent ad valorem.	Senate substitute.	Equivalent ad valorem.	Importations for fiscal year 1887. Unit of value.	Quantity.	Value.	Duty.	Estimated duties under Senate substitute.
SCHEDULE E.—*Sugar*—continued.										
All sugar No. 13 to No. 16 D. S.	218	2¼ cts. per lb.	86.97	1⅛ cts. per lb	43.48	.032	lbs. 293,957	$9,295.00	$8,0 3.88	$4,043.44
All sugar No. 16 to No. 20 D. S.	219	3 cts. per lb.	89.43	1½ cts. per lb	47.79	.034	lbs. 65,967.80	2,213.00	1,979.02	1,071.97
All sugar above No. 20 D. S.	220	3½ cts. per lb.	83.91	2 cts. per lb	47.61	.042	lbs. 38,205	1,583.57	1,337.20	764.10
Molasses testing above 56 deg.	221	8 cts. per gal	47.26	4 cts. per gal	23.63	.169	gal. 2,159	365.50	172.72	86.36
Sugar drainings and sweepings	222	20 per ct. ad val., n.e.	20.00	Subject to duty as sugar or molasses, as the case may be.						
Sugar-candy and confectionery	223	5 cts. per lb. (*a*) / 10 cts. per lb. (*b*)	59.29 / 71.00	5 cts. per lb	59.29 / 35.50	.084 / .141	lbs. 87,881.50 / lbs. 10,352.50	7,410.80 / 1,458.20	4,394.07 / 1,035.25	4,394.07 / 517.62
All other confectionery	224	50 per ct. ad val.	50.00	50 per ct. ad val	50.00			13,796.26	6,898.13	6,898.13
Glucose or grape sugar	225	20 per ct. ad val.	20.00	¾ ct. per lb	37.50	.020	lbs. 1,784,642	35,644.00	7,128.80	13,384.81
Total sugar, etc								68,940,157.07	56,527,124.54	28,284,208.17
SCHEDULE F.—*Tobacco, etc.*										
Cigars, cheroots, and cigarettes	226	$2.50 p. lb., and 25 p.c.	108.11	$3.50 per lb.	116.31	3.009	1,102,600.11	3,318,012.17	3,586,003.38	3,859,100.38
Leaf-tobacco, for wrappers, unstemmed	227	75 cts. per lb.	81.57	75 cts. per lb	81.57	.919	28,756.00	26,441.00	21,567.00	21,567.00
Leaf-tobacco, for wrappers, stemmed		$1 per pound		$1 per lb			None reported			
All other leaf-tobacco, unstemmed*	228	35 cts. per lb	71.17	20 cts. per lb	40.65	.492	15,238,637.81	7,493,661.79	5,333,523.25	7,447,727.56
All other leaf-tobacco, stemmed		40 cts. per lb	89.58	25 cts. per lb	55.92	.447	48,996.14	21,868.50	19,590.37	12,249.03
Tobacco stems	229	15 cts. per lb.	113.23	15 cts. per lb	113.23	.132	lbs. 234	31.00	35.10	35.10
Tobacco manufactured	230	40 cts. per lb	178.73	40 cts. per lb	178.73	.224	lbs. 378,998.75	84,818.57	151,599.50	151,599.50
Snuff and snuff-flour, etc	231	50 cts. per lb	150.04	50 cts. per lb	150.04	.333	lbs. 30,879.31	10,290.00	15,439.66	15,439.66
Total tobacco, etc								10,955,123.03	9,127,758.26	11,507,718.23
SCHEDULE G.—*Provisions, etc.*										
Animals, live:										
Horses	232	20 per ct. ad val. / Free for breeding	20.00 / Free.	$20 per head	31.66 / 14.25	63.164 / 140.262	No. 38,800 / No. 15,090	2,450,763.45 / 2,252,374.00	490,152.69 /	776,000.00 / 301,800.00
Cattle	233	20 per ct. ad val. / Free for breeding	20.00 / Free.	$5 per head	37.31 / 17.68	13.437 / 28.263	No. 72,977 / No. 14,194	980,605.31 / 401,168.83	196,121.06 /	364,885.00 / 70,970.00
Hogs	234	20 per ct. ad val. / Free for breeding	20.00 / Free.	50 cts. per head	21.18 / 3.48	2.369 / 14.363	No. 1,634 / No. 160	3,871.25 / 2,298.00	774.25 /	817.00 / 80.00
Sheep	235	20 per ct. ad val. / Free for breeding	20.00 / Free.	50 cts. per head	19.00 / 25.31	2.632 / 1.975	No. 451,263 / No. 28,535	1,187,918.80 / 56,348.00	237,583.75 /	225,633.00 / 14,267.50
All other†	236	20 per ct. ad val. / Free for breeding	20.00 / Free.	20 per ct. ad val.				41,907.70 / 51,357.00	8,381.54 /	8,381.54 / 10,271.40
Beans	241	10 per ct. ad val.	10.00	25 cts. per bush	24.27	1.030	bu. 478,205.33	492,752.39	49,275.23	119,551.33
Beans, pease, mushrooms, prepared	242	30 per ct. ad val. n.e.		25 cts. per gal			No data			
Cabbages	245	10 per ct. ad val.		1 ct. each			No data			
Chicory, burnt or roasted	247	2 cts. per lb	65.17	1 ct. per lb	32.25	.031	lbs. 5,333,585	163,682.00	106,671.70	53,335.35
Chicory, ground or in rolls		Not enumerated		2 cts. per lb			No data			
Cocoa-butter	250	20 per ct. ad val.	20.00	3½ cts. per lb				18,362.00	3,672.40	
Dandelion root and acorns, prepared	253	2 cts. per lb	33.57	1½ cts. per lb		.060	110,746	6,597.00	2,214.92	1,661.19
Extract of meat‡	254	20 per ct. ad val.	20.00	35 cts. per lb. / 15 cts. per lb.				208,549.00	41,709.80	41,709.80
Extract of meat‡										
Dates, grapes, plums, and prunes	255	1 ct. per lb / Grapes 20 per ct	30.26 / 20.00	1 ct. per lb.		.033	80,587,319	2,662,551.72 / 371,662.00	805,873.19 / 74,332.40	805,873.19 / 92,915.50
		L. 16 cts. per box / O. 13 cts. per box	16.80 / 20.43	10 cts. per pkge.		.952	2,246	2,139.00	359.36	224.60
		L. 30 cts. per box / O. 25 cts. per box	16.15 / 22.72	20 cts. per pkge.		.636 / 1.858 / 1.100	117,565 / 2,043,875.83 / 1,561,887.75	74,821.00 / 7,797,735.50 / 1,717,887.75	15,283.45 / 613,162.75 / 390,343.50	11,756.50 / 408,775.16 / 312,377.55
		55 cts. per bbl	24.28	40 cts. per pkge / 8 cts. per cubic ft. additional		2.265	156,230.55	353,898.85	85,926.80	61,492.20
Oranges, limes, or lemons	257	20 per ct. ad val / L. 32 per M / O. $1.60 per M / Limes 20 per ct	20.00 / 38.00 / 36.43 / 20.00	$1.50 per 1,000		4.829 / 5.263 / 4.392	M. 53,864.65 / M. .76 / M. 8,311.733	260,122.58 / 4.00 / 36,504.25 / 40,128.73	52,054.52 / 1.52 / 13,258.78 / 8,025.75	80,796.97 / 1.14 / 12,467.59
Ginger and citron, preserved	260	35 per ct. ad val.	35.00	4 cts. per lb				13,373.00	4,680.55	6,017.85
Orange and lemon peel, preserved	261	Not enumerated		2 cts. per lb			No data			
Hops	273	8 cts. per lb.	42.64	10 cts. per lb	53.35	.188	lbs. 16,618,829	3,117,662.70	1,329,506.31	1,661,882.90
Macaroni, vermicelli, etc	276	Free	Free.	2 cts. per lb	35.40	.056	lbs. 8,866,977	500,970.20		177,339.54
Milk, preserved or condensed, including weight of packages	277	20 per ct. ad val.	20.00	3 cts. per lb				402,127.00	80,425.40	80,425.40
Spices, ground or powdered, not specially enumerated	279	5 cts. per lb.	50.12	4 cts. per lb	40.11	.100	lbs. 24,991.30	2,492.57	1,249.50	999.65
Filberts and walnuts of all kinds	281	3 cts. per lb.	54.79	2 cts. per lb	36.52	.055	lbs. 11,207,548	613,711.55	333,226.44	244,150.96
Nuts of all kinds, shelled or unshelled, not specially enumerated	283	2 cts. per lb.	44.38	1½ cts. per lb	33.30	.045	lbs. 867,939	39,109.91	17,358.78	13,019.08
Split pease, per bushel	286	20 per ct. ad val.	20.00	20 cts. per bush	26.17	.765	bush. 53,076	40,608.40	8,121.73	10,615.29
Rice, cleaned	287	2½ cts. per lb	113.03	1 ct. per lb	50.24	.020	lbs. 33,731,463	671,461.73	758,957.95	337,314.63
Rice, uncleaned, or in flour or meal		1½ cts. per lb	71.52	½ ct. per lb	23.84	.021	lbs. 4,000,642	83,909.00	60,009.64	20,003.21
Rice, broken		20 per ct. ad val.	20.00	½ ct. per lb	31.86	.016	lbs. 48,526,783	702,302.00	152,460.40	242,633.91
Paddy and broken rice		1½ cts. per lb	134.50	½ ct. per lb	26.90	.010	lbs. 2,152	20.00	26.90	5.38
Castor beans or seeds	290	50 cts. per bush.	55.70	25 cts. per bush	27.85	.898	bush. 33,648.75	30,204.00	16,824.38	8,412.18
All starch preparations	293	2½ cts. per lb	97.90	2 cts. per lb	78.31	.025	lbs. 300,622.50	7,676.50	7,515.60	6,012.45
Vegetables of all kinds, prepared or preserved, pickles, sauces, etc., not specially enumerated	295	30 and 35 per ct.	32.81	35 per ct. ad val	35.00			681,466.72	223,543.88	238,492.35
Total provisions								24,315,080.97	6,192,126.83	6,831,393.95
SCHEDULE H.—*Wines, liquors, etc.*										
Still wines, including ginger wine in casks	302	50 cts. per gal.	71.57	60 cts. per gal.	85.71	.709	gal. 3,405,228.88	2,378,886.70	1,702,614.44	2,043,137.32
All bottles or jugs containing wines or liquors		3 cts. each (bottles)		3 cts. each			No. 6,407,643.33		192,229.45	285,263.83

*About 8,000,000 pounds wrappers which would pay 75 cents per pound, $6,000,000; balance reduced to 20 cents, $1,447,727.56.
† Mules included, to pay $20.
‡ Tin cans or jars, dutiable at 15 cents per pound.

Articles.	Schd. No. substitute.	Rates of duty. Existing law.	Equivalent ad valorem.	Senate substitute.	Equivalent ad valorem.	Importations for fiscal year 1887. Unit of value.	Quantity.	Value.	Duty.	Estimated duties under Senate substitute.
SCHEDULE H.—*Wines, etc.*—cont'd.										
Alcohol containing 94 per cent. anhydrous alcohol	303	$2 per pf. gal.	170.35	$2 per pf. gal.	170.35	.908	gal. 345.58	$339.00	$577.59	$671.16
Compounds containing 50 per cent. anhydrous alcohol		$1 per pf. gal.								
Malt extracts, fluid, in casks	310	Not enumerated		20 cts. per gal			No data			
Malt extracts, fluid, in bottles or jugs		Not enumerated		40 cts. per gal			No data			
Malt extract, solid or condensed		Not enumerated		40 per ct. ad val			No data			
Cherry juice or prune juice, not over 24 per cent. alcohol	311	20 per ct. ad val.	20.00	60 cts. per gal	55.97	1.072	gal. 15,914	17,060.00	3,412.00	9,548.40
Containing more than 24 per cent. alcohol		20 per ct. ad val		$2 per gal			No data			
Ginger-ale, lemonade, soda water, ¾ pint	312	20 per ct. ad val	20.00	25 cts. per doz	37.53	.666	doz. 230,445	153,376.54	30,675.30	57,611.25
In bottles, ¾ pint to 1½ pints		20 per ct. ad val		5 cts. per doz			No data			
In bottles, over 1½ pints		20 per ct. ad val		50 cts. per doz			No data			
Total wines, liquors, etc								2,549,662.24	1,929,508.77	2,396,231.96
SCHEDULE I.—*Cotton manufactures.*										
Cotton thread, yarn, or warp yarn, 25 to 40 cents per lb	313	15 cts. per lb	42.30	18 cts. per lb	50.70	.355	lbs. 624,537.48	221,477.00	93,680.62	112,416.74
Yarn, 40 cts. to 50 cts. per lb		20 cts. per lb	45.38	23 cts. per lb	52.13	.441	lbs. 477,395.29	210,422.00	95,479.07	109,800.91
Yarn, 50 cts. to 60 cts. per lb		25 cts. per lb	45.21	28 cts. per lb	50.63	.553	lbs. 322,656.67	178,405.00	80,664.18	90,343.86
Cotton cloth, not bleached, not over 50 threads to inch*	315	Exceeding 100 and not exceeding 200 threads:		New class.						
Bleached		2½ cts. per sq. yd		2 cts. per sq. yd			80,059		2,001.51	1,601.18
Stained, painted, or printed		3½ cts. per sq. yd		2½ cts. per sq. yd			662,671		23,193.53	16,566.77
Cotton cloth, 50 to 100 threads		4½ cts. per sq. yd		4 cts. per sq. yd			746,576.12		33,595.95	29,863.04
Bleached		2½ cts. per sq. yd		2½ cts. per sq. yd			80,059		2,001.51	1,801.32
Stained, painted, or printed		3½ cts. per sq. yd		3 cts. per sq. yd			662,671		23,193.53	19,880.13
		4½ cts. per sq. yd		4 cts. per sq. yd			746,576.12		33,595.95	29,863.04
Cotton cloth, not exceeding 100 threads to square inch: Unbleached, not over 6½ cents per yard. Bleached, valued over 9 cents, and dyed, stained, or printed, valued over 12 cents per square yard.	316	Not bleached, val. 8 cts. or less. p. sq yd:								
		2½ cts. per sq. yd	48.94	35 per ct. ad val		.051				
		Bleached, val. 10 cts. or less per sq. yd:								
		3½ cts. per sq. yd	75.28			.046				
		Dyed, colored, etc., val. 13 cts. or less per sq. yd:								
		4½ cts. per sq. yd	73.31			.061				
		Exceeding 100 and not exceeding 200 threads:		New class.						
Cotton cloth, 100 to 150 threads to square inch, unbleached	317	Not in present law		New class.						
Bleached		3 cts. per sq. yd		3 cts. per sq. yd			614,806		18,444.18	18,444.18
Dyed, stained, or printed		4 cts. per sq. yd		4 cts. per sq. yd			2,194,986.12		87,799.44	87,799.44
		5 cts. per sq. yd		5 cts. per sq. yd			2,268,417		113,420.86	113,420.86
Cotton cloth, 150 to 200 threads, unbleached	318	Not in present law		40 per ct. ad val						
Bleached		3 cts. per sq. yd	56.19	3½ cts. per sq. yd		.053	s. yds. 614,806	65,648.00	18,444.18	21,518.21
Dyed, stained, or printed		4 cts. per sq. yd	55.76	4½ cts. per sq. yd		.072	s. yds. 2,194,986.12	314,930.27	87,799.44	98,773.37
		5 cts. per sq. yd	49.23	5½ cts. per sq. yd		.102	s. yds. 2,268,417	460,800.25	113,420.86	124,762.93
Cotton cloth, 150 to 200 threads to square inch, unbleached, valued at over 8 cts. per square yard; bleached, valued at over 10 cts.; dyed, stained, or printed, valued at over 12 cts. per square yard, 45 per cent. ad valorem.		Exceeding 100 and not exceeding 200 threads. Not bleached, val. at over 8 cts.								
		Bleached	40.00	45 per ct. ad val.		.098	653,403	63,952.75	25,581.10	28,777.73
		40 per ct. ad. val	40.00			.126	1,861,345	234,126.23	93,650.49	105,356.80
		Dyed, colored, etc., valued at over 13 cts.	40.00			.162	6,418,006	1,036,606.37	414,642.51	466,472.85
Cotton cloth, over 200 threads to square inch, not bleached		4 cts. per sq. yd	57.54	4½ cts. per sq. yd	64.29	.070	s. yds. 134,825	9,372.00	5,393.00	6,067.12
Bleached		5 cts. per sq. yd	51.83	5½ cts. per sq. yd	57.29	.096	s. yds. 1,304,760.25	125,743.00	65,238.01	71,761.81
Dyed, stained, or printed		6 cts. per sq. yd	48.40	6½ cts. per sq. yd	54.43	.124	s. yds. 2,184,598.25	270,767.00	131,075.90	147,460.38
Unbleached valued over 10 cts., bleached over 12 cts., and dyed or printed over 15 cts., 45 per cent.	319									
		40 per ct. ad val	40.00	45 per ct. ad val.		.136	s. yds. 98,678	13,443.00	5,377.20	6,049.35
			40.00			.164	s. yds. 734,649	120,783.00	48,313.20	54,352.35
			40.00			.194	s. yds. 3,502,375.05	677,546.00	271,018.40	304,896.70
Stockings, hose, etc., fashioned by machinery, etc	321	40 per ct. ad val	40.00	60 cts. per doz. pairs and 20 per cent.				5,947,478.04	2,378,991.23	2,378,991.23
Cotton damask, clothing ready-made, etc	322	35 per cent., 40 per cent. ad val.	38.77	40 per cent. ad val.	40.00			1,860,271.99	721,271.27	744,108.79
Hamburg edgings, embroideries, etc	323	40 per cent. ad val	40.00	45 cts. per lb. and 15 per cent. ad val.	40.00			10,661,300.73	4,264,520.29	4,264,520.29
Plushes, velvets, etc	324	40 per cent. ad val	40.00	10 cts. per sq. yd. and 20 per cent. ad val.	40.00			2,252,965.07	901,186.03	901,186.03
Total cotton manufactures								24,726,037.70	10,152,993.44	10,356,856.42

* A new classification under 50 threads to square inch, and by 317, 100 to 150 threads is here introduced, precluding accurate estimate. In each case the estimate given assumes that half the class divided will be entered in the new class.

Articles.	Schd. No. substitute.	Rates of duty. Existing law.	Equivalent ad valorem.	Senate substitute.	Equivalent ad valorem.	Importations for fiscal year 1887. Unit of value.	Quantity.	Value.	Duty.	Estimated duties under Senate substitute.
SCHEDULE J.—*Flax, hemp, and jute.*										
Hemp	331	$25 per ton	16.59	$20 per ton	13.27	150.701	tons. 5,623.3864	$847,449.00	$140,584.70	$112,466.72
Cables and cordage, tarred	332	3 cts. per lb	30.13	1½ cts. per lb		.100	lbs. 566,831	56,444.50	17,004.93	8,502.46
Cables and cordage, manila		2½ cts. per lb	32.89			.077	lbs. 355,890	27,052.00	8,897.24	5,838.35
Cables and cordage, all other		3½ cts. per lb	30.08			.146	lbs. 23,826	2,772.00	833.94	357.39
Yarns, flax		35 per ct. ad val	35.00	40 per ct		.128	lbs. 1,527,292	195,589.50	68,456.33	78,235.80
Yarns, hemp		35 per ct. ad val	35.00	40 per ct		.125	lbs. 500,000	62,316.00	21,810.60	24,926.40
Brown and bleached linens		35 per ct. ad val	35.00	40 per ct				13,589,418.55	4,756,296.50	5,435,767.42
Grass cloth		35 per ct. ad val	35.00	40 per ct				75,310.00	26,348.50	30,124.00
Sheetings	333	35 per ct. ad val	35.00	40 per ct		.111	yds. 39,804	4,423.00	1,548.05	1,769.20
Manufactures of flax		35 per ct. ad val	35.00	40 per ct				410,856.44	143,799.76	164,342.57
Sail duck		30 per ct. ad val	30.00	40 per ct			yds. 94,404	14,904.00	4,471.20	5,961.60
Seines and gilling twine		25 per ct. ad val	25.00	40 per ct				6,232.75	1,558.19	2,493.10
Jute yarn		35 per ct. ad val	35.00	40 per ct		.042	lbs. 12,614,917	531,108.00	185,887.80	212,443.20
Laces, embroideries, etc	336	30 per ct. ad val	30.00	50 per ct. ad val				1,142,473.35	342,742.00	571,236.67
Collars and cuffs for men's wear of cotton	337	Not in present law		15 cts. per doz. pieces and 35 p. ct. ad val.			No data			
In whole or in part of linen				30 cts. per doz. pieces and 35 p. ct. ad val.			No data			
Bagging for cotton	339	1½ cts. per lb	54.13	¾ cent per lb	27.06	.028	lbs. 964,452	26,727.00	14,446.78	7,223.39
Oil-cloths for floors	340	40 per ct. ad val	40.00	10 cts. per sq. yd. and 15 per ct. ad. val.	40.38	.394	sq. yds. 782,843	308,336.95	123,334.78	124,534.83
Total flax, hemp, and jute								17,301,413.04	5,858,031.30	6,785,723.10
SCHEDULE K.—*Wool and manufactures of wool.*										
Class 1:										
Clothing wools, value 30 cents or less per pound	346	10 cts. per lb	54.78	11 cts. per lb	61.11	.182	lbs. 22,607,556.30	4,127,025.97	2,260,785.64	2,486,831.19
Value over 30 cents		12 cts. per lb	35.92	11 cts. per lb	32.90	.334	lbs. 17,586	5,875.00	2,110.32	1,934.46
		Washed:								
		20 cts. per lb	58.51	22 cts. per lb	64.36	.342	lbs. 383,275	131,006.00	70,655.00	84,320.70
		24 cts. per lb	69.71	22 cts. per lb	63.90	.344	lbs. 2,010	692.00	482.40	442.20
		Scoured:								
		30 cts. per lb	74.11	33 cts. per lb	81.65	.405	lbs. 184,985	74,886.00	55,495.50	61,043.05
		36 cts. per lb	60.92	33 cts. per lb	55.84	.591	lbs. 22	13.00	7.92	7.26
Class 2:		Second class:								
Combing wools, value 30 cents or less per pound		10 cts. per lb	43.23	11 cts. per lb	47.55	.231	lbs. 9,568,481	2,213,331.00	956,843.10	1,052,527.41
Value over 30 cents per pound		12 cts. per lb	28.78	11 cts. per lb	26.39	.417	lbs. 129,573	54,026.00	15,548.76	14,253.03
		Scoured, 30 cts per lb.	66.18	33 cts. per lb	72.81	.453	lbs. 5,968	2,701.00	1,787.40	1,966.14
Class 3:		5 cts. per lb	27.69	6 cts. per lb	33.53	.181	lbs. 19,865,714	3,554,823.00	984,285.70	1,191,942.84
Carpet wools, value over 12 cents per pound	348	Scoured, 15 cts. per lb.	22.79	18 cts. per lb	27.34	.658	lbs. 79	52.00	11.85	14.22
Total wools								10,164,430.97	4,354,013.59	4,895,284.30
Wools, hair of the alpaca, goat, and other like animals, and manufactures of:										
Manufactures—										
Cloths, woolen—										
Valued at not exceeding 80 cents per pound		35 cents per pound and 35 per cent.	89.84	Valued above 60 cents per pound, 40 cents per pound and 40 per cent.	102.66	.638	lbs. 1,117,564.40	713,315.94	640,808.21	732,352.13
Valued at above 80 cents per pound		35 cents per pound and 40 per cent.	68.91		73.04	1.211	lbs. 7,689,699.02	9,309,054.73	6,415,016.73	6,799,501.48
Shawls, woolen—										
Valued at not exceeding 80 cents per pound		35 cents per pound and 35 per cent.	83.44		101.07	.655	lbs. 42,604.31	27,903.34	24,677.68	28,203.05
Valued at above 80 cents per pound	354	35 cents per pound and 40 per cent.	65.41		69.04	1.377	lbs. 237,778.30	327,460.85	214,206.74	223,095.66
Composed wholly or in part of worsted, the hair of the alpaca, goat, or other animals		40 cents per pound and 35 per cent.	61.53		66.53	1.508	lbs. 447,504.20	674,634.00	415,123.58	448,855.23
All manufactures of every description not specially enumerated or provided for, made wholly or in part of—										
Wool—										
Valued at not exceeding 80 cents per pound		35 cents per pound and 35 per cent.	88.81		101.49	.650	lbs. 123,783.46	80,510.00	71,502.76	81,717.38
Valued at above 80 cents per pound		35 cents per pound and 40 per cent.	64.46		67.95	1.431	lbs. 993,500.11	1,421,735.00	916,419.10	966,094.04
Flannels—										
Valued at above 60 and not exceeding 80 cents per pound		24 cts. per lb. and 35 per ct.	67.65	Valued at above 60 cts. per pound, 40 cents per pound and 40 per cent. ad valorem.	94.41	.735	lbs. 136,889	100,633.33	68,075.03	95,098.93
Valued at above 80 cents per pound		35 cts. per lb. and 40 per ct.	73.02		77.73	1.060	lbs. 77,097.15	81,722.45	59,673.03	63,527.84
Blankets—										
Valued at above 60 and not exceeding 80 cents per pound	355	24 cts. per lb. and 35 per ct.	69.36		95.22	.698	lbs. 709.50	480.30	339.38	475.92
Valued at above 80 cents per pound		35 cts. per lb. and 40 per ct.	70.30		74.65	1.155	lbs. 1,550.07	1,790.62	1,258.81	1,336.26
Hats of wool—										
Valued at above 60 and not exceeding 80 cents per pound		24 cts. per lb. and 35 per ct.	66.22		92.03	.759	lbs. 428	329.00	217.87	302.80
Valued at above 80 cents per pound		35 cts. per lb. and 40 per ct.	52.07		53.82	2.900	lbs. 2,027.46	5,578.98	3,061.21	3,162.57

Articles.	Schd. No. substitute.	Rates of duty. Existing law.	Equivalent ad valorem.	Senate substitute.	Equivalent ad valorem.	Importations for fiscal year 1887. Unit of value.	Quantity.	Value.	Duty.	Estimated duties under Senate substitute.
SCHEDULE K.—*Wool and manufactures of wool*—continued.										
Knit goods, and all goods made on knitting frames—										
Valued at not exceeding 30 cents per pound		10 cts. per lb. and 35 per ct.	88.33		258.33	.187	lbs. 48	$9.00	$7.95	$23.25
Valued at above 30 and not exceeding 40 cents per pound		12 cts. per lb. and 35 per ct.	65.20		145.70	.397	lbs. 201.33	79.95	52.13	116.50
Valued at above 40 and not exceeding 60 cents per pound		18 cts. per lb. and 35 per ct.	69.14		120.88	.527	lbs. 20,109	10,601.60	7,330.18	12,814.32
Valued at above 60 and not exceeding 80 cents per pound		24 cts. per lb. and 35 per ct.	69.62		102.70	.693	lbs. 73,417.25	50,895.08	35,433.42	52,269.68
Valued at above 80 cents per pound	358	35 cts. per lb. and 40 per ct.	62.58	40 cts. per lb. and 45 per ct. ad val.	70.80	1.550	lbs. 1,238,052.29	1,918,868.11	1,200,865.63	1,358,711.55
Balmorals—										
Valued at above 30 and not exceeding 40 cents per pound		12 cts. per lb. and 35 per ct.	67.72		154.05	.367	lbs. 1,009	370.00	250.58	570.10
Valued at above 40 and not exceeding 60 cents per pound		18 cts. per lb. and 35 per ct.	65.59		112.74	.588	lbs. 724	426.00	279.42	480.30
Valued at above 60 and not exceeding 80 cents per pound		24 cts. per lb. and 35 per ct.	68.15		100.25	.724	lbs. 873	632.00	430.72	633.60
Valued at above 80 cents per pound		35 cts. per lb. and 40 per ct.	66.35		75.11	1.328	lbs. 1,213	1,611.00	1,068.95	1,210.15
Yarns, woolen and worsted—										
Valued at above 60 and not exceeding 80 cents per pound	355	24 cts. per lb. and 35 per ct.	69.08	Valued above 60 cts. per lb., 40 cts. per lb. and 40 per ct. ad valorem.	98.30	.686	1,275,844.79	875,280.12	612,550.81	860,449.05
Valued at above 80 cents per pound		35 cts. per lb. and 40 per ct.	68.79		72.80	1.216	157,866.50	191,912.25	132,018.19	139,911.50
Worsted, the hair of the alpaca, goat, or other animals (except such as are composed in part of wool)—										
Valued at not exceeding 30 cents per pound		10 cts. per lb. and 35 per ct.	76.49	35 cts. and 35 per ct.	180.22	.241	100,189.00	24,146.00	18,740.00	43,516.25
Valued at above 30 and not exceeding 40 cents per pound	354	12 cts. per lb. and 35 per ct.	69.38		135.27	.349	174,018.25	60,737.00	42,140.14	82,164.33
Valued at above 40 and not exceeding 60 cents per pound		18 cts. per lb. and 35 per ct.	68.28	35 cts. and 40 per ct.	104.70	.541	1,588,069.60	859,029.70	586,512.92	809,436.24
Valued at above 60 and not exceeding 80 cents per pound		24 cts. per lb. and 35 per ct.	68.15	40 cts. and 40 per ct.	95.25	.724	3,785,978.60	2,740,730.00	1,867,855.36	2,610,643.44
Valued at above 80 cents per pound		35 cts. per lb. and 40 per ct.	71.99		76.55	1.094	1,343,256.80	1,469,661.73	1,058,004.68	1,125,107.41
Bunting	357	10 cts. per sq. yd. and 35 per ct.	80.75	11 cts. and 40 per ct.	90.82	.219	s. yds. 242.50	53.00	42.80	47.87
Dress goods, women's and children's, coat linings, Italian cloths, and goods of like description—										
Composed in part of wool, worsted, the hair of the alpaca, goat, or other animals—	356									
Valued at not exceeding 20 cents per square yard		5 cts. per sq. yd. and 35 per ct.	67.89	Valued above 15 cts.; 7 cts. per sq. yd. and 40 per ct. ad val.	86.25	.152	s. yds. 26,926,224.70	4,094,403.66	2,779,502.28	3,522,806.94
Composed wholly of wool, worsted, the hair of the alpaca, goat, or other animals, or of a mixture of them, and all such goods of like description, with selvages made wholly or in part of other materials, or with threads of other materials introduced for the purpose of changing the classification—	357									
Weighing 4 ounces or less per square yard		9 cts. per sq. yd. and 40 per ct.	82.96	11 cts. and 40 per ct.	92.50	.209	s. yds. 31,136,149.26	6,522,568.51	5,411,280.91	6,034,003.81
All weighing over 4 ounces per square yard		35 cts. per lb. and 40 per ct.	69.68	40 cts. per lb. and 40 per ct. ad val.	73.02	1.179	lbs. 2,560,715.83	3,019,201.46	2,103,931.19	2,231,966.91
Clothing, ready-made, and wearing apparel of every description not specially enumerated or provided for, and balmoral skirts and skirting, and goods of similar description, or used for like purposes	358	40 cts. per lb. and 35 per ct.	54.18	40 cts. per lb. and 45 per ct. ad val.	63.02	2.085	lbs. 330,415.94	689,002.38	373,317.15	442,217.44
Cloaks, dolmans, jackets, talmas, ulsters, or other outside garments, for ladies' and children's apparel, and goods of similar description, or used for like purposes	359	45 cts. per lb. and 40 per ct.	67.74	45 cts. per lb. and 45 per ct. ad val.	72.74	1.622	lbs. 476,129.73	772,240.65	523,154.55	561,766.66
Total wool and manufactures of wool								36,047,816.14	25,584,880.09	29,427,561.54

Articles.	Schd. No. substitute.	Rates of duty. Existing law.	Equivalent ad valorem.	Senate substitute.	Equivalent ad valorem.	Importations for fiscal year 1887. Unit of value.	Quantity.	Value.	Duty.	Estimated duties under Senate substitute.
SCHEDULE L.—*Silk and silk goods.*										
Silk, partially manufactured	372	50 cts. per lb	19.08	50 cts. per lb		2.621	lbs. 3,461	$9,071.00	$1,730.50	$1,730.50
Thrown silk, sewing silk, etc	373	30 per ct. ad val	30.00	30 per ct. ad val		2.501	lbs. 174,020.70	445,162.98	133,548.89	133,548.89
Silk goods and ribbons, 8 to 10 ounces per square yard, and 10 to 25 per cent. silk	374	50 per ct. ad val	50.00	75 cts. per lb. and 15 per ct.				15,982,839.77	7,966,419.88	7,966,419.88
25 to 50 per cent. silk		50 per ct. ad val		$1.25 per lb. and 15 per ct.						
50 per cent. or more of silk, if black		50 per ct		$1.60 p. lb. and 15 per ct.						
50 per cent. or more of silk, if white, colored, or mixed		50 per ct		$2.25 p. lb. and 15 per ct.						
Velvets, plushes, fabrics, and ribbons, not otherwise specially provided for, of 1 to 8 ozs. per sq. yd. and 10 to 25 per ct. silk	375	50 per ct		$1 p. lb. and 15 p. c.				6,343,086.33	3,171,543.15	3,171,543.15
25 to 50 per ct. silk		50 per ct	50.00	$1.50 p. lb. and 15 p. c.						
50 per ct. or more of silk		50 per ct		$3.50 p. lb. and 15 p. c.						
Webbings, gorings, etc	376	50 per ct	50.00	50 per ct. ad val				462,455.00	231,227.50	231,227.50
Laces, embroideries, clothing, c	377	50 per ct. ad val	50.00	60 per ct. ad val				4,617,933.42	2,308,966.78	2,770,760.05
All manufactures of silk not enumerated	378	50 per ct. ad val	50.00	50 per ct. ad val				3,453,727.98	1,726,864.00	1,726,864.00
Total silk and silk goods								31,264,276.48	15,540,300.70	16,062,094.04
SCHEDULE M.—*Books, papers, etc.*										
Books, pamphlets, etchings, etc	379	25 p. ct., 20 p. ct.	24.95	25 per ct. ad val				2,762,324.70	689,241.50	690,581.17
		25 per ct	25.00					35,424.07	8,856.03	8,859.03
		20 per ct	20.00					25.00	5.00	6.25
Envelopes	380	25 per ct	25.00	25 cts. p. M				6,533.00	1,633.25	1,633.25
Manufactures of papers*	381	15 per ct	15.47	25per ct. ad val				768,129.54	118,847.43	192,032.38
Lithographs, surface-coated papers	382	Not in present law		35 per ct. ad val						
Total books, papers, etc								3,572,436.31	818,583.21	893,139.08
SCHEDULE N.—*Sundries.*										
Brooms of all kinds	389	25 per ct. ad val	25.00	30 per ct. ad val	30.00			4,174.80	1,043.70	1,252.44
Feathers and downs of all kinds when dressed, colored, or manufactured, including dressed or finished birds, artificial feathers, flowers, not specially enumerated	398	50 per ct. ad val	50.00	40 per ct. ad val	40.00			849,097.00	424,993.50	339,638.80
Fire-crackers of all kinds	399	100 per ct. ad val	100.00	8 cts. per lb				332,941.00	332,941.00	332,941.00
Gunpowder and all explosive substances used for artillery, blasting, mining, or sporting purposes, valued at 20 cents or less per pound	403	6 cts. per lb	34.13	5 cts. per lb	28.44	.176	lbs. 1,280	225.00	76.80	64.00
Valued above 20 cents a pound		10 cts. per lb	8.46	8 cts. per lb	6.77	1.182	lbs. 500	591.00	50.00	40.00
Human hair, clean or drawn, not manufactured	405	30 per ct. ad val	30.00	20 per ct. ad val	20.00			40,611.28	12,183.38	8,122.25
Hair, curled, for beds or mattresses	406	25 per ct. ad val	25.00	15 per ct. ad val	15.00			153.00	38.25	22.95
Calf-skins, tanned or tanned and dressed; dressed upper-leather, enameled or japanned, and skins of all kinds not specially enumerated	412	20 per ct. ad val	20.00	25 cts. per lb	25.00			3,827,133.09	765,426.61	956,783.27
Lime	414	10 per ct. ad val	.10	5 cts. per 100 lbs			bbls. 132,239	57,226.46	5,722.65	19,835.85
Manufactures of alabaster, amber, jet, spar, etc	415	Various: 10, 20, 25, and 30 per ct.	22.56	25 per ct. ad val	25.00			322,862.22	72,742.42	80,715.56
Manufactures of leather, gutta-percha, human hair, and papier-maché, wholly or in part not specially enumerated	417	30 to 35 per ct	31.72	35 per ct. ad val	35.00			729,464.46	231,426.88	255,312.56
Manufactures of ivory, vegetable ivory, mother-of-pearl, and shell, wholly or chief part, not specially enumerated	418	Average 34.31 per. ct.	34.31	40 per. ct. ad val	40.00			244,826.14	84,099.49	97,930.46
Matches, in boxes, 100 or less	422	35 per ct. ad val	35.00	10 cts. per gross				25,458.41	8,910.44	*8,910.44
Matches, in boxes, over 100, or not boxed				1 ct. per 1,000 matches.						
Cocoa matting	423	20 per ct. ad val	20.00	10 cts. per sq. yd				221,492.19	44,298.54	44,298.54
Cocoa mats				5 cts. per sq. foot						
Pipes, pipe-bowls, and cigar-holders, of wood	429	70 per ct. ad val		½ ct. each and 70 per ct.			No separate data			
Buttons, except silk	432	25 per ct. ad val	25.00	2 cts. per line, button measure of $\frac{1}{40}$ in., per gross and 25 per ct. ad val.				3,469,016.25	867,254.07	867,254.07
Hatters' plush	433	25 per ct. ad val	20.00	10 per ct. ad val	15.00			158,243.00	39,560.75	15,824.30
Freestone, granite, etc., rough	435	$1 per ton	21.22	14 cts. per cu. foot	31.83	4.713	tons 13,513.18	63,689.61	13,513.18	20,269.77
Freestone, etc., dressed	436	20 per ct. ad val	20.00	25 per ct. ad val	25.00			221,142.34	44,228.46	55,285.58
Total sundries								10,568,347.25	2,948,510.12	3,104,501.84

*Part of this is raised to 35 per cent. by section 382.

Free-list.

Articles.	Sched. No.	Importations of 1887. Present rate.	Equivalent ad valorem.	Unit of value.	Quantity.	Value.	Duty.
Baryta, sulphate of	469	10 per cent	10.00	.001	11,813,810	$12,649.00	$1,264.90
Bees-wax	471	20 per cent	20.00	.212	9,159.25	1,946.10	389.22
Braids, plaits, flats, laces, etc., for hats, bonnets, etc	487	do	20.00			4,113,521.67	822,704.33
Bristles, raw or manufactured	490	15 per cent	15.08	.995	lbs. 1,162,824.75	1,156,435.00	174,423.71
Bulbs and bulbous roots	493	20 per cent	20.00			160,982.47	32,196.40
Coal slack or culm	510	30 cents per ton	39.86	.753	tons 36,292.80	27,313.97	10,887.83
Coal-tar, crude	512	10 per cent	10.00	3.269	lbs. 2,599	8,495.00	849.50
Currants, Zante	528	1 cent per pound	27.48	.036	lbs. 29,196,393	1,052,326.00	291,963.93
Egg-yelks	538	20 per cent	20.00	.147		2,726.00	545.20
Ostrich and other feathers	544	25 per cent	25.00			1,246,558.46	311,639.65
Jute	550	20 per cent	20.00	40.178	tons 21,477,436	862,926.00	172,585.20
Jute-butts	551	$5 per ton	19.13	26.131	tons 68,965,361	1,802,162.00	344,826.84
Manila	552	$25 per ton	21.06	118.718	tons 23,359,100	2,773,150.00	583,977.53
Sisal-grass	554	$15 per ton	14.80	101.318	tons 33,287,355	3,372,619.00	499,310.34
Sunn	555	$15 per ton	15.45	97.085	tons 277.7145	26,962.00	4,165.72
All other textile grasses, etc., n. s. o	556	$15 per ton	13.66	109.837	tons 1,519.132	166,856.00	22,787.03
Floor-matting	561	20 per cent	20.00			661,476.58	132,895.31
Grease and oils not otherwise provided for	572	10 per cent	10.00	.014	lbs. 8,881,134	125,483.66	12,548.37
Human hair	577	20 per cent	20.00		lbs. 20,337,139	63,088.00	12,617.60
Mineral waters not provided for	627	30 per cent	30.00	.305	gals. 21,243	6,473.14	1,941.94
Molasses not above fifty-six degrees	630	4 cts. per gal	28.04	.140	gals. 37,417,265	5,336,364.13	1,496,690.00
Nut oil, or oil of nuts, n. o. p	667	25 per cent	25.00	.296	gals. 283,773	83,857.00	20,964.25
Olive oil, unfit for eating	669	25 per cent	25.00	.901	gals. 544,855	470,944.29	122,736.08
Opium, crude, unadulterated, not under 9 per cent. morphia	678	$1 per lb	43.76	2.285	lbs. 468,153.13	1,069,918.00	468,153.13
Potash:							
Crude	701	20 per cent	20.00	.034	lbs. 4,744,276	163,603.00	32,720.60
Caustic	702	20 per cent	20.00	.045	lbs. 1,237,857	56,184.00	11,236.80
Nitrate of	703	1 cent per lb	35.30	.028	lbs. 10,552,118	298,070.00	105,221.18
Sulphate of	704	20 per cent	20.00	.020	lbs. 1,996,324	38,986.00	7,797.20
Chlorate of	705	3 cents per pound	94.93	.120	lbs. 1,855,899	223,321.00	55,676.97
Rags, not otherwise provided for	712	10 per cent	10.00	.683	lbs. 2,280	1,558.00	155.80
Hemp seed	729	½ cent per pound	15.07	.017	lbs. 3,040,473	50,447.00	7,601.19
Rape seed	736	½ cent per pound	7.50	.033	lbs. 1,111,839	37,040.00	2,779.60
Sponges	754	20 per cent	20.00			302,509.57	60,501.00
Sand	757	10 per cent	10.00			12,904.00	1,290.40
Turpentine, spirits of	777	20 cents per gal	11.80	1.700	146.50	294.00	29.30
						25,803,105.04	5,828,074.65

Mr. BAYNE. I did suppose, in view of the fact there had been a long discussion of the tariff question in the House of Representatives and the matter had gone over to the Senate, that we should have forborne on an occasion of this sort when unanimity is so necessary in order to effect an adjournment. [Laughter.] But it seems the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. MCMILLIN] is anxious to discuss the tariff question even when the proposition before the House is whether we shall adjourn or not; and he has devoted his remarks mainly to the measure which is now pending in the Senate.

The first proposition of the gentleman from Tennessee, as I caught it, was that the Mills bill simply made a reduction of existing duties of between 5 and 6 per cent. The argument of the advocates of that bill in the House of Representatives was directed to that end, and it was assiduously asserted on that side of the House that the total reduction made was about 5 or 6 per cent. Like some of the propositions of the bill, this argument is a deception and a snare calculated to deceive the public who could not fully investigate the bill. Taking the entire bill and eliminating from the calculation the duties which were stricken entirely from existing law, such a calculation was possible, but that conclusion is erroneous.

In order to ascertain how far the Mills bill reduces the duties on imports, all articles under existing law which are not touched by the bill should not be taken into consideration. Articles which are put on the free-list, and which now pay a duty, should be counted as a 100 per cent. reduction. If sugar, an industry which flourishes in a certain section of the country be left out, and if the calculation be made on the basis of the proposed free-list, coupled with the articles on which the duties are reduced, it will be found that the Mills bill makes an average reduction of duty of from 40 to 50 per cent.

Mr. WHEELER. May I ask the gentleman a question—one question.

Mr. BAYNE. In a moment. And yet the argument on that side of the House has been that the reduction of duties has only been between 5 and 6 per cent.

Mr. WHEELER. The question I want to ask is, what would be the effect of the reduction on sugar——

Mr. BAYNE. I will come to that presently. The gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. MCMILLIN] has said that the iron schedule of the bill prepared by the Senate increases the duty upon the whole about 10 per cent.

How he arrives at that conclusion I can not understand. The duties on soft steel and cotton-ties are raised by the Senate bill. They are simply put upon the level they should occupy in a properly graduated metal schedule. Unless these duties raise the percentage 10 per cent. on the iron schedule, there is no such increase as he asserts. But cotton-ties are a commodity consumed in a certain section of the country, not produced like sugar, and therefore they were put upon the free-list by the Mills bill. The Senate did not see fit to discriminate in favor of the Southern section of this country as against the consumers of hoop-iron throughout the West and throughout the entire North. It sought to draw no line of discrimination as to production or consumption, but aimed to treat both the producers and the consumers of the country equally, equitably, and alike.

The gentleman has undertaken to show that the Senate bill, notwithstanding its reduction of the duties on sugar of 50 per cent. yet raised the duty on sugar and gives advantage to the sugar trust. I aver that the Mills bill as it passed the House was under the direction and inspiration of the sugar trust. It has sufficiently appeared that a leading Democrat of New York and the president of that great trust, appeared either directly or indirectly before the Ways and Means Committee of the House and secured from that committee such protection as would enable that trust to flourish.

Mr. TURNER, of Georgia. Will the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BAYNE] allow a suggestion there?

Mr. BAYNE. Yes, sir.

Mr. TURNER, of Georgia. The gentleman has probably forgotten that he has just stated a fact that has been denied by all the gentlemen who constitute the majority side of the Ways and Means Committee; and if he persists in that statement I would be greatly obliged to him if he would state the evidence upon which he makes that allegation.

Mr. BAYNE. I shall treat the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. TURNER] fairly. It was denied by gentlemen of that committee that Mr. Havemeyer appeared before the Committee on Ways and Means; that is, that he appeared in one of its official sittings. But it has been admitted by members of the Ways and Means Committee that Mr. Havemeyer and his attorney had conferences with them respecting duties upon sugar.

Mr. TURNER, of Georgia. May I have the attention of the gentleman just a moment on a matter of fact?

Mr. BAYNE. I must decline to yield now.

Mr. TURNER, of Georgia. I will take only a moment of the gentleman's time.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE, of Kentucky. The gentleman from Pennsylvania will have plenty of time, because the statement he has made is absolutely untrue, and the facts must go into the RECORD.

Mr. BAYNE. Very well; if plenty of time is accorded I will yield for any interruption.

Mr. MCMILLIN. The statement the gentleman has made is one that can not be substantiated in any way in the world, because it is absolutely devoid of all fact.

Mr. EZRA B. TAYLOR. I think that statement is true; because there was no investigation or hearing before the Committee of Ways and Means, but only before a fraction of it.

Mr. BAYNE. It was admitted in a colloquy on this floor that Mr. Havemeyer and his attorney were here in Washington. It was admitted, if I recall the facts correctly, by the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. BRECKINRIDGE] that he had had a conversation with Mr. Havemeyer.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE, of Kentucky. On the contrary, the gentleman from Kentucky expressly stated that he had had no conversation with Mr. Havemeyer, though he thought that he had been introduced to him. The gentleman from Kentucky also stated that he had had no conversation with Mr. Parsons, the attorney of Mr. Havemeyer, on the question of the sugar schedule, but had had conversation with him on other subjects, and that those gentlemen were here before the Committee on Manufactures under subpœna from that committee. Instead of making any admission that I had had any conversation with Mr. Havemeyer on the subject of the sugar schedule, I expressly disclaimed it; and as to the statement that I had had any conversation with his attorney on that subject, I explicitly said it was not true, and that I now repeat. There was no foundation of truth in it.

Mr. BAYNE. These two gentlemen deny that they had any conversation with Mr. Havemeyer or his attorney respecting the duties on sugar, but I say that the Committee on Ways and Means, whether they did it consciously or unconsciously, changed the sugar schedule in the Mills bill after that visit of Mr. Havemeyer. The original bill reported by the committee drew the line at No. 16 Dutch standard, and the bill was amended so as to draw the line at No. 13 Dutch standard, and the object sought by the sugar trust was to have the line drawn at No. 13 Dutch standard, because it would give them an advantage. The two events were coincident, namely, the visit of Mr. Havemeyer and his attorney to the city of Washington and these changes made in the Mills bill.

Mr. TURNER. I beg the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BAYNE] to allow me to make a statement of a minute or two at that point, because the gentleman has, no doubt unintentionally, done an injustice. The statement of fact which he has made is untrue, Mr. Speaker. The change in the sugar schedule to which he adverts occurred prior to the visit of Mr. Havemeyer to which he refers; and, in regard to the visit of Mr. Havemeyer, I beg leave to make this statement.

That gentleman came here in answer to a summons from the Committee on Manufactures, as the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BAYNE] is aware, in order to testify in regard to the sugar trust, and while here he brought into the room of the Committee on Ways and Means samples of sugar which he had with him to illustrate the different grades and standards. Those samples were brought to Washington for use before the Committee on Manufactures, and while engaged here as a witness before that committee, Mr. Havemeyer appeared in the room of the Committee on Ways and Means and displayed his samples on a table there; on which occasion there were present, according to my recollection, one Republican gentleman and two or three Democratic members of the committee. None of us had any conversation with Mr. Havemeyer. He simply made his statements in regard to the colors and grades and standards of sugar as illustrated by the samples which he exhibited. There was no discussion of our bill.

It was merely an informal affair, and nothing beyond what I have stated took place. No propositions were made on either side, but the matter ended there. Out of that transaction have grown the extraordinary statements repeated here to-day by the very fair and courteous gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BAYNE], who, I believe, usually means to be just; and on that slight foundation has arisen also the extraordinary statement made by Mr. Blaine the other day in Indiana. All of these statements, whether that of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BAYNE], or that which was made on the floor of the Senate on a recent occasion by a gentleman managing the Senate bill, or the statement made by the gentleman from Maine, Mr. Blaine, in his discussion of the sugar question in Indiana—all of the statements are untrue.

Mr. MILLIKEN. Will the gentleman allow me to make a suggestion at this point, as Mr. Blaine's name has been mentioned?

Mr. BAYNE. Mr. Speaker, I beg that I shall be allowed to occupy a little of the time that is allotted to this side of the House.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE, of Kentucky. I want to add that I was not present at the conversation of which my friend from Georgia [Mr. TURNER] has just spoken.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED.

Mr. KILGORE, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that they had examined and found duly enrolled a bill (H. R. 11599) to authorize the Postmaster-General to rent a suitable building in the city of Washington to be used as a mail-bag repair-shop, and for other purposes; when the Speaker signed the same.

Mr. BAYNE. The gentleman from Georgia [Mr. TURNER] has stated what took place between Mr. Havemeyer and certain gentlemen of the committee; and I of course accord due credit to any statement that gentleman may make. But, whether consciously or unconsciously, the Mills bill promotes the sugar trust. If the gentlemen disclaim any intention to promote the interests of that trust, they should amend the Mills bill so as to conform it to the Senate bill.

Mr. TURNER, of Georgia. Is the gentleman from Pennsylvania aware——

Mr. BAYNE. I must decline to yield.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The gentleman from Pennsylvania is entitled to proceed without interruption.

Mr. TURNER, of Georgia. Of course I will not persist in interrupting the gentleman if he declines to yield; but I wanted to call his attention to a fact which he has forgotten.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The gentleman declines to yield.

Mr. BAYNE. I must beg to decline, because I can not state connectedly the facts and propositions I wish to submit if I am constantly interrupted.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The gentleman is entitled to proceed without interruption.

Mr. BAYNE. By the House bill the duty on sugar of 75 degrees saccharine strength is fixed at 1.15 cents per pound, and upon refined sugars between 13 and 16 Dutch standard the bill as amended here in the House makes the duty 2.20 cents per pound. The difference between the two was 1.05 cents per pound. That gave to the sugar "trust" an advantage of thirty-eight one-hundredths of a cent per pound, an aggregate amount to the refiners of $11,400,000 per year. The Senate bill puts raw sugars of 90 degrees at 1 cent and the duty on sugar between 13 and 16 at 1⅜ cents per pound, the difference being three-eighths of a cent per pound in favor of the Senate bill. The aggregate reduction of duty on sugar by the Mills bill was only about 20 per cent., from 82 per cent. to 62 per cent., while the aggregate reduction by the Senate bill is from 82 per cent. to 41 per cent., a reduction of 50 per cent. How anybody knowing anything about figures and comprehending at all the situation can aver, in view of these facts, that the Senate bill is favorable to the sugar "trust" is a mystery to me.

But more. This House bill, right in the teeth of the recommendation of Hon. Daniel Manning, late Secretary of the Treasury—a man of ability and an able financier—placed one duty after another, so far as it practically could, upon an ad valorem instead of a specific basis. Secretary Manning had in his report admonished Congress that specific duties should be substituted for ad valorem in order to prevent undervaluations, evasions, and frauds upon the revenue; yet in the preparation of this bill the advice of that great financier was disregarded and a multitude of duties now specific were relegated to the ad valorem class. The Senate, taking up that very subject, has adopted a specific duty wherever practicable, and applied in the preparation of its bill the suggestion of the late Democratic Secretary of the Treasury, Mr. Manning.

Now, when it is claimed on the one hand that the reduction of the rates of duty made by the Mills bill is only between 5 and 6 per cent., when in point of fact it is between 40 and 50 per cent. upon the articles embraced in the reduction, leaving out sugar, and when in connection with that the door to undervaluation, to evasion of the law, to fraud, is open wider and wider so that the importers may break the law, how can gentlemen on the other side say that they desire a full, fair collection of the revenues of this country? How can they claim that there is not a sinister aim underlying this Mills bill to render the protective system of this country odious in the eyes of the people and to render evasions of it so frequent that the law will become difficult of execution?

Mr. HOOKER. Will the gentleman allow me to ask a question just there?

Mr. BAYNE. Yes, sir.

Mr. HOOKER. What do you do with the argument your people have made that the Mills bill, instead of reducing revenue, is going to add to it?

Mr. BAYNE. I reply by stating the simple proposition that as you reduce duties you swell importations, and thereby the revenue is increased. The tariff act of 1883 reduced duties, but it increased the revenue of the Government. The Mills bill reduces rates of duty, but it would swell the revenues of the Government. It is a logical inference, and one borne out by experience, that if you reduce duties and swell importations the aggregate revenue is increased.

The gentleman who preceded me has spoken of tin-plate. Sir, tin-plate was manufactured successfully in this country for a number of years. Up to the year 1878 an excellent quality of tin-plate was manufactured here, there being four establishments in this country engaged in that manufacture. Before those establishments started tin-plate was selling at $12 to $14.75 per box of 112 pounds. After these establishments were started in this country the effect was that the price of tin-plate was reduced year after year until it ran down to $6 per box. The tin-plate "trust" of Great Britain maintained high prices until it found that American manufacturers were going to produce tin-plate; when this was discovered the British manufacturers brought down their selling price so low as to compel the American manufacturers to close their establishments.

There are now in this country four establishments fully equipped and ready to manufacture this article; and if we authorize a duty of 2.2

cents per pound they will manufacture all the tin-plate that may be required by the consumers of this country at prices as low as those at which tin-plate is now selling; they will give employment to $30,000,000 of capital and to twenty thousand men, and will keep within the borders of our country the $16,000,000 now annually paid to foreign manufacturers for this article.

Mr. HOOKER. Why have you not done that before?

Mr. PETERS. We have not had the power.

Mr. BAYNE. No, we have not had the power. When we get the opportunity we propose to do it; and we propose to have an opportunity after the November election.

Mr. HOOKER. That will be a "deferred hope."

Mr. BAYNE. I do not think so. There is nothing more certain politically under the sun than that the next House of Representatives will be Republican, and it follows almost as certainly as night the day that General Harrison will be elected President of the United States. You mark that prediction, and see if it is not verified by the facts in a short time.

The gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. MCMILLIN] has seen fit to speak of cutlery, and he goes on to say the Senate bill maintains a higher rate of duty on the very low grades of cutlery than it does on the higher and better grades. That is an effect of specific duties to put a higher rate of duty on inferior articles and a lower rate of duty on superior articles. It is a consequence of specific duties, but it is a consequence which inures to the advantage of the American consumer. If the ad valorem duty be low on cutlery, or woolen goods, or cotton goods, or anything else, the most inferior character of goods will be imported, whereas if the duty be specific and be graduated as low as can be in the matter of specific duties, the specific duty, when it invites importation at all, invites a better quality of goods from abroad, and thus the American consumer has a better article for the money he pays. And that is one of the reasons at least why the Senate has seen fit to put specific instead of ad valorem duties.

Now, Mr. Speaker, under our protective system in this country we have prospered beyond all precedent. During the three hundred and fifty years of our occupancy of this continent, including the hundred years of our existence as a nation, the aggregate wealth of this country up to 1860 amounted to about $16,000,000,000, while from 1860 to 1880, a period of twenty years, the aggregate wealth of the country, as shown by the census of 1880, reached the enormous aggregate of $45,000,000,000. Thus in twenty years of protection the people of the country made nearly $30,000,000,000, or to be accurate, $29,000,000,000 in aggregate wealth. That result was attributable to our protective system.

From 1860 up to the present time is the only period in our history when we have had a fair test of the protective system. At no other period has that system been permitted to endure longer than eight or ten years. Since the beginning of the Government in 1789 we have had over one hundred and thirty modifications of our protective system; tariff enactment after tariff enactment, tinkering with the tariff all the time; but during this last period we have had a continued protection for twenty-four years, and during that twenty-four years this country has prospered more and gained more in wealth by 200 per cent. than in all the three hundred and fifty years of its antecedent history.

It is claimed by the gentleman from Tennessee the Senate bill will not reduce the revenue of the Government. It is shown beyond all peradventure that bill will reduce the revenues about $75,000,000.

Mr. HOOKER. Then if the taxes were doubled the revenues would be increased as much more.

Mr. BAYNE. Yes, if the tariff were doubled it would increase the prosperity of this country. There is no doubt about it. [Laughter.] There is no question about that. The Senate bill was framed with a view to reduce the revenues of the Government. It will have that effect because it will not increase importation. It will have that effect because the duties are made specific, and there will not be undervaluations and evasions of the law.

The Senate bill is the most perfect piece of tariff legislation ever presented to or ever enacted by Congress. It is the most perfect system which has ever been framed. One advantage of it is that it divides the various classes of goods into thirteen different schedules, placing the different articles in alphabetical order in each schedule.

So framed is that bill that the administration of it by the Treasury Department and customs officers will be easy. Evasions of that plan will be difficult, and the country under the system proposed by the Senate, which will be the law of the country if any legislation be enacted by this or the subsequent Congress, will go on and prosper as it has done during the last quarter of a century.

It has been stated by the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. BRECKINRIDGE] that the Senate bill puts a duty of 258 per cent. on a certain class of knit goods, and I believe he referred to a computation made by Mr. Switzler, Chief of the Bureau of Statistics, as his authority. The allegation is founded on paragraph 358 of the Senate bill. That paragraph is as follows:

358. Clothing ready made, and wearing apparel of every description not specially enumerated or provided for in this act, balmoral skirts and skirting and goods of similar description, or used for like purposes, knit goods, all goods made on knitting-frames, and plushes, and all pile fabrics, composed wholly or in part of wool, worsted, the hair of the alpaca, goat, or other animals, made up or manufactured wholly or in part by the tailor, seamstress, or manufacturer, 40 cents per pound and in addition thereto 45 per cent. ad valorem.

Now, it so happens that in the year 1887 there were imported 48 pounds of some kind of knit goods, valued at $9, and the duty of this peculiar and exceptional class, under paragraph 358 of the Senate bill, would probably be 258 per cent. What kind of goods these are I have been unable to ascertain, and the reports of Mr. Switzler do not show.

But should this isolated and exceptional fact disparage paragraph 358 of the Senate bill?

The woolen goods imported in the fiscal year ending June 30, 1887, were—

Cloths	$10,022,370.67
Dress goods	17,199,141.02
Knit goods	1,980,453.74
Shawls	1,029,998.19
Yarns	1,747,562.09
Making a total of	31,979,525.71

That vast importation ought to satisfy the veriest free-trader, especially in view of our abundant capacity to produce all these things. And this very Mr. Switzler makes the Senate bill levy duties on these articles as follows:

	Per cent.
Cloths	75.15
Dress goods	78.02
Knit goods	71.90
Shawls	68.27
Yarns	113.83

Now, why was a change of existing law in regard to woolens necessary? For reasons that are obvious to those who understand the situation. Under existing law a pound of clean wool pays a far higher amount of duty than a pound of cloth. It takes, I am informed, 18 ounces of wool to make a pound of cloth. The 18 ounces of wool pay 33.75 cents duty, while the pound of cloth pays but 12 cents duty. I am indebted to the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. ARNOLD] for this information.

It is obvious that the duties on articles in the woolen schedule should be raised if the manufactured product should pay its relative proportion of duty. And inasmuch as there are vast and increasing importations of woolens, and for the further reason that many of our people, including large numbers of working women, are engaged in manufacturing them, the Senate committee doubtless foresaw that the duties they have fixed would diminish importations and thus decrease the surplus revenue on the one hand and stimulate home production and employ home labor on the other. The Senate's proposition is not only just and well founded from an economic standpoint, but it is as well humane and patriotic.

The Mills bill puts a straight ad valorem of 40 per cent. on all woolens. Its effect in this regard would simply be to flood our markets with the cheapest, meanest shoddy that the poorest-paid labor of Europe can produce.

Mr. Speaker, I did not anticipate this debate. It is scarcely appropriate to the occasion or to the subject under consideration. But the debate is a good thing, for the more this great subject of protection is discussed, the more certain will be the victory which the friends of American industries will achieve.

I yield ten minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. EZRA B. TAYLOR].

Mr. EZRA B. TAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, in view of the extraordinary statement of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. TURNER] and the more extraordinary statement of the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. BRECKINRIDGE], in reference to the matter of interview between the members of the Ways and Means Committee and Mr. Havemeyer and those interested with him, I wish to take the time allotted to me in reading from the RECORD of July 10 last a colloquy which will be found on page 6563. The gentleman from Maryland [Mr. MCCOMAS] was on the floor, and asked this question:

Mr. MCCOMAS. Mr. Chairman, I desire to ask a question of the majority of the Committee on Ways and Means for information. I desire to ask the gentlemen of the majority of the committee (and I see three of them present), whether or not on the 26th of March last, Mr. Havemeyer, of New York, did not have a hearing by a majority of the committee, or by four members of the majority, with respect to sugar? I know that on the 12th of March there was a hearing and an examination of Mr. Havemeyer before the Committee on Manufactures, but I want to know now whether, on the 23d of March, the day of the adjournment of this House by reason of the decease of the lamented Chief-Justice of the United States, the members of the majority of the Committee on Ways and Means did not, individually or collectively, some of them, give a hearing to Mr. Havemeyer on this subject?

To which this response was given:

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE, of Arkansas. Mr. Chairman I do not believe that anybody ever came to Washington to confer with the Democratic members of the Committee on Ways and Means but what he had ample opportunity to talk over the business he came here about.

This was a direct answer, a Democratic answer.

Mr. MCCOMAS. Does that include Mr. Havemeyer?

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE, of Arkansas. As regards this particular case, I do not remember dates, but I remember that Mr. Havemeyer talked with me and perhaps a little with some of the other Democratic members of the Ways and Means Committee about the sugar-refining business. It was when he was here summoned as a witness before the Committee on Manufactures.

Mr. McCOMAS. That was on the 12th of March.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE, of Arkansas. Very well, then, I would say that it was on the 12th. I am speaking now from memory, and I will say that at my request, having developed before the Committee on Manufactures an interesting line of investigation, precisely what the Committee on Ways and Means were engaged upon, I asked him to wait after he was done with the Committee on Manufactures and go with me to the Ways and Means Committee room, as I wanted him to talk there with one or two gentlemen of the committee. It related to some matters of a technical character that I for one wanted information about. That, I suppose, is what the gentleman from Maryland refers to.

Mr. McCOMAS. Now, does the gentleman from Arkansas recall the fact that on the day of our adjournment here on account of the decease of the Chief-Justice Mr. Havemeyer did have a hearing before the Committee on Ways and Means or some of its members?

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE, of Arkansas. I have no recollection of it.

Mr. McCOMAS. Anyhow, you admit that he did have a hearing before the majority on some other day upon your invitation?

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE, of Arkansas. I do not mean to deny it, the facts, as stated, at all. My only recollection on the subject is what I have given you. But suppose he did. Suppose he had come to me or I had met him on the day you say, I would have listened to him with great pleasure.

* * * * * * *

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE, of Kentucky. Nor were some of us present. But this is the fact which the gentleman has disingenuously distorted. No human being came to any member of the majority of the Ways and Means Committee and asked to have a conversation with him when it was not courteously accorded.

Mr. McCOMAS. Did Mr. Havemeyer——

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE, of Kentucky. One moment. When the gentleman says, in antithesis, that we gave a hearing to the "chief of the sugar trust" and refused it to others he is intentionally disingenuous.

Mr. McCOMAS. Let me ask the gentleman this question. If he wants to be fair and frank, does he deny specifically that Mr. Havemeyer on March 12 or 23, individually conferred, informally if you please, on this subject with a number of gentleman of that committee?

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE, of Kentucky. I do not deny it.

Mr. McCOMAS. Ah, that is my point.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE, of Kentucky. I do not deny it. [Applause on the Republican side.] And the gentlemen who applaud, applaud a disingenuous statement.

Mr. McCOMAS. My statement is as fair as yours. My assertion was that members of that committee, men who happen to be on that committee, a number of the gentlemen in the majority on the committee, had, informally or formally, I care not which, given time and had conversations on this question with this gentleman at the head of the sugar "trust," and within a few days thereafter reported this bill making the change from 16 to 13, Dutch standard.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE, of Kentucky. Indubitably, if Mr. Havemeyer asked an audience, he got it.

Mr. TURNER, of Georgia. The gentleman does not read the whole of that answer.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE, of Kentucky. Certainly not.

Mr. EZRA B. TAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, in our part of the country we do not pride ourselves about being particularly chivalrous, but we have an appreciation of what honesty is and fair-dealing, and when Mr. MILLS tells Mr. Blaine that the Committee on Ways and Means had no audience with Mr. Havemeyer, he tells the absolute truth in words, but I think he should have stated an interview was had with certain members of the committee and Mr. Havemeyer.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE, of Kentucky. Go on and say it; say what you intended to say. Have the courage as well as the malignity to use the term you design to imply.

Mr. EZRA B. TAYLOR. I say nothing more than that. I say it was a truth in language, because the Committee on Ways and Means never existed as a committee in formulating that bill. It was only a fraction of the Committee on Ways and Means.

Mr. BAYNE. I now yield ten minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. FARQUHAR].

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE, of Kentucky. Before the gentleman from New York proceeds will he permit an interruption?

Mr. FARQUHAR. Certainly.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE, of Kentucky. I want to say to the gentleman from Ohio that I intend to respond to what he has said, and I desire that he shall be present when I do so. I want to point out the disingenuousness of the original conversation as carried on, with the disingenuousness of the gentleman himself in his garbled extract from it.

Mr. EZRA B. TAYLOR. I will be here.

Mr. FARQUHAR. Mr. Speaker, I do not know that I can throw any light on this aftermath of tariff discussion. At the close of the great tariff debate which took place in this House there was a speech of one hour made by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MILLS], the whole burden of which speech was that the entire reduction of taxation proposed by the Mills bill, from the present rate of tariff duty, amounted to from 5 to 7 per cent. There was no opportunity for further debate after that speech had been delivered, and hence no chance of contradicting the statements in open House that were then made. I see those statements still repeated all over the country. The speech rests on the statement embodied in the arguments then delivered, first that the 47 per cent. claimed to be exacted by the present law was a robbery on the part of the manufacturers, and that the Mills bill proposes merely a lesser robbery. But I want to go beyond that. The Democratic platform of 1884, as well as the reaffirmation of the platform in 1888, held out to the wage-earners of America the hope that whatever tariff legislation should be enacted, or internal-revenue laws, that the wage-earner of the country should be cared for.

Now we have sufficient data, and they credible, too, I believe, from the Bureau of Statistics itself, to show that the wages of the American wage-earners are from 65 to 67 per cent. greater than in any competing country in the world, and especially have these figures been used by the chiefs of the Bureaus of Statistics and of Labor in respect to the wages of English workmen as compared with our own. So if we are to take the message of President Cleveland, and take the Democratic platforms, and then take the figures furnished to us by these bureaus, indicating 67 per cent. difference between the wages here and abroad, and that the Democratic party is determined in its legislation to save, to protect, to make independent the American wage-earners, we ought naturally in all of our tariff measures to bear out this same relative rate by making our dutiable list 67. But there is a deduction to be made from it. The Chief of the Bureau of Labor in his well-considered figures shows that there is an advantage to the English workmen of 17 per cent. in the matter of living.

That fairly would leave the general tariff scale of America at 50 per cent. That is the proposition that the President holds out in his message; that is the proposition that has been made in repeated speeches from the Democratic side; but I find by the Mills bill that instead of holding it at 50 per cent. for the protection of American labor, it is stated to have gone down to 42 per cent. Now, on this floor, and I am willing to stand by the figures here and elsewhere, I present to this House what I regard as a mathematically correct tabular comparison of the present tariff rates and the Mills bill, to which I desire to call the attention of the House, as a side note. At the same time I will say that I am very sorry Mr. MILLS or any one else has seen fit on the stump and elsewhere in this country to persist in playing on the intelligence of our people with the fact or the statement that there is only 5 per cent. of reduction in his bill from the present tariff.

Now, sir, here are the averages in the various schedules:

Schedules.	Present rate.	Proposed rate.
A.—Chemicals	41.28	26.23
B.—Earthenware and glassware	60.61	50.50
C.—Metals	52.57	43.97
D.—Wooden ware	34.60	29.25
E.—Sugar	78.14	63.41
G.—Provisions	46.62	37.38
I.—Cotton	50.89	39.40
J.—Hemp, flax, jute	34.40	23.64
K.—Wool and woolens	69.49	40.15
M.—Books, papers, etc	24.40	18.19
N.—Sundries	44.78	35.06
Total	64.84	48.28

The difference between 64.84 and 48.28 is 16.56, and 16.56 is 25.53 per cent. of 64.84, not counting the free-list.

So the actual reduction according to this tabulated statement of the duty, which will pass uncontradicted by the Bureau of Statistics, and which is prepared in this Mills bill itself, is over 25 per cent. on the existing rates, not counting the free-list.

Now let me summarize, as my time is very short. My reasons on this floor, Mr. Speaker, for antagonizing the Mills bill clear through were, first, the opposition that I had to a change from specific duties to ad valorem. The very first position that was taken by any amendment on the Republican side was to bring back the specific rates or to compound the rates.

Now, I have as an authority the present Secretary of the Treasury, where he speaks in his last annual report in respect to the specific and ad valorem duty, which I will ask the Clerk to read. I am willing to take Democratic authority even for the Senate bill. In the action of the Senate in going back to specific duties, I desire to say that it has been at the demand and at the request of all the wage-earners of this country that a specific duty should be allowed, both for the prevention of undervaluation and at the same time to show that the American Congress had taken care specifically of the labor that enters into every product of our industries.

The Clerk read as follows:

Whatever the rates of customs taxation may be, the laws for the collection of the same should be made as efficient as possible. In this the bona fide importer, who wishes to gain only the legitimate profits of his business, the home manufacturer, and laborer are equally interested. They all have a right to demand that the laws be so administered as to give them every possible protection in their business. The high ad valorem tariff of the last quarter of a century has been the fruitful cause of devices to gain improper advantage at the custom-house. It is, therefore, desirable that in revising and reducing the rates of duty they should be made specific instead of ad valorem, so far as the nature of the merchandise will admit. Theoretically considered, ad valorem are preferable to specific duties; but in practice, under such rates as we have had and must continue to have for years to come, the former are the too-easy source of deception and inequality at the custom-house. Congress has it in its power to change, from time to time, as may be advisable, specific rates so as to meet any permanent changes in values.

Now, Mr. Speaker, as my time is limited, I want to summarize in one or two words my whole opposition to the House bill. I find by examination of the tables furnished by the Ways and Means Committee of this House that this bill abolishes one-fourth of all the customs duties. I find also that it puts one-sixth of all these dutiable articles on the free-list, and adds to the free-list products of American industries which employ 300,000 persons and $500,000,000 of capital that are

placed in hazard by its provisions. It reduces the duties on schedules that are the ark of our tariff system, because it strikes immediately at the home industries; and these schedules give protective employment to 1,750,000 Americans, and in this there are employed two thousand millions of American capital.

Mr. BAYNE. I now yield five minutes to the gentleman from Maine [Mr. MILLIKEN].

Mr. MILLIKEN. Mr. Speaker, I do not intend to detain the House more than a few minutes, and I do not intend to get mixed up in the disputes between the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. BRECKINRIDGE] and other gentlemen on this side of the House. I have simply this to say, since reference has been made to the statement of Mr. Blaine upon the stump in regard to Mr. Hevemeyer having been heard before the Committee on Ways and Means, that he founded his statement upon the record which has been read here to-day, and I think that any man outside of Congress, reading that record, would be warranted in coming to the conclusion which not only he but so many people in this country have come to on this subject. In addition to that, my friend from Georgia [Mr. TURNER], even in attempting to defend the position of the Committee on Ways and Means, has stated this morning that Mr. Havemeyer had a hearing in that committee-room. That is something which I understand nobody else had there.

The gentleman has stated that Mr. Havemeyer had a hearing, that he presented his samples, that he commented upon them, and that he was listened to; and the result seems to show that he was listened to with effect and that what he stated was so far accepted by the committee that the duty on sugar was placed where he wanted it to be. Therefore, taking the record as it stands and the supplementary statement of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. TURNER], which goes to confirm the position taken by this side of the House upon that matter, I do not think that anybody can reasonably reflect either upon Mr. Blaine or anybody else for anything that has been said about it.

My friend from Tennessee [Mr. MCMILLIN] in his remarks this morning stated that the Senate bill raised the duties upon articles of necessity. I desire to know if there are any articles of greater or more general necessity, any articles that relate more directly to the comfort and welfare of the people generally than the article of sugar, upon which Mr. Havemeyer or somebody else succeeded in leaving a duty of 68 per cent., while fifty-three other articles were put upon the free-list, almost all of them articles produced by our own people in the North. There is a radical difference between the two bills.

As Mr. Harrison so felicitously said the other day, it is not a question of schedules but of wide-apart principle. Mr. MILLS took the position here, they who supported the Mills bills took the position, and the President took the position, that in every instance the duty is added to the cost of the article, even though it be an article of domestic production. We take issue upon that proposition, and the facts show that it is not correct. I heard a little illustration of this given once by a distinguished gentleman who was formerly a Democratic Senator from Connecticut, and afterwards a Representative on this floor, Mr. Eaton. He said that on one occasion a distinguished college professor came down to a manufacturing community in his State to make a free-trade speech, and got along very nicely until he saw a farmer standing up beside the wall, and thought he would be a specially good man to talk to. So he told the farmer how the tariff had swindled him, and stolen from him, and robbed him, and impoverished him. The farmer said, "I don't know about that, Mr. Professor. I came down here five years ago with only $500 in money; I bought a farm, agreeing to pay $3,000 for it. I paid $500 down, mortgaged it for $2,500, and in five years I have paid for that farm, and I have a little money in bank. So I don't think I have suffered much from these protectionists." "Ah!" said the professor, "you are probably one of those shrewd, hard-working, industrious, thrifty men who would save money anywhere, and you would have done what you have done in spite of the tariff; but don't you know that this tariff robs you at the rate of 6 cents a yard for every yard of cotton that is in your shirt?" "Now," replied the farmer, "you probably think that is true or you would not say it, but you can't prove it by anything that you teach up in that school of yours, because I pay only 5 cents a yard altogether for that cotton." [Laughter.]

Mr. BAYNE. I yield now to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. PETERS]. I have only a few minutes remaining, and before the gentleman from Kansas proceeds I would like to inquire whether he will not be allowed ten minutes, if so much time is to be occupied on the other side.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE, of Kentucky. I have no objection, except that I have an engagement which will take me away from the House soon, and I prefer that the ten minutes should not be occupied at this time.

Mr. PETERS. Then I will yield to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. BRECKINRIDGE].

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE, of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I did not intend to participate in this debate, and I would not have done so, but for (to use his own words) the extraordinary exhibition which the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. EZRA B. TAYLOR] has made to-day, and which seems to render necessary a statement from me. The gentleman from Ohio said he would occupy his ten minutes in reading from the RECORD, and then he read that RECORD in such a way as to give a false coloring to it, which I might be justified in saying was intentionally done, because he suppressed such parts of it as would show that the coloring which he gave was a false coloring. As, for instance, he reads a sentence from the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. MCCOMAS] and then takes one word from my response as if I had approved of what Mr. MCCOMAS had said, and suppresses the remainder of my sentence, though the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. TURNER] called his attention to it immediately.

Mr. EZRA B. TAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, I deny that statement, and I call for the proof of it.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE, of Kentucky. The denial of the gentleman is now utterly useless, when he could have made the correction immediately upon Judge TURNER'S calling his attention and my attention to his use of the word "indubitably," which he read and then stopped.

Mr. EZRA B. TAYLOR. I did not stop at the word "indubitably." I read the whole sentence: "Indubitably, if Mr. Havemeyer asked an audience, he got it."

The gentleman from Kentucky must make no mistake when he charges me with anything that is dishonorable.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE, of Kentucky. I did not catch the last sentence of the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. EZRA B. TAYLOR. I say the gentleman from Kentucky must make no mistake when he charges me with anything that is dishonorable.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE, of Kentucky. "The gentleman from Kentucky" will make no mistake when he makes that charge against the gentleman, after his exhibition this morning.

Mr. EZRA B. TAYLOR. I do not understand the gentleman.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE, of Kentucky. I suppose he is the only person present who does not understand the response. Judge TURNER was sitting close to the gentleman from Ohio, and instantly, when he used the word "indubitably," Judge TURNER ejaculated, "You have not read the whole sentence."

Mr. EZRA B. TAYLOR rose.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE, of Kentucky. Wait a moment; I will give you plenty of time. And then Judge TURNER turned to me and said, "He has read only the word 'indubitably;' he has not read the whole sentence." I said "Certainly;" and the gentleman from Ohio went on with his comment—a very fair comment indeed. He said, "We do not profess in my country to have any chivalry, but we do profess to admire fair dealing"——

Mr. EZRA B. TAYLOR. Mr. Speaker——

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE, of Kentucky. Which is exhibited by their sending this gentleman to Congress; it exhibits their desire for fair dealing.

Mr. EZRA B. TAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, I will say that I did not stop at the word "indubitably." I marked it on my RECORD for the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BAYNE] to read; and I marked the whole sentence. If I did stop there it was unintentional. I intended to read the whole sentence. I did read the whole sentence.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE, of Kentucky. I will not follow the example of the gentleman in what he has done this morning, and say that he did intentionally suppress a part of the sentence. If he says he intended to read it, I will let the matter go. I will not even go on and say that it would have sounded much more as if he were now accurate if he had done that when Judge TURNER called his attention and my attention to it. We were both sitting close to him, and attention was called to it.

Mr. EZRA B. TAYLOR. Will the gentleman allow me?

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE, of Kentucky. Certainly.

Mr. EZRA B. TAYLOR. The record at the Reporter's desk will show that I read the whole sentence at once.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE, of Kentucky. I can not say how the record is; but I know the gentleman did not read the whole sentence——

Mr. EZRA B. TAYLOR. I know I did.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE, of Kentucky. And Judge TURNER called his attention to it.

Mr. EZRA B. TAYLOR. May I ask to have the Reporter read——

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE, of Kentucky. I am not to be called off into any discussion with the Reporter.

Mr. TURNER, of Georgia. I will state, in confirmation of what the honorable gentleman from Kentucky has said, that his recital just made of the facts as to what I stated, and as to my understanding of the reading the gentleman from Ohio made, is correct. As I understood, the gentleman read the word "indubitably," and then either said "etc." or stopped altogether and read no other word. If the Reporter has got the other words it is not because the gentleman from Ohio read them, but because, according to what is the usual practice here, he handed the language to the Reporter.

Mr. EZRA B. TAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, I handed not a word to the Reporter.

Mr. TURNER, of Georgia. But the Reporters know how to go to the different pages of the RECORD and get a passage which is referred to.

Mr. EZRA B. TAYLOR. Does the gentleman, for the purpose of condemning me, condemn also the Reporters of this House?

Mr. TURNER, of Georgia. I do not, sir. Let the gentleman un-

derstand me. When the gentleman took his seat he ceased that quotation with the word "indubitably."

Mr. EZRA B. TAYLOR. If I did I made a mistake——

Mr. TURNER, of Georgia. I have no disposition to challenge that last statement. I acted on the instant upon my understanding of what the gentleman read, and called the attention of gentlemen around me to it.

Mr. EZRA B. TAYLOR. If you had called my attention to it, so that I could have understood——

Mr. TURNER, of Georgia. If the gentleman from Ohio had then used the courtesy which he ordinarily observes in these cases he would have yielded to me and I would have called his attention to it.

Mr. EZRA B. TAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, at this moment I am not aware that the gentleman from Georgia asked me to yield or said a word to me.

Mr. TURNER, of Georgia. But I did, sir.

Mr. EZRA B. TAYLOR. I was not aware of it.

Mr. HOOKER (to Mr. TURNER, of Georgia). I heard you; you certainly did.

Mr. TURNER, of Georgia (after conferring with Mr. BAYNE). The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BAYNE] was sitting by the gentleman from Ohio and heard me. The gentleman from Ohio, no doubt, did not hear me, if he says so.

Mr. EZRA B. TAYLOR. I did not.

Mr. TURNER, of Georgia. I will not contradict the gentleman's statement in that regard.

Mr. BAYNE. Mr. Speaker, I heard the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. TURNER] call the attention of the gentleman from Ohio to the point, but, as I suggested to the gentleman from Georgia, the gentleman from Ohio probably did not hear it.

Mr. EZRA B. TAYLOR. I was so much interested in my own matter that I did not hear it.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE, of Kentucky. Now, Mr. Speaker, the gentleman read with great emphasis at one part that I had said "I do not deny it" to a statement made by Mr. MCCOMAS. The gentleman was familiar with this whole record, and he knew that in a subsequent part of it I explained that the reason I did not deny the statement was because I was not familiar with the facts, and therefore did not contradict it; that I personally was not present. He read it so as to make the impression upon the House that by that refusal to deny it I had affirmed the statement, when I had expressly said the reason I did not contradict it was because I was not aware of the fact, and therefore did not contradict it.

Mr. EZRA B. TAYLOR. Will the gentleman allow me a single word now?

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE, of Kentucky. Certainly.

Mr. EZRA B. TAYLOR. I understood the gentleman this morning to deny it; and having seen in the RECORD that he once said he did not deny it, I called his attention to that fact.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE, of Kentucky. Yes, sir; and if the gentleman who has interposed now had not suppressed it he would have found I denied it then. For in answer to it I said to Mr. MCCOMAS, who asked whether he did have a conversation with certain members of that committee—I said this:

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE, of Kentucky. I do not deny it.

I said I did not know. I was not present. The gentleman knew I had said that. He deliberately suppressed it. He read the sentence, "I do not deny it," and read the applause of the Republican members of the House which followed that, with emphasis. Having used the words "in my extraordinary denial this morning," for the purpose of insinuating to this House I had not denied the thing at all in the presence of Mr. MCCOMAS what I had denied this morning, and that is a specimen of the fair play which the gentleman says in his part of the country is admired.

Now, Mr. Speaker, there is one thing in this RECORD to which I do call attention now, although it has been corrected heretofore. I said in that conversation——

Mr. FARQUHAR rose.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE, of Kentucky. Let me get through. It was an exciting colloquy, a great many persons interposing, persons asking questions and other persons answering questions, interrupting gentlemen on the other side of the House, interrupting by applause and by derisive laughter the reporter, therefore it is not unnatural he should make some mistake; but the mistake he made is so apparent on the face of it I do not think anybody was deceived by it. But I took the liberty of making a correction, so there should be no mistake about the matter:

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE, of Kentucky. Let me get through. The gentleman, judging of me by himself, may think it was improper.

As that gentleman [Mr. MCCOMAS] is absent, I care not to pursue that. I went on:

I had known Mr. John Parsons; he was in the committee-room; we renewed our acquaintance, and had a humorous conversation about the gentleman being before the Committee on Manufactures, and I was introduced to three or four gentlemen, including one or possibly two of the Messrs Havemeyer; but there was no conversation between us either about the sugar schedule or the testimony before the Committee on Manufactures.

Mr. MCCOMAS. I understand that Mr. Parsons is the counsel of the sugar trust.

The colloquy goes backward and forward for some time. I am reported as asking as to the sugar schedule. The corrected RECORD states, and what I said was, I had no conversation with him on the sugar schedule.

I make this as to this correction so there may be hereafter no apparent contradiction. The correction will be found in the permanent RECORD. I state that as the gentleman has not called attention to it so there may be no doubt about it hereafter.

The point has been made again this morning by the gentleman from Maine [Mr. MILLIKEN], of whom I speak courteously because he has shown courtesy in it, and has been made by the gentleman from Ohio, who is entitled to no courtesy after the way he has behaved this morning, that there were hearings before the committee; that is, these gentlemen came into the committee-room and had a hearing when no one else was allowed to come into the committee-room to have a hearing. That has been explained over and over again. I believe the gentleman from Maine [Mr. MILLIKEN] does not mean to use the word "hearing" disingenuously. There was no hearing accorded by the Committee on Ways and Means to any human being during the Fiftieth Congress on the subject of the tariff, with which hearing I was familiar or acquainted, in the sense——

Mr. FARQUHAR rose.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE, of Kentucky. One moment. In the sense that committee in its organized and formal meeting had anybody with a formal hearing before it. There was no exception. There was no partiality. Nobody was granted time; on the contrary, there was nobody denied a conversation, or, if you choose to use the word, a hearing, with the majority of the Ways and Means Committee, or any member of it, on any subject in which he was interested, who desired to talk to the members of the Committee on Ways and Means—with the committee or any individual member of it on matters before it, so far as I know. Those conversations were during our hours of rest. They were given to any gentleman. One gentleman had a conversation on the cotton schedule. I recollect Mr. Dalton, chairman of the Arkright Club, and the gentleman from Massachusetts is listening to me, and he knows who Mr. Dalton is—the chairman of the Arkright club—Mr. Townshend, and other gentlemen from Massachusetts, who came to talk about cotton with us. A gentleman from Rhode Island, Mr. Merriman, a large woolen manufacturer, Mr. Jesse Metcalf, and other gentlemen came to talk with us on the woolen question.

Mr. Jesse Metcalf and other gentlemen representing the woolen interest were heard with reference to the woolen schedules. We heard gentlemen from Philadelphia representing the great carpet interests, and various other industries there, and there was no secrecy whatever about it. They were of all classes of manufactures. We heard labor committees. We heard gentlemen on glass. I recollect specially one gentleman from Indiana, Mr. Depauw, as well as a delegation from Baltimore, who were heard upon the subject, and there never was any secrecy about it.

Now certain gentlemen have disingenuously used the word "hearing" in a different meaning from that used by myself in this connection, for the word has two meanings, and allege that there was a refusal on the part of the committee to "hear" the workingmen, but at the same time it granted "hearings" to manufacturers. That always was, when intelligently done, a disingenuous statement, and after the explanation was made, and it was repeated, then, of course, it was intentionally disingenuous. There never was any concealment about it.

Mr. BAYNE. Will the gentleman yield to me for a question?

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE, of Kentucky. Certainly.

Mr. BAYNE. The gentleman has enumerated a number of persons who were given hearings by perhaps members of the Committee on Ways and Means——

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE, of Kentucky. Just there I want the gentleman to understand exactly what I did say and the use I make of the word. I say they were given hearings, that is to say that we had conversations with them; that they came to us for information. We talked with them individually. We did not as a committee.

Mr. BAYNE. I understand that. But the gentleman has enumerated a number of persons with whom conversations, if you please, were had by members of the committee.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE, of Kentucky. Yes.

Mr. BAYNE. And these are mostly identified with the idea of protection. Now, I would like to ask the gentleman whether J. D. Moore had any conversation with members of the committee?

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE, of Kentucky. J. S. Moore, you mean.

Mr. BAYNE. Yes; J. S. Moore.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE, of Kentucky. He undoubtedly had with me, and with other members of the committee, too, as also did Mr. David A. Wells, on my seeking; and I will not hesitate to say that I went to Boston largely for the purpose of having a conversation with Mr. Edward Atkinson.

I needed certain information that I knew Mr. Atkinson possessed, and I went expressly to see him. I also did what I am not in the habit of doing, got him to invite me to a dinner and asked him to invite to meet me a number of gentlemen representing various industries there with whom I desired to talk. We had at this intervie[illegible] Mr.

Jefferson Coolidge, Mr. W. B. Rice, and other gentlemen representing various industries of Massachusetts. I asked these gentlemen and asked other gentlemen connected with the enterprises and industries of that State to give me an opportunity to have conversations with them on various matters. As to Mr. J. S. Moore, I did seek a conversation with him; as far as I know he never did with me, but I did with him, and I found him one of the most valuable, intelligent, and admirably informed gentlemen.

Mr. BAYNE. So I suppose.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE, of Kentucky. Just as I did Mr. David A. Wells, Mr. Edmund Atkinson, Mr. James Russell Lowell, and various other gentlemen connected with industries of many kinds throughout the country. I do not hesitate to avow, and in the most public manner, my sense of obligation to these and many other gentlemen for valuable information connected with the industries of the country as relating to the preparation of the tariff bill.

Mr. FARQUHAR. I would suggest to the gentleman that the most of the members who have been named by him are also members of the Cobden Club.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE, of Kentucky. That may be true—no, I think it is not; but if they were I do not see what difference it could make. The members of the Cobden Club, whose faces I have never seen, are entitled to gratitude for valuable information upon this very subject; and I do not hesitate to acknowledge my indebtedness to Mr. Gladstone and Sir Lionel Playfair, whose contributions to economic questions have great value, if indeed they have been excelled; and I would commend to my friend from New York to read Mr. Gladstone and Sir Lionel Playfair, and try to draw a little of the broad spirit which animates their writings, as well as a little of the liberality with which they deal with a question of this magnitude.

Mr. FARQUHAR. I accept graciously, of course, the recommendations of the gentleman from Kentucky, but I may be permitted to say that for the last twenty years I have perused pretty much all of these economic studies, and the longer I read economic books the more I am confirmed in the opinion that there is an American system which is paramount to and independent of the British system, and is more satisfactory to the American people.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE, of Kentucky. I confess to some admiration for the learning and erudition that my friend testifies he has, and I give him the meed of my admiration on the modesty that has kept his light under a bushel so many years, so that we had not heard of it before. [Laughter on the Democratic side.]

Mr. FARQUHAR. I am glad of the compliment. I merely wish to suggest that if the wage-earners of the country had been more consulted the gentleman would have had more information than he obtained on this subject.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE, of Kentucky. I have no doubt, Mr. Speaker, that if we had sat on the inside and heard testimony and on the outside had caught the frying of the fat, it might have been that our bill would have been different to what it is, and the exchequer of our party might have been fuller. That is, on the other end of the Capitol, not on this. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Now, as to the sugar schedule and Mr. Havemeyer's connection with it, I want to say once for all that so far as I had anything to do with it—and I was perhaps as largely responsible for that schedule as any member of the Ways and Means Committee, as it was originally put in the bill—I thought it was a good thing to make the line of demarkation at 16 and not at 13. The Democratic members of the Ways and Means Committee disagreed with me on that subject, and only after a great deal of hesitation that schedule was adopted by us.

As soon as it was adopted the New York Times came out in a series of able articles demonstrating that the schedule as we drew it up was not in the interest of the American producer. I made personal inquiries as far as I was able to do so of persons who were familiar with the manufacture of sugar in Louisiana, in California, in the Hawaiian Islands, and elsewhere, of gentlemen of all political views, that I might make myself familiar with it. I came to the conclusion that we had made a mistake in the change of that schedule, and while the existing schedule was wholly unsatisfactory, that my change of it was probably equally unsatisfactory; and acting on the principle that controlled me and all that I did on this bill whenever I was in a state of doubt as to what I ought to do, I thought the existing condition of things had better be retained, and so I consented to a change back to the schedule, precisely as the Senate, after full examination, have also done. They left the line of demarkation at 13, precisely as the House did.

Now, in relation to Mr. Havemeyer, he had nothing to do with me so far as the making of that change is concerned. I had no conversation with him on the subject of sugar at all.

Now, as to what ought to be done with the sugar schedule, I then was in doubt; I now am in doubt. In the Senate schedule there are two grave defects, according to my best judgment. One is that it admits molasses not exceeding fifty degrees of saccharine matter entirely free. Thirty-seven million gallons of that class came in during 1887.

By that the refiners can control the introduction of the raw material. I see no reason why under this bill the introduction of raw sugar would not cease, and all would come in in the shape of molasses and the sugar refiner get the entire margin of duty on his refined sugar; and if any gentleman at this time can point out that I am mistaken, I will be glad, because I want to know what is the real merit or demerit of putting molasses on the free-list, which seems to strike at the beet-sugar interests of California and the sorghum industry of Kansas and Louisiana sugars, because the refiner would get the entire margin of duty. Under the schedule as it is in the Senate bill the margin between the duty on raw sugars and the duty on refined sugars is larger than that in the Mills bill. The gentleman from Pennsylvania has not examined the sugar schedule with his usual care or he would have ascertained in the refined sugars the margin of the duty is higher in proportion to the duty on the raw sugar in the Senate bill than it is in the House bill or under the present law.

Mr. BAYNE. Will the gentleman permit an inquiry there?

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE, of Kentucky. Certainly.

Mr. BAYNE. If all raw sugar should be imported in the form of molasses and put on the free-list as in the Senate bill, would it not very largely reduce the revenues of the Government?

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE, of Kentucky. It would. Fifty-six millions of dollars, of course. And, Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman says that that is what his party desires to do, that they desire to have that $56,000,000 taken out of the revenue and not to avoid a plan to prevent the introduction of raw sugar, but to effect the destruction of the hope of Kansas and California to produce sugar from sorghum and beets and the destruction of the sugar interests of Louisiana, it may be a matter which he would himself and I myself might have some remarks to make. If molasses under fifty-six degrees of saccharine is introduced in sufficient quantities to make the refined sugars of the country, the entire $56,000,000 revenue received from sugar will of course cease, and it will go into the pockets of the sugar refiner. That $56,000,000 will be transferred by the gentleman's legislation from the Treasury of the United States to the pockets of the refiner, because the refiner will have the entire duty on refined sugars which is 1⅞ of a cent. Certainly that will be sufficient to exclude all refined sugars, and the reduction of revenue to the Government will mark precisely the increased profit and revenue to the sugar refiner.

There can be no doubt about that, and if the gentleman, with his usual research, will take the subject up and study it he will agree with me, though possibly he may not acknowledge it until after the Presidential canvass is over.

Mr. BAYNE. That will be free raw material.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE, of Kentucky. Undoubtedly it will be free raw material; but the gentleman seems to have no conception of the difference between a free raw material which increases the amount of product in America and decreases the cost, and a free raw material which diminishes the revenue of the Government, increases the profit of the manufacturer, and leaves the burden upon the consumer precisely where it was before. That is the difference between the gentlemen who advocate free molasses and those who advocate free wool, free leather, free raw silk, free cotton, free lumber, and other free raw materials which have to be made up here.

Now, I did not intend to participate in this debate, but as I am up, there are one or two points in this "perfect" Senate bill to which I wish to direct attention. There is a colloquialism in Kentucky that "you don't need to eat the whole leg of mutton to know that it is underdone;" and I propose to take a sample from this Senate bill. The duty on knit goods is increased by this bill in such a way as to put it at 258 per cent. That is, goods costing $9 will have put upon them a duty of $23.25, by the mere changing of the term "knit goods" from its place in the present statute to another classification in the proposed bill. I understood the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BAYNE], in the colloquy that he had with the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. TURNER], to approve of that. Does he believe that a prohibitory duty of 258 per cent. upon knit goods is a "perfect" rate of duty? I understand the gentleman to say that that is his doctrine.

Mr. BAYNE. I am not prepared to speak at this moment specifically as to knit goods; but I know that under the existing law there has been a very large importation.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE, of Kentucky. I took it for granted that the gentleman knew this Senate bill as the Turk knows the Koran, because he said it was "perfect" in all its parts, a sort of divine inspiration which had come down from the heavenly source of the Committee on Finance of the Senate. But may be the gentleman will think that 148 per cent. duty is a proper rate of duty on woolens. On manufactures of worsted, hair of the alpaca, goat, etc., not exceeding 30 cents a pound, or exceeding 30 and not exceeding 40 cents a pound, the duty under the present law is 69 per cent. The Mills bill makes it 40 per cent. and the Senate bill makes it 148 per cent. That is, the Senate bill makes a change of 78 per cent. according to my way of counting; but the gentleman says that is not a proper way; he says that we should reckon the percentage on the duty, not on the price of the article. Well, it is over 100 per cent. of increase on the present duty. Seamless goods that are brought in at over 80 cents pay, under the present law, 64 per cent., by our bill they will pay 40 per cent., by this "perfect" Senate substitute they will pay 69.74 per cent. That is, the duty on costly goods, over 80 cents, is increased 5 per cent., while the duty on the less valuable goods, such as poor people have to buy, is in-

creased 78 per cent. The one increase is 5 per cent., the other is 78 per cent.

Do I understand my friend from Pennsylvania [Mr. BAYNE] to indorse that discrimination by which the duty on the cheaper goods is made 148 per cent., an increase of 78 per cent., while on the more valuable goods the increase is only 5 per cent.?

Mr. BAYNE. I observed in my remarks that specific rates upon knit goods and upon everything else would raise the duty on inferior articles, and I stated that that would be to the advantage of the consumer. A shoddy blanket, for instance, would pay a very small ad valorem duty, but under a specific rate the duty upon it would be comparatively high. The Senate bill encourages the importation of good goods instead of inferior ones.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE, of Kentucky. In other words, I would say that it gives to the privileged class, who have money and who own the manufactories in which the cheap goods are made, an opportunity to sell those cheap goods at enormous prices to the poor while they import from abroad their own wearing-apparel at a comparatively low rate of duty. I take issue with the gentleman as to whether this is a "perfect" bill for the benefit of the consumer, in view of the fact that of the sixty millions of our people probably fifty-nine millions must wear the cheaper goods, while possibly one million with their wives and daughters may be able to import the more costly goods. That is the equality of citizenship which my friend believes lies at the foundation of the Republican party.

Mr. BAYNE. I have no doubt that the change was made on knit goods in consequence of the fact that in 1887 there were over $60,000,000 of them imported.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE, of Kentucky. My friend is permitting himself to make a misstatement unintentionally. He is reading the figures of the whole importation of woolen goods and raw material—woolens, worsted goods, and the raw material.

Mr. BAYNE. I have not made a mistake. There is no division in the statement, and I read the whole, intending to eliminate the wool. Eliminating that, $16,000,000, it still leaves about forty-four million as the importation of knit goods.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE, of Kentucky. Undoubtedly. Now, the point of difference between the gentleman and me is that he wants to put the increase of duty on so much of that forty-four millions as a rich man can buy at only 5 per cent., while upon what the poor man can buy he proposes an increase of 78 per cent.; and I, on the other hand, want to make the duty only 40 per cent. upon whichever article the man's means enable him to buy.

Mr. BAYNE. If my friend will permit me, the object of the Senate bill is to prevent the importation of goods made from the refuse matters of the cities of Europe. I believe that the poor man should have as good a blanket as the rich man, and every poor man in this country is able to buy a good American blanket.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE, of Kentucky. I am glad my friend believes that, for if he does honestly believe it he will join the Democratic party as soon as his belief takes the form of practical action. [Laughter.] At present the margin between his practice and his opinion is greater than the margin between the rich man's goods at an increase of only 5 per cent. and the poor man's goods at an increase of 78 per cent. of duty. [Laughter.]

This bill is full of just such things. In pocket-knives the case is exactly the same: the man of small means pays an enormous duty; the man of larger means pays less in proportion. And so all the way through.

Mr. BAYNE. Will my friend hear me a moment? A European jack-knife, I believe, sells at something like $2 a gross over there. Its blade is made of iron. The Senate bill will perhaps by a specific duty exclude the importation of iron-bladed jack-knives which sell at about $2 a gross. The American consumer, however, will thereby secure a knife with a steel blade that will be of some value to him.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE, of Kentucky. The difference between the gentleman and myself is that I think the man who wants to buy a jack-knife ought to have the liberty of doing so—ought not to be deprived of the opportunity, besides paying for the privilege of being deprived of it, while my friend from Pennsylvania believes that if a man wants such a jack-knife he has no right which the Republican Senate ought to regard, and he not only ought not to be allowed to buy the jack-knife, but ought to pay to the gentleman's constituents and others who make knives not only the full price of the knife but a bonus; he ought to pay first for the knife, and second for wanting the jack-knife.

Mr. BAYNE. Then, if I understand the gentleman's proposition, he ought to bring in a bill taking off all tariff duties and raising the revenue of the Government by direct taxation.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE, of Kentucky. Not by any means. We have to raise a certain amount of revenue—$310,000,000. Direct taxation must be apportioned among the States according to population. It would be an impossibility for us to raise our revenue in that way. Nobody thinks it can now be done—certainly not I. Therefore we must raise this revenue in large part—in much the larger part—by imposts on imports. The difference between the gentleman and myself is that I believe in an honest levying of taxes, each man paying his ad valorem tax on the thing he desires to import; the gentleman believes, as he frankly says, in laying these taxes so that revenue shall not be collected for the Government, which means, as I understand, that it shall be collected for the manufacturer. That is the distinct difference between us; and that is what this bill does—not openly, not frankly, not candidly, but clandestinely—by changes in schedules, by the manipulation of classifications, by the hiding away of words in the midst of unusual collocations, so that nobody, not even an expert, can read this bill and understand what it means except after careful comparison and the most accurate and painful analysis.

Mr. Speaker, I had intended to say some other things about the sugar schedule and the action of certain gentlemen in regard to it, but I do not care to do so. Some of those gentlemen are absent to-day, and I myself have to go away. I wish to say I have felt that the late statement of the gentleman who is at the head of the Ways and Means Committee about the sugar "trust" was absolutely accurate. I have not criticised the statement of Mr. Blaine, because I supposed he was misled by statements made on this floor; but I felt that it was an outrage on decency as well as a violation of truth for the gentleman from Ohio to say that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MILLS], when he denied the statements of Mr. Blaine, had been accurate as to the letter, but had spoken what he meant to say was a falsehood as to the spirit. That statement was wholly gratuitous; it was absolutely without foundation; and it will stick to the gentleman from Ohio, as all intentionally false statements do, for the balance of his public life.

Mr. EZRA B. TAYLOR addressed the Chair.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE, of Kentucky. I reserve the remainder of my time.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore* (Mr. SOWDEN). The gentleman from Kentucky has fifteen minutes remaining.

Mr. EZRA B. TAYLOR. I have no disposition to take very much time, Mr. Speaker; but in reference to the strictures which the gentleman from Kentucky has made upon my action to-day I wish to say, without using any adjectives, that I think he is in the wrong and I am in the right. The first statement which he makes is that I garbled an answer of the gentleman in the RECORD by stopping, in reading the answer, at the word "indubitably." My reply to that is, first, that I have no such recollection; second, I had no such intention; third, there is no such fact—it is not true. In this connection I desire the Reporter to have the Clerk read the notes of that matter.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE, of Kentucky (after a pause). While we are waiting, I will ask, in order to throw light upon this matter, whether the Reporter has to refer to the notes or to the RECORD.

Mr. J. H. WHITE (one of the Official Reporters). I have the notes here, and can read them.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE, of Kentucky. Read them, if you please, so that we can hear them.

Mr. WHITE read as follows:

Mr. EZRA B. TAYLOR (reading):

"Mr. BRECKINRIDGE, of Kentucky. Indubitably, if Mr. Havemeyer asked an audience he got it."

Mr. TURNER, of Georgia. The gentleman does not read the whole of that answer.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE, of Kentucky. Certainly not.

Mr. EZRA B. TAYLOR. Now, Mr. Speaker, the report of the RECORD shows that I read the whole sentence; and I know that I did read it. If any man living says I did not, I still know I did. I understand how easy it is to make mistakes in a matter of this kind. I had no reason at all to suppress any part of the extract; I did not suppress any of it; and when the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. TURNER] made his remark, as I am sure he did make it, because the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BAYNE] heard it, my mind being upon the subject that I was following, I did not hear it; I did not stop to listen. But to say that I read that word "indubitably," and stopped there, is a slander on me that never has been made before, and never must be made here or elsewhere.

Mr. FARQUHAR. I would like to suggest that it was not the intention of my friend from Ohio to read that from the RECORD at all. He carried the book over to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. EZRA B. TAYLOR. I will refer to that.

Mr. FARQUHAR. Mr. BAYNE had not risen to read from the RECORD.

Mr. EZRA B. TAYLOR. While the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BAYNE] was speaking the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. TURNER] made his remarks, and the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. BRECKINRIDGE] made his. I passed over to the gentleman from Pennsylvania and suggested it would be well enough to get the RECORD. He said: "You get it for me." I went to work, and it was late before I found it. It seemed to be absent from all our desks. I hastily examined it. I was looking only at those two points, one was whether any member of the Committee on Ways and Means had a conversation with Mr. Havemeyer and the other was whether the statement of the gentleman from Kentucky made to-day denying there was any such interview was a matter of correct recollection or not.

Finally I found the RECORD and looked hastily on this page and saw the name of the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. BRECKINRIDGE]. I

called upon the gentleman from Pennsylvania to read it, but he was closing his remarks at that moment. I looked for a pencil, and the gentleman from Kansas handed me a pencil and I marked the report of the remarks of the gentleman from Kentucky. Then having occupied myself alone on the question of denial whether any such thing had occurred to any member of the committee, whether there had been any hearing at all, I looked over on the next column and I saw the report which I read. I marked that. I marked it, as this paper will show, including the entire sentence said to be suppressed. I marked it not for myself. I did not say a word and do not wish to say a word in this House if anybody will say it for me. But the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BAYNE] was closing and suggested that I take ten minutes to read this report.

This was the RECORD of the 9th day of July. I did not look over the leaf to see what else was there, and I did not remember what was there. I had no occasion to remember. It was not a question whether the gentleman from Kentucky was present at these interviews, because I did not understand he was by this statement. He simply said he did not deny there had been an interview between Mr. Havemeyer and some member of the committee. I had but ten minutes in which to read this, and eight of the ten minutes was occupied in reading it. I made a remark or two, and had no opportunity either to read the balance of the speech made in the colloquy which occurred or anything else except this matter which I brought to the attention of the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Now, if I had had the slightest idea the gentleman from Kentucky would regard it as a matter of the least interest, or that it would throw the least light on this subject, or if I had known the fact of his subsequent statement, which I did not know, wherein he said that he was not present, I would have taken more time to explain that whole matter.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE, of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I desire to say, after what the gentleman from Ohio has just said, that what seemed to me to be a statement of his which called for my remarks began with the use of the words "extraordinary denial of the gentleman from Kentucky," after what had occurred at a certain time which he would read from the RECORD. It naturally seemed to me that it was a deliberate charge on the part of a gentleman of long standing in this House that my denial of to-day was a denial which had in it an element wanting in veracity, as would be shown by his reading the extract from the RECORD. I now desire to say, after what the Reporter has read from his notes, and after what the gentleman himself has said in denial, that I regret having said what I did in response to what I believed to be a personal attack upon my veracity and character, and which I believed at the time was attempted to be sustained by an unfair and garbled reading of the RECORD. I think it is due to myself as well as the gentleman from Ohio to say this much.

Mr. EZRA B. TAYLOR. I had no intention, Mr. Speaker, of raising any such question. And I would say here that when anybody attacks me in that way they always apologize. [Laughter.]

I yield now the remainder of my time to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. PETERS].

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

A message from the Senate, by Mr. NEWELL, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment the joint resolution (H. Res. 229) to print the Agricultural Report for 1888;

Also, that the Senate agreed to the concurrent resolutions of the House of Representatives to print the first and second annual reports of the Commissioner of Labor, to be used in the Department of Labor; and the report of the Director of the Mint on the production of the precious metals in the United States for 1887.

The message further announced that Mr. EDMUNDS, Mr. DAWES, and Mr. FAULKNER had been appointed members of the joint select committee on the part of the Senate to investigate the Washington Aqueduct tunnel.

FINAL ADJOURNMENT.

Mr. PETERS. Mr. Speaker, in the time allotted to me——

Mr. TURNER, of Georgia. Before the gentleman from Kansas proceeds, will he yield to me for a moment?

Mr. PETERS. Certainly.

Mr. TURNER, of Georgia. I would like to call the attention of the gentleman from Ohio to another fact in connection with this subject which transpired during his speech. Of course the statement of the Official Reporter should be conclusive as to whether the gentleman read the entire sentence about which a dispute has arisen or not.

Mr. EZRA B. TAYLOR. I did read it.

Mr. TURNER, of Georgia. If the gentleman read the latter part of the sentence, I certainly did not hear it. But the statement he had already made was satisfactory to me even without the reading of the official record of the Reporter's notes. But I desire to call his attention to the fact that his statement was preluded by an assertion that what I said here was "extraordinary," and I think the gentleman went on to use the statement "disingenuous."

Mr. EZRA B. TAYLOR. I think not. I am certain I did not use the word.

Mr. TURNER, of Georgia. Then I misunderstood the gentleman.

Mr. EZRA B. TAYLOR. I did not use that language.

Mr. PETERS. Now, Mr. Speaker, as the clouds have all been blown away and the sky is once more clear, I want to come back to the original subject-matter before the House.

Mr. RICHARDSON. The adjournment question.

Mr. PETERS. Yes, the resolution providing for adjournment. As the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. MCMILLIN] has said, this has been an extraordinary session of Congress. It not only has been an extraordinary session by reason of the peculiar circumstances attending the beginning of it, but it seems to-day, from what has occurred, that its closing hours are to be as extraordinary as its opening hours.

We have here a resolution which has been called up in the House providing for an adjournment *sine die* on next Saturday. That means, if adopted, that there will be no other legislation in the Fiftieth Congress until the first Monday in December next. It means more than that. It means that there will be really no further legislation of any consequence or importance until January next, because every member who is familiar with the course of legislation in this House knows that even at the second session but little is accomplished prior to the holiday vacation, and consequently we are met face to face to-day with a proposition to close all further legislation in regard to every matter before the House practically until the beginning days of January, 1889.

On the first Monday in December, 1887, when the Fiftieth Congress met, when Mr. Speaker CARLISLE took the chair, he made some remarks prior to taking upon himself the oath of office, in which he called the attention of the country to the dangerous surplus that had accumulated in the Treasury of the United States and the absolute necessity to the business interests of the country for a revision of the tariff and for a reduction of the duties which had placed that surplus in the Treasury.

He called attention to the stagnation in business and to the great injury to the business interests that was being brought about by the accumulation of this surplus. If there was anything to be deduced from that great Democratic leader's expressions, it was that as soon as the House got under way and the committees were appointed there should be immediate steps taken not only to reduce the surplus already in the Treasury, that had been withdrawn from the circulating medium of the country and the business interests of the country, but more particularly to stop the flow of this surplus into the Treasury.

Now, what is disclosed in relation to this notwithstanding these urgent words of the Speaker, notwithstanding that these remarks were followed by the marvelous and remarkable message of the President of the United States on the following day, in which he depicted the horrors that would overtake the business interests of this country if that surplus was not reduced and if there was no revision of the tariff? Notwithstanding all these warnings, notwithstanding all we were led to expect, what does the record disclose?

The record of the Fiftieth Congress discloses that not a single effort was made towards the reduction of the surplus until the 1st of March, 1888. And it was upon that day that a proposition was offered in this House originating with the Committee on Ways and Means, which was virtually a re-enactment of the law of 1881. It was not a very difficult piece of legislation to draw; it was not a very difficult measure to determine.

But, notwithstanding all this, the surplus that had been allowed from April, 1887, to increase and accumulate in the vaults of the Treasury from that time up to the meeting of the Fiftieth Congress, and to the importance of the reduction of which the attention of the House had been called, no effort was made in this branch of the Legislature until the 1st of March, 1888, for its reduction. And what was done then? We passed that bill which was virtually a re-enactment of the law of 1881, which authorized the Secretary of the Treasury to go into the markets and purchase the bonds of the United States with the surplus in the Treasury. That was sent to the Senate. The Senate amended it and sent it back to the House, and it was referred to the Committee on Ways and Means, and there that bill sleeps and rests to-day. It has not been brought to the light of day. Then what was done? Afterwards a resolution was offered which provided and expressed that it was the sense of each individual member of this House that the law of 1881 was in fact meant to give the Secretary of the Treasury power to purchase bonds with the surplus accumulated in the Treasury of the United States. That resolution, which I say was an expression of the individual judgment of each member of this House, passed this body, and then for the first time since April, 1887, began the purchase of bonds with the surplus in the Treasury of the United States.

Now, is not that remarkable haste shown by the legislative record that has been made by this Congress in the face of the speech made by Speaker CARLISLE, and the remarkable message that was sent to this House on the second day of this session in December, 1887?

Now, then, what further were we led to believe? Not only were we led to believe that there should be an immediate attempt made to reduce this surplus and get this money out into business channels, so that the business interests that had been stagnated by its withdrawal might be relieved, but we were also informed and made to believe that there would be a special proposition to revise or reform this tariff, which has

been charged as the great source of injury to the business interests of the country.

And, now, what is the record in regard to that? It shows that, notwithstanding there was not a single dilatory measure or motion presented in this House, yet the majority of the Ways and Means Committee did not present a tariff bill to this House until, I believe, the 3d day of April, 1888, and there it rested until the 17th day of that month, when it was called up for consideration, and, as gentlemen all remember, that tariff measure was not passed through this House until July 21, 1888, nearly eight months from the time the Fiftieth Congress first met.

Now, if there was such a necessity for a revision of the tariff, if this tariff was robbing the tax-payers of the country, if there was extorted from the labor of the country dollar after dollar of their hard earnings, how does it come that in this remarkable and extraordinary session of Congress eight months should have elapsed before the bill should have been passed by a Democratic House to relieve the people from this burdensome extortion and robbery?

Now, Mr. Speaker, it seems to me, in the light of this record, that this resolution proposing an adjournment, and which seems to be advocated by the majority side of the House, is only in keeping with the studied effort that has been made by the Democratic party to keep open this question of the tariff, to keep it before the people as a great question, not for the purpose of securing a revision, but for the purpose of carrying the elections this fall.

Mr. HOOKER. Why, this resolution comes from the Republican Senate!

Mr. PETERS. I will come to that in a moment, and, if the gentleman will permit me to be unparliamentary, I will refer him to the record of the proceedings in another branch of the legislative body, where he will find that the resolution as first introduced provided for taking a recess, and that it was the objection which came from the Democratic side of that body which prevented the passage of the resolution in that form and led to the introduction and passage of the resolution providing for a final adjournment. If gentlemen on the other side find any comfort in that state of facts, they are welcome to it.

Mr. RICHARDSON. Does not the gentleman know that the time taken by the Senate to prepare its substitute for what is known as the Mills bill has been unprecedented in the history of tariff legislation in this country?

Mr. PETERS. The record shows that the time taken by the Ways and Means Committee of the House in preparing the Mills tariff bill was just twice as long as the time consumed by the Senate in preparing its bill.

Mr. RICHARDSON. If the gentleman will refer to the record he will find that he is mistaken.

Several MEMBERS on the Republican side. Oh, no.

Mr. PETERS. I want to say further that there have never been but two long sessions of Congress, according to my recollection, that have continued as late as the 21st day of July. Now, what was the object in this case? I do not accuse any individual of having any particular motive in view, but I speak of the Democratic party as a body, as a political organization, and I say that the conclusion may be reasonably drawn from the record that that party was not in earnest when it spoke about a revision of the tariff.

If it had been in earnest, or if it is in earnest now, what should be adopted is the resolutions proposed by the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. WHEELER], which was read for the information of the House, and which provides for taking a recess so that this Congress can come together on the 12th day of November for the purpose of carrying out what will then be known to be the will of the people expressed at the polls. If the people in November next re-elect Grover Cleveland President of the United States, it will be an indorsement of the Mills bill. If they elect Benjamin Harrison President of the United States, as I believe they will, it will be an indorsement of the Senate bill, and, whatever may be the result, it is the duty of the party in power in this House, according to my judgment, if it is sincere in its professed desire to reform the tariff, to keep this body in such a position that it can at once address itself to a revision of the tariff immediately after the election.

That, I say, will be the duty of the majority of this House if their position as embodied in the Mills bill is indorsed by the people at the polls; yet, notwithstanding that fact, notwithstanding what seems to be the judgment of every man who gives the subject his unbiased attention, a Democratic member of the Ways and Means Committee calls up here to-day a resolution providing for an adjournment *sine die*.

Mr. MCMILLIN. A resolution brought over from the Republican Senate, which now has the tariff question before it.

Mr. PETERS. I have already alluded to that, and I have perhaps gone beyond the proper parliamentary line in calling the attention of the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. HOOKER] to what is disclosed by the RECORD as to the proceedings of the other branch of Congress.

Mr. HOOKER. I do not think the gentleman has transgressed very far, because he has the resolution here before him.

Mr. PETERS. I have the resolution here, but I have no right to refer to what occurred in the Senate.

Mr. HOOKER. Well, we will not disagree about that.

Mr. PETERS. That is what you desire to keep out of sight.

Mr. HOOKER. Why so?

Mr. PETERS. Because it shows the inconsistency of your party.

Now, Mr. Speaker, there has been much said upon this question of percentage in relation to the tariff. I have never heard a Democratic orator speak against a protective tariff but what he indulged in this "hifalutin" talk about "per cent." Why do they do it? I mean nothing offensive to any individual speaker; I am referring only to the general style of Democratic orators on the question of the tariff.

I remember reading somewhere the utterance of a speaker or writer on the tariff who said that the poor farmer who rises in the morning puts on a flannel shirt which is taxed 89 per cent., that if he wishes to look at the glorious sunlight he looks out through window-glass that has been taxed 59 per cent., and so on, piling one per cent. upon another. Now, why do gentlemen adopt that style of argument? I can not understand any reason for it, unless it be to invest this whole tariff question with an air of mystery so as to impress the ordinary, average human being with the idea that he is incapable of understanding it. So far as my observation goes, so far as my experience goes, so far as my knowledge goes, this tariff question is a simple, plain, business question, and whoever endeavors to address himself to it upon plain business principles can usually be understood by the masses.

But whenever he wants to talk so that, if possible, he may not be understood, then he commences dealing in "percents." I do not propose to enter into a discussion of the tariff question. I have only called attention to it in connection with this extraordinary resolution, in the light of the past action of the Democratic side, that is now before this House for consideration.

[Here the hammer fell.]

The SPEAKER *pro tempore* (Mr. SOWDEN). The gentleman's time has expired.

Mr. MCMILLIN. I hope the gentleman will permit me to ask him a question; and I will yield him one minute to answer.

Mr. PETERS. Perhaps that may not be long enough to enable me to answer.

Mr. MCMILLIN. Well, then, two minutes. What I want to know is this: The Senate bill puts lumber back on the tax-list; I want to know whether the gentleman favors that.

Mr. PETERS. I will state to the gentleman that I stand now as I stood when the Mills bill was before the House. I am opposed to free lumber.

Mr. MCMILLIN. Then is the Senate bill right or wrong?

Mr. PETERS. The Senate bill does not put lumber on the free-list.

Mr. MCMILLIN. Then the Senate bill is right?

Mr. PETERS. Certainly. Lumber is now free, so far as lumber in the rough is concerned. Logs can now come in from Canada free. It is only when lumber has been touched by the magic hand of labor that protection comes in and says, "We will protect it to a sufficient amount to compensate for the difference between the wages of labor in the United States and the wages of labor in Canada." Although I come from an agricultural State, which has scarcely a stick of timber, yet my people understand that, even if this duty on lumber were taken off, it would not operate to the advantage of the consumer, but would tend simply to benefit the "lumber kings" and the railroad companies that transport lumber from the manufacturer to the consumer.

[Here the hammer fell.]

Mr. MCMILLIN. Mr. Speaker, I desire a vote as early as possible on the pending resolution; but I do not wish to be discourteous to any gentleman. The gentleman from Alabama [Mr. WHEELER], I believe, desires to speak. I yield him fifteen minutes.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. Speaker, I am delighted to see that the discussion to-day has been so beneficial that even the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. PETERS] has been constrained to rise in his seat and demand a reform in the tariff laws of our country, and I am also glad to see that the conversion has been so complete that he insists we shall remain here, inconvenient as it is to us all, in order to reform the tariff laws and do justice to the people. The gentleman must have heard from home; and he may apprehend that unless the tariff laws are reformed there is danger Kansas may go Democratic. [Laughter.]

Mr. RYAN. That is the way you are going to elect Cleveland!

Mr. WHEELER. We are going to elect Mr. Cleveland, and we can do so without Kansas, though I should rejoice to see that State redeemed. A failure to re-elect Mr. Cleveland, with his wise and pure administration, and his stainless and unassailable record, would be well-nigh equivalent to an admission that the American people are incapable of self-government.

Mr. Speaker, I have sent a resolution to the Clerk's desk to amend the Senate resolution for adjournment. I have done this because I have very emphatic convictions in regard to it. I am as homesick as any man in this House; I am desirous to go home; I have been here constantly since last November; I desire very much to go home, and I would like exceedingly to remain there until December; I do not want to come back here the 12th of November; but I believe it is our duty to do so.

I believe the paramount question before us is the revision of the tariff-tax laws.

Every President and every Secretary of the Treasury since 1865 has emphasized this necessity. Mr. Cleveland, the great champion of the people's rights, has demanded it, and even the Republican Senators have admitted the wisdom of his requirement. In the report they say:

The demand for a careful and thorough revision of our revenue laws is imperative. This revision is necessary:

1. To reduce the national revenues, which are now excessive.

No valid reason can be given why we should, under existing circumstances, continue to collect annually a sum approximating $60,000,000 in excess of the amount required to administer the Government economically and keep the pledges of public faith.

2. To protect honest importers and domestic producers.

3. To remedy the defects, anomalies, and incongruities which have been from time to time discovered in the tariff schedules, or which have been created by erroneous decisions of the Treasury Department.

4. To secure the proper readjustment and equalization of tariff rates rendered necessary by modified business conditions, improvements in methods of production, radical changes in prices, or by new elements or sources of competition.

Some gentlemen say we can complete this great work during the next session, and promise to remain all through the Christmas holidays. I will gladly join them in this commendable resolve, but I am not so sanguine as they, and would much prefer to take no risks in so important a matter. This Congress will cease to exist on the 4th day of March, 1889. There can not be more than sixty working days in the next regular session of Congress. It is impossible for us to get a quorum of members to remain here during the Christmas holidays. They will more certainly come here on the 12th of November and work on this important measure for three weeks before the regular commencement of the session than remain here during the holidays. I express this opinion as the result of my experience in former Congresses, but so far as I am personally concerned I will gladly remain here and work through Christmas and New Year's week.

My resolution provides that instead of adjournment we shall take a recess from Saturday, October 27, until Monday, the 12th of November. This will give us ample time to get through with the election, and then we can put in three good weeks of work before the next session commences.

In order to pass a tariff bill the Senate substitute must be thoroughly discussed, and the time required to properly debate that measure can be easily estimated. Each speech will require at least one hour, and we know it is usual for Senators to speak on such a bill for two, three, and sometimes four hours. Those who are prepared to speak will be here promptly on November 12, and others will gather in, until finally all will be present in time to bear their part in this important legislation.

THE DUTY OF DEMOCRATS.

When I introduced the resolution last Monday, which excited so much opposition on the other side of the House, I was confronted by the fact that every Republican on the floor had by his speeches and votes opposed the course insisted upon by the measure; but the moment I saw a possible indication that a single member of that party was willing to join us in our just, humane, and righteous effort to lift the burdens of the people, I immediately asked to have the word "Democrat" stricken from the first resolution, which I certainly had a right to do, for every member has such a privilege regarding his own measures while they are still in the course of introduction. As thus amended the resolution was as I will read:

Whereas the Senate of the United States has reported a bill to revise the tax laws, which bill is more oppressive to the masses of the people and more in the interests of the monopolists than any measure ever proposed to any legislative body of which we have a record: Therefore,

Be it resolved, That the members of this House pledge themselves to continue their efforts to defend the people against this unequal, unjust, and unwise legislation, which, if enacted into law, must inevitably check and limit the sale of American products in foreign countries, stimulate and strengthen the operations of combinations and trusts, and prolong, if not perpetuate, the subjection of the people to the exactions of accumulated capital; and the members of this Congress will maintain the contest upon this floor until the victory is won or the duties with which they have been charged by the people lapse by constitutional limitation; and

Be it also resolved, That the Senate tariff bill should be discussed upon this floor, to the end that its features may be exposed and made known to the people.

This seemed to make the resolution less satisfactory to our friends on the other side of the House. They were in a dilemma. They were unwilling to go before the country admitting their opposition to so wise and good a line of procedure, and by keeping the resolution out of the RECORD they seemed to think or hope that their unfortunate position on this question could be kept from the people.

Now I will ask the gentlemen who oppose the measure, do they insist that the Senate bill shall not be discussed? I know that the more it is debated and its deformities, its illogical features, and un-American principles exposed the more desperate becomes their cause, but let me tell them that the people of the United States are too intelligent and well informed to be misled with sophistry. We must publish the two bills, we must compare them and point out the respects in which they differ, and the people will readily see that the Democratic House bill is in the interest of the people and the Republican Senate bill is against the people, and in the interest of accumulated capital.

What has occurred here to-day shows the necessity of discussing that Senate bill and letting the people know the merits of the two measures, because, as the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. PETERS] has said, the 6th of November will determine the question, and the happiness of our people demands that it shall be determined in favor of the measure proposed and passed by the House of Representatives.

As the gentleman from New York stated in a few words what his idea was on the subject, I will state in a few words what I said some eleven days ago contrasting the House and the Senate bills:

The effect of the bill prepared and passed by the Democratic House of Representatives will be to lighten the burdens and increase the prosperity and happiness of 20,000,000 people who earn their living by daily toil. The effect of the bill prepared by the Republican Senate will be to perpetuate the privileges whereby a few favored monopolists and corporations have gained enormous individual fortunes at the expense of the comfort and happiness of those by whose toil the wealth of the country is created.

INCONGRUITIES AND INCONSISTENCIES.

As the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. BRECKINRIDGE] said, the Senate bill from the beginning to the end is one mass of incongruities, which it will take an expert of the Treasury Department who has been studying these questions all his life to unfold and disentangle, so that it can be understood by the people.

The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BAYNE] repeated more than once in his speech—

As you reduce duties you will swell importations.

The gentleman was very careful to emphasize this assertion, and made it the basis of a large part of his argument.

This has been the theory of many of the gentleman's colleagues, but I find in the Republican Senators' report on the proposed Senate tariff bill, without any comment or explanation, a table which takes quite a different view of this matter.

The table is Appendix B of the Senate report, and is found on page 54 of that document, which the Republican members of the Finance Committee have submitted to Congress and the country as their explanation of their substitute for the bill H. R. 9051 which we passed on July 21 of this year. The table is as I will read:

APPENDIX B.—*Estimates of imports and duties by provisions of Senate substitute to H. R. 9051.*

	Importations, fiscal year 1887.		Estimated imports under the proposed bill.		Estimated decrease of duty by the proposed bill.	Average ad valorem rate of duty.	
	Values.	Duties.	Values.	Duties.		Present law.	Proposed bill.
A.—Chemical products	$15,123,113.72	$4,655,375.27	$14,751,699.54	$4,383,074.79	$272,300.48	30.78	29.70
B.—Earthenware and glassware	13,055,763.49	7,583,953.97	13,042,454.73	7,308,270.25	275,683.72	58.09	56.03
C.—Metals	57,784,719.42	23,090,797.67	51,402,136.87	21,376,664.68	1,714,132.99	39.96	41.58
D.—Wood and woodenware	8,274,012.16	1,518,723.09	8,061,909.70	1,513,440.16	5,282.93	18.35	18.77
E.—Sugar	68,956,335.07	56,530,360.14	68,924,968.35	28,770,576.19	27,759,783.95	83.43	41.02
F.—Tobacco	10,955,125.03	9,127,758.26	10,739,454.24	6,856,875.68	2,270,882.58	83.82	63.85
G.—Provisions, etc	42,593,244.97	11,048,754.66	33,596,588.35	9,040,908.68	2,007,845.98	25.94	26.91
H.—Wines, liquors, etc	10,387,592.49	7,681,031.53	9,761,316.47	7,586,442.73	94,588.80	73.94	77.72
I.—Cotton manufactures	30,207,908.83	12,081,263.03	29,564,007.64	12,049,295.48	31,967.55	40.00	40.59
J.—Flax, hemp, and jute	24,791,662.08	7,868,405.78	24,030,013.17	7,682,125.73	186,480.05	31.74	31.97
K.—Wool and manufactures of wool	60,586,613.61	35,629,534.13	53,658,583.84	34,642,732.88	986,801.25	58.81	64.56
L.—Silk and silk goods	31,264,276.58	15,540,300.70	30,340,689.80	15,447,942.94	92,357.76	49.71	50.92
M.—Books, papers, etc	5,212,152.54	1,154,619.13	4,751,274.82	1,113,825.58	40,793.55	22.15	23.44
N.—Sundries	44,008,079.14	10,810,310.37	43,629,620.50	10,679,774.20	130,536.17	24.56	24.47
Articles, not enumerated—dutiable under section 2513 Revised Statutes:							
Unmanufactured	305,545.78	30,554.61	305,545.78	30,554.61		10.00	10.00
Manufactured	564,001.70	112,800.34	564,001.70	112,800.34		20.00	20.00
Packages, crates, boxes, etc., designed to evade duty	12,340.96	12,340.96	12,340.96	12,340.96		100.00	100.00
	424,082,487.48	204,477,083.64	397,236,006.46	168,607,645.88	35,869,437.76	48.21	42.45

SENATE REPORT ILLOGICAL.

This Republican Senators' report on the bill is almost as remarkable, inconsistent, and illogical as the bill itself.

Referring to Schedule A, the report says the bill will reduce the duty on chemical products from 30.78 per cent. to 29.70 per cent., these Senators' "estimate" that this diminution in the tariff will reduce importations to the extent of $371,414.18.

The report states that in Schedule B the bill will reduce duties on earthenware and glassware from 58.09 per cent. to 56.03 per cent., and, according to the report, it is estimated that this reduction of duty will be followed by a reduction in the value of the importations of these articles to the amount of $13,308.76.

In Schedule E the report states that the bill will reduce the duty on sugar from 83.43 per cent. to 41.02 per cent., and this enormous reduction in the duty—the proposed duty being less than one-half that imposed by the existing law—they claim will cause no increase in the importation, but on the contrary, according to the estimate of the authors of the report, the result will be that the value of sugars imported under the proposed bill will be $31,366.72 less than under existing laws.

In Schedule F the report states that the bill will reduce the duty on tobacco from 83.82 per cent. to 63.85 per cent., and they think this reduction of duty will not increase the importation of foreign-grown tobacco, but on the contrary their estimate is that it will cause a reduction in the annual imports of tobacco to the amount of $215,670.79.

In Schedule N the report states that the bill will reduce the duty on Sundries from 24.56 per cent. to 24.47 per cent., and this reduction in duty, the report estimates, will reduce the importation of the articles embraced in this schedule to the amount of $378,458.64.

Now, it will be remembered that since Mr. Blaine gave the key-note of the Republican campaign in his cablegram of December 8, 1887, the Republican clamor has been that even the least reduction in the tariff tax will flood our country with foreign products, and since this House passed the bill making a reduction of 5 per cent. there has been one resounding chorus—sometimes approximating a howl—that such a reduction in the tariff would glut our markets with the products of foreign labor, stop all of our factories, pauperize our labor, and play the dickens generally.

But when even a greater reduction is made by the unsoiled, sacred hands of Republican Senators, the argument is reversed, and forgetting for a moment the Republican campaign oratory which has nearly deafened the country for the last ten months, the Republicans now assure us that a reduction in the tariff tax on imports, including the great variety of goods in the sundries schedule, will certainly cause a diminution in the aggregate value of importations of that character. And this, too, in the face of the well-known fact that our population, wealth, and requirements are rapidly increasing.

Again: It is clear that a reduction of the duty on an article will lessen the cost of that article and larger quantities be purchased because of the lower price.

Now, if importations are diminished while requirements are increased and the ability to purchase augmented, it is clear the deficiency must be made up from the products of American manufactures, and therefore the Republican Senators contend that a reduction of duties will result in a vast increase in the prosperity, happiness, and comfort of the American people.

If the unflinching partisans be correct in the conclusions they have deduced from their premises, they are entitled to and should receive our hearty thanks for their unexpected co-operation, for, accepting their conclusions, we could not desire a more complete vindication of the Democratic position on the tariff, or a more forcible argument in support of the Mills bill than is found in this report of Republican Senators.

In defending this absurd position I presume it will be said the table is merely a mathematical calculation based upon some theory, but there is not one word in the report to justify this assumption. We must therefore take the table as submitted and assume that the Republican Senators meant what they have said, namely, that the third column in the table is an estimate of what they really believe the importations of the various articles will be should the bill become the law.

ARTICLES ON WHICH TARIFF IS INCREASED.

Let us now examine their estimate of the effect of an increase of the tariff tax. Referring to Schedule C, the Republican report states that the Senate bill will slightly increase the duty on metals, raising it from 39.96 per cent. to 41.58 per cent., but this trivial increase in the duty these Senators estimate will effect a reduction in our imports of foreign metals to the amount of $6,382,582.55 and a diminution in the Government's revenue of $1,714,132.99.

Regarding Schedule D the report states that the Senate bill will increase the duty on wood and woodenware from 18.35 per cent. to 18.77 per cent., and, according to the estimate of the Senators, will effect a reduction in the value of our imports amounting to $212,102.46 and a reduction of $5,282.93 in the amount of duty collected.

In Schedule G, the report states that the increase in the duty on provisions from 25.94 per cent. to 26.91 per cent. will cause a reduction of imports to the amount of $8,996,656.62, and will reduce the revenue by $2,007,845.98.

In Schedule H, the report states that the Senate bill will raise the duty on wines, liquors, etc., from 73.94 per cent. to 77.72 per cent., and it is estimated that this increase in the tariff tax will cause a falling off in imports to the amount of $626,275.93 and a reduction in the revenue of $94,588.80.

In Schedule I the report says that under the Senate bill there will be an increase of the duty on cotton manufactures from 40 per cent. to 40.59 per cent., and it is estimated in the report that this increase of duty will be followed by a reduction of $543,901.19 in the value of our imports and a decrease of $31,967.55 in the customs revenue.

In Schedule J the report says that the Senate bill will increase the tariff tax on flax, hemp, and jute from 31.74 per cent. to 31.97 per cent., which increase in duty will result in reducing the imports of those articles $761,648.91 and decreasing the revenue $186,480.05.

In Schedule K the report says that the Senate bill will increase the tariff on wool and manufactures of wool from 58.81 per cent. to 64.56, and it is estimated by the Republican Senators that this increase of duty will occasion a decrease of importations to the amount of $6,928,-029.77, while the revenue will be reduced $986,801.25.

In Schedule L the report states that the Senate bill will increase the tariff on silk and silk goods from 49.71 per cent. to 50.92 per cent., and the estimated effect of this reduction in duty is that imports will be diminished to the extent of $923,586.78, and the revenue will be lessened $92,357.76.

In Schedule M the report states that the Senate bill will raise the tariff on books, papers, etc., from 22.15 per cent. to 23.44 per cent., and the Republican authors of the report estimate that this increase in duty will diminish the imports to the amount of $460,877.72 and decrease the duty collected to the amount of $40,793.55.

FRAUDS UPON THE PEOPLE.

The gentleman from New York [Mr. FARQUHAR], the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. EZRA B. TAYLOR], and the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BAYNE] have all advocated and commended those features of the Senate bill by which many articles now subject to an ad valorem tax are required to pay specific duties. The only reason given for the proposed change is that it will prevent fraud by undervaluation.

I insist, Mr. Speaker, that we should prevent fraud, and it can be done, and should be done, by punishing those who commit the fraud. That is our method of dealing with that matter, but our friends on the other side of the House propose to prevent fraud upon the Government by perpetrating a greater fraud upon the people, and the people selected as the victims of this fraud are those of limited means who are compelled to purchase the cheapest commodities.

Take the wool schedule. The Democratic House proposes to tax all blankets 40 per cent. The poor man who buys a two-dollar blanket pays a tax of 80 cents upon it, and the rich man who buys a ten-dollar blanket pays upon it a tax of $4. The Republican bill says the rich man should pay less and the poor man must pay more. To do this the framers of that measure put a mixed or compound duty on blankets, exacting from 35 to 40 per cent. ad valorem, and in addition, from 10 to 40 cents per pound, thus placing the higher tax on the cheap blanket and a heavier burden on the poor man who is obliged to purchase the less expensive class of goods.

In the same way the Senate bill raises the tax on woolen cloths from the 40 per cent. proposed by the House bill to above an average of 75 per cent. And this 75 per cent. is so arranged that the heaviest tax is levied upon the coarse, cheap cloths, and the least exaction falls upon the expensive cloths.

Pursuing the same method the Senate bill increases the tax on woolen shawls from the uniform rate of 40 per cent. provided by the House bill to an average rate of 68 per cent.

Manufactures of worsted, hair of the alpaca, goat, etc., are subjected in the House bill to a tax of 40 per cent., and the Senate bill proposes to make it as high as 148 per cent. On children's worsted clothing the 40 per cent. imposed by the House is increased to 93 per cent. by the Senate. The House bill proposed a tax of 40 per cent. on woolen balmorals, and the Senate bill fixes it at 130 per cent.; and so on through the entire woolen schedule. No, not through the entire schedule, for when the Senate bill comes to deal with goods used most largely by the wealthy the tax is either reduced or removed altogether.

For instance: I find that the Senate bill tranfers bonnet trimmings and other trimmings from the dutiable list to the free-list. This class of imports paid customs duties last year to the amount of $800,000 and the contemplated change will relieve the well-to-do of a tax and the deficiency in the revenue thus created is to be supplied by increasing the taxes which necessarily fall upon those of limited means.

And right here I desire to call the attention of the House to the fact that, in some instances, so adroitly have the framers of the Senate bill managed the wool schedule that it is calculated to mislead any one. Far be it from me to imply that the bill has intentionally been made deceptive, but the fact remains that it is likely to deceive. The bill makes four classifications of woolen cloths and on cloths costing under 60 cents per pound, a lower tax is imposed than on those costing 80 cents per pound, but an examination of the statistics reveals the fact that

but a small quantity of cloths costing less than 60 cents per pound are imported. Our imports of woolen cloths costing less than 80 cents per pound cost an average of between 60 and 70 cents.

SUGAR AND THE SUGAR TRUST.

But let us examine the Senate monstrosity in another schedule. I asked the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BAYNE] a question he did not answer. I asked if the reduction in the tax on sugar would not all, or substantially all, inure to the benefit of the refiners. The gentleman said he would answer my inquiry and explain the question at issue before he finished his speech, but he forgot to do so.

Now, I insist that this enormous reduction of $28,000,000 will not inure to the benefit of the people.

The members of the sugar trust who control all business in that line will buy the sugar for about $28,000,000 less than they would pay for it if the present law remained in force; but we all know that so long as they can control the selling price they will keep it at the highest point possible, and some of these magnates have admitted that they habitually fix the price of sugar at the highest figures the public will bear.

I believe that if the Senate bill shall become the law, with the sugar trade in its present condition, much of the $28,000,000 which now goes into the public Treasury will find its way into the vaults of this mammoth combination.

Some Republican Senators and some Republican members of this House appear to be quite familiar with Mr. Havemeyer, while our side of the House and the Democratic Senators know very little of this distinguished gentleman.

SECTIONAL DISCRIMINATION.

To my mind it seems reasonable to suppose that he or his attorneys must have had some influence in the framing of this clause of the Senate bill. Two objects are accomplished by the Senate bill. The sugar trust reaps a great harvest and a chastisement is inflicted upon a Southern Democratic State. If the punishment could have been made more severe, without simultaneously injuring Northern industries, I fear the heavier infliction would have been visited upon us. I read from the Senate report, bottom of page 47:

> The high rates of duty which have been levied upon this important article of food have not successfully developed the sugar-producing industry of the United States. The great natural advantages which the producers of cane sugars in the tropical islands have over those of the United States preclude domestic competition upon equal terms.

The existence of these conditions is usually regarded by avowed protectionists as an unanswerable argument for increasing the tariff, but in absolute disregard of all dogmas and former declarations of doctrine the Republican Senators in this instance give it as a sufficient reason for abandoning all further effort to produce sugar in this country, and say further that were it not for other existing conditions a still greater reduction would have been made.

I will read from the Republican Senators' report, bottom of page 47 and top of page 48:

> If it were not for the fact that parties interested in the production of sugar from sorghum or beets are confident of the rapid development of these industries in the United States, the committee would recommend a still greater reduction in the rate of duty upon sugar.

Now bear in mind that in this country sugar from cane is exclusively a Southern product and sugar from sorghum and beets is obtained almost exclusively in the North, and we can appreciate the modesty, consistency, and assurance of these Senators when they denounce the Mills bill as a sectional measure, and these are the gentlemen who insist on raising the tax on cotton-ties, used by the Southern people, from 35 to 118 per cent.

OUR DUTY AS REPRESENTATIVES.

Gentlemen may be wearied with the unusually protracted session, but they should remember we are sent here by the people, not to consider our own comfort or to be governed by our own preferences, but simply and only to guard the interests, promote the welfare, prosperity, and happiness of our constituents by such legislation as we think best adapted to secure these ends. We should remember, also, that it is enjoined upon us by the highest authority "be not weary in well doing," and though the struggle through which we have passed in our effort to relieve the great mass of our people from the oppressive exactions of unequal and unjust tax laws enacted by the Republican party in the interest of a specially favored and privileged few, though this struggle has been trying and exhausting, fidelity to those by whom we have been trusted and honored demands we shall remain at our post of duty, be we never so weary and worn, until all the measures designed to benefit the people have been properly considered and finally disposed of.

There are quite a number of such measures which, in my opinion, should be acted upon before we have the right to seek the repose and comfort of our homes.

I will mention a few which I have reported from the committee of which I am chairman and the consideration of which I have repeatedly but unsuccessfully urged.

There is the bill providing for the establishment of camps of refuge for yellow-fever sufferers, which I regard as of the gravest importance to the whole country; and as at this time "the pestilence that walketh at noonday" is ravaging a portion of my own district, it is of special interest to those I immediately represent on this floor. Under this state of facts I think I would be fully justified in opposing an adjournment until that necessary measure of relief is considered.

Then there is the bill to establish signal stations in the West Indies, the object being to give our people notice of the approach of cyclones. This much-needed legislation has been asked for by the chambers of commerce of nearly all of our maritime cities, particularly by those of New York, New Orleans, and Mobile.

There is the bill providing for the creation of a bureau of tariff statistics, and all who have participated in the recent discussion on our tax laws will admit that we need some such bureau.

There is, too, the bill designed to secure a better class of work in printing the money and securities of the Government, now pending in the other House. No one who has read the evidence secured by the committee which reported that bill will deny that the enactment of that bill into law is imperatively demanded to protect the people from the losses they must sustain if the inferior quality of work we now have is to be continued—a perfect but costly exemplification of counterfeiting made easy.

Then there is, too, the important bill to determine the final balances due to and from the Government which the Treasury officials regard as necessary to a proper system of accounting, and without the sanction of which law they can not close their books.

There is, too, the bill granting leaves of absence to certain faithful and well-deserving employés of the Government, and doubtless many others equally meritorious which it would be tedious to specify.

But, it may be said, we can not possibly transact business in the absence of a quorum. Well, we can at least try, and fix the responsibility for preventing needed legislation where it belongs. I would suggest, however, that we have ample power to compel the attendance of absent members, and with proper authority the Sergeant-at-Arms can use the telegraph, and we can secure a quorum within two days at the outside.

Let us not deceive ourselves. We can not neglect a plain and imperative duty, and then excuse ourselves by the reflection that the neglect was attributable to others than ourselves. Whatever it is necessary we should do can be done, and for one I feel that the effort to perform our duty should not be abandoned—at least it should not be abandoned until we have exerted all the powers with which we are clothed and it has been demonstrated that their exercise was in vain.

THE PRAYERS OF ALL THE PEOPLE.

I was thinking last Sunday that in the churches throughout our land there have been, since Congress began its session, prayers offered up by the people asking that we may take such action as will tend to promote the national happiness, to the increase of industry, and to perpetuate to us the blessings of equal liberty. We have not yet accomplished the work we were sent here to perform, and therefore this Hall is our post of duty.

Mr. MILLIKEN. Will the gentleman yield to me for a question?

Mr. WHEELER. Certainly.

Mr. MILLIKEN. Does the gentleman think it is going to increase the industries of our country by putting them on the free-list? Is not that the very best way in the world to secure their absolute destruction?

Mr. WHEELER. No, sir; I think not. If we put some articles on the free-list and judiciously revise the tax on others it will be better for this country. We would soon have a great foreign trade—a trade which in ten years would make the United States the center of wealth, power, and civilization. Its ships would sail on every sea, and the flag of the country would float and be respected in every port. [Great applause on the Democratic side.]

There will be a demand for labor because of the demand for the laboring man's product, and this demand will be so great that it will necessitate an increase in the laboring man's wages, and it will enable us to get better classes of labor from abroad and keep out paupers and Chinese. [Applause.]

Mr. MILLIKEN. I doubt very much if my friend's ideas could be realized in that manner. I fear the plan he proposes is going to make it impossible ever to be realized.

Mr. WHEELER. The history of the world shows that to be the result. No nation was ever great and wealthy without commerce. The gentleman will hardly claim that people will send empty ships to our country to carry away our products. We have got to trade with foreign countries in order to secure a market for our own.

[Here the hammer fell.]

Mr. MILLIKEN. I hope the time of the gentleman will be extended. If I had known that his time was so brief I would not have interrupted him with questions.

Mr. WHEELER. I am much obliged to the gentleman, but I do not wish to detain the House longer. I have insisted that the Democratic House of Representatives should not take the initiative in the matter of adjournment. This much has been accomplished. We have not sent to the Senate any proposition looking to either adjournment or recess. Rather than consent to that I would have remained here until

the 4th day of March. But as the Republican Senate have sent us a resolution announcing that they would do no more business, I am ready to acquiesce in and accept their proposal.

I have expressed my views, and I trust that when we meet again in December we will all be ready to labor without intermission until we have agreed upon a measure which will relieve the people of their present heavy burdens, and enable them to realize that this is, in fact as well as in name, a land of liberty and equal rights. [Cries of "Vote!" "Vote!"]

Mr. RICHARDSON. Mr. Speaker, I did not intend to participate in this debate at all, and do not rise now for the purpose of indulging in it to any considerable extent. But inasmuch as the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. PETERS] has seen fit to challenge the Democratic party for alleged delay in this matter, and charges the delay in the passage of tariff legislation upon that party, I have risen simply for the purpose of presenting a statement which has been prepared by a member of this House with some care, and which forms part of an interview published in a New York paper some days ago.

I ask to have it read, as reflecting upon this question of delay. One date is not given in the paper; that is the date of the passage of the Mills bill. It is well known that it passed this House on the 21st day of July. The Senate did not enter, so far as the public records show, upon the discussion of the tariff in committee prior to that time; but from some day in May it is well known that the Senate committee was engaged on the tariff bill as a substitute for any bill which might be passed by the House. I ask the Clerk to read this paper:

The Clerk read as follows:

The celebrated tariff bill of 1846 passed the House July 7; July 28 it passed the Senate. The tariff bill of 1857 was adopted by the House six days after it passed the Senate. The tariff bill of 1870 passed the House June 6, and on July 5 it passed the Senate. There has never been any tariff bill that lingered in the Senate anything like the time that it has devoted to this. It is true that all these bills were framed in the House and only amended in the Senate, as the Constitution contemplates. But we have one case that is precisely in point, the tariff bill of 1883. December 8, 1882, the Senate took from the Calendar a little internal-revenue bill, recommitted it to the Committee on Finance, and January 4, 1883, reported to the Senate a tariff bill complete and perfect, which they had manufactured in twenty-seven days. The committee reporting that bill was the same, with one exception, as the present one.

The committee on the bill of 1883 was, MORRILL, SHERMAN, FERRY, JONES, of Nevada, ALLISON, and ALDRICH. The only change is that HISCOCK has been substituted for FERRY. HISCOCK is at least equal to FERRY in ability, and has a great deal more knowledge of this question, because he was for a long time on the Ways and Means Committee of the House, so that with five more years' experience than they had in 1883 the committee has taken one hundred and thirty days precisely to do what they did in twenty-seven days then. This means something. It can only mean these Senators have intended just exactly the result which has followed—to delay the bill until there was no quorum in the Senate and there could be no vote had. A vote would show that in the Senate, just as in the House, no reduction of taxation on the necessaries of life or any of them is to be expected from the Republicans.

Mr. MCMILLIN. I now demand the previous question upon the adoption of the resolution.

The previous question was ordered; under the operation of which the resolution was adopted.

Mr. MCMILLIN moved to reconsider the vote by which the resolution was adopted; and also moved that the motion to reconsider be laid on the table.

The latter motion was agreed to.

JOHN PRATER.

Mr. HOOKER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to offer a resolution at this time for consideration.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The resolution will be read, subject to the right of objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That the Clerk of the House be authorized to pay out of the contingent fund of the House to John Prater for services rendered in the cloak-room, from December 1, 1887, to October 31, 1888, at the rate of $60 per month.

Mr. HOOKER. That is the amendment which was offered this afternoon by the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. BRECKINRIDGE] to another resolution. I offer it now as a separate measure, and hope it will be adopted.

There being no objection, the resolution was considered and agreed to.

Mr. HOOKER moved to reconsider the vote by which the resolution was agreed to; and also moved that the motion to reconsider be laid on the table.

The latter motion was agreed to.

BRIDGES ACROSS THE CUMBERLAND AND CANEY FORK RIVERS.

Mr. MCMILLIN. Mr. Speaker, I have a little bill here which I wish to ask consent to take up and consider. It is a bill making no appropriation, but is merely to amend the authority given for the construction of certain bridges. The railroad company is actually at work now, and if this is not done this work must be suspended. It is recommended by the War Department, and the Committee on Commerce have also favorably reported upon it.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The bill will be read, subject to objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 11604) to amend an act approved March 3, 1885, to authorize the construction of bridges across the Cumberland and Caney Fork Rivers, in Tennessee.

The bill is as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 1 of an act approved March 3, 1885, entitled "An act to give the assent of Congress to the construction of a railroad bridge by the East and Middle Tennessee Railroad Company over the Cumberland and Caney Fork Rivers," be amended so as to read:

"That the Middle and East Tennessee Central Railroad Company and the Knoxville Railroad Company, or either of said companies, or any company with which either may consolidate, be, and are hereby, authorized to construct and maintain a bridge, and approaches thereto, over the Cumberland River at the most accessible point in or near the limits of Carthage, county of Smith, and State of Tennessee. Said bridge shall be constructed to provide for the passage of railroad trains across said river, and, in the discretion of said company or companies, wagons, horses, and foot-passengers."

SEC. 2. That section 6 be amended so as to read:

"Said company or companies, or either of them, is hereby also authorized to construct a railroad bridge over the Caney Fork River at such point as may be necessary in the building of their road, subject to the provisions and limitations contained in the preceding sections of this and the act it is intended to amend."

SEC. 3. That said act is hereby so amended as to empower the Secretary of War to use his discretion in the approval of the plans of the bridges therein provided for, as to the height they shall be placed above high water and the length of span that shall be given the main channel-span, whether the bridges be a continuous span or with a draw-span, provided the bridges, or either of them, shall not be so constructed as to limit or obstruct the navigation of said river or rivers.

Mr. MCMILLIN. I will insert a letter from the Secretary of War, and also the report of the Committee on Commerce favoring the bill.

The letter of the Secretary of War is as follows:

WAR DEPARTMENT, *Washington City, October* 16, 1888.

SIR: Referring to the proposed amendment to House bill 9793, "to amend an act approved March 3, 1885, to authorize the construction of bridges across the Cumberland and Caney Fork Rivers, in Tennessee," submitted by you, providing that the height above high water, and the length of the main span of these bridges be left to the discretion of the Secretary of War. I have the honor to state that a copy of the report of the Chief of Engineers on the subject, dated the 15th instant, has this day been handed to you.

Very respectfully,

WM. C. ENDICOTT, *Secretary of War.*

Hon. B. MCMILLIN,
House of Representatives.

The report (by Mr. CRISP) is as follows:

The Committee on Commerce, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 9793) to amend an act approved March 3, 1885, to authorize the construction of bridges across the Cumberland and Caney Fork Rivers, in Tennessee, have had the same under consideration, and report as follows:

The proposed bill has been submitted to the Secretary of War, meets his approval, does not change any of the provisions of the original bill looking to the protection of the navigation of the rivers, and we recommend its passage.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the bill was considered, ordered to be engrossed, and read a third time; and being engrossed, it was accordingly read the third time, and passed.

Mr. MCMILLIN moved to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed; and also moved that the motion to reconsider be laid on the table.

The latter motion was agreed to.

LEE SWORDS.

Mr. MILLIKEN, by unanimous consent, submitted the following resolution; which was read:

Be it resolved, That the Clerk of the House be, and is hereby, authorized and directed to pay to Lee Swords $40 out of the contingent fund of the House for services as folder in the House folding-room during May, 1877.

The resolution was agreed to.

Mr. MILLIKEN moved to reconsider the vote by which the resolution was agreed to; and also moved that the motion to reconsider be laid on the table.

The latter motion was agreed to.

MAJ. GEN. ANDREW J. SMITH.

Mr. WARNER. I ask to take from the Speaker's table the following bill and non-concur in the Senate amendments, and ask a committee of conference.

The Clerk read the title of the bill, as follows:

A bill (H. R. 2579) authorizing the President to appoint and retire Andrew J. Smith, late colonel of the Seventh United States Cavalry, and major-general of volunteers.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore* (Mr. MCMILLIN in the chair). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. WARNER] that the House non-concur in the Senate amendments and request a conference? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

PUBLIC PARK, TACOMA, WASH.

Mr. MCRAE. I desire to offer for present consideration this bill, which I report from the Committee on Public Lands.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 3475) granting the use of certain lands in Pierce County, Washington Territory, to the city of Tacoma for the purposes of a public park.

The bill was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That there is hereby granted to the city of Tacoma, in the county of Pierce, in the Territory of Washington, a license to occupy, improve, and control, for the purposes of a public park for the use and benefit of the citizens of the United States, and for no other purposes whatever, the following-described pieces or parcels of land, situate in the county of Pierce and Territory of Washington, and described as follows, namely: Lots 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, and 6, and the east half of the southeast quarter, and the northeast quarter of the northwest quarter, and the southwest quarter of the northeast quarter of section 15, township 21 north, of range 2 east, and lots 1, 2, and 3, and the south half of the south-

west quarter of section 14, same township and range, and lots 1, 2, and 3 in section 10 of the same township and range, containing 635 acres, more or less: *Provided*, That the United States reserves to itself the fee of all said lands, and that this license is granted upon the express condition that the United States may take possession of and occupy said lands or any part thereof for military or other purposes whenever its proper officials see fit to order the same, and without any claim for compensation or damage on the part of said city of Tacoma.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill? The Chair hears none. The Chair will state to the gentleman from Arkansas that this bill is before the Committee on Public Lands.

Mr. MCRAE. I report the bill now and ask for its consideration.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The gentleman's request was to report the bill and consider it now. Is there objection? The Chair hears none.

The bill was ordered to a third reading, and it was accordingly read the third time, and passed.

Mr. MCRAE moved to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed; and also moved that the motion to reconsider be laid on the table.

The latter motion was agreed to.

ANDREW J. SMITH.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The Chair will appoint as conferees on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the bill H. R. 2579, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. TOWNSHEND], the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MAISH], and the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GEAR].

ARMY AND NAVY BANDS.

Mr. COX. I ask unanimous consent to discharge the Committee on Naval Affairs from the further consideration of joint resolution No. 24, in reference to the employment of Army and Navy bands, and I propose to amend it so as to take away the obnoxious features which were objected to by the chairman of the Committee on Naval Affairs [Mr. HERBERT].

The resolution was read, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That hereafter no enlisted man in the service of the United States, the Army and Navy, respectively, whether a non-commissioned officer, musician, or private, shall be detailed, ordered, or permitted to leave his post to engage in any pursuit, business, or performance in civil life for emolument, hire, or otherwise, where the same shall interfere with the customary employment and regular engagement of local civilians in their respective arts, trades, or professions.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York [Mr. COX] to discharge the Committee of the Whole from the further consideration of this resolution and consider the same now? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. COX. I propose to amend it so as to take away the features which were obnoxious to Mr. HERBERT, of Alabama, the chairman of the Committee on Naval Affairs, and limit it entirely to the musicians of the Army and Navy. The practice of employing them is not uniform, and this proposes simply to limit it to the musicians. The bands of the various posts, etc., around the country come down and play for a smaller sum than certain bands, and the other bands are more or less discouraged, as they depend upon their music for a living. Therefore I ask to amend the bill so as to make it apply to musicians only.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The Clerk will report the amendments.

The Clerk read as follows:

In line 3, after the word "enlisted," strike out the word "man" and insert "musician;" in lines 4 and 5, strike out the words "whether a non-commissioned officer, musician, or private;" in line 9, after the word "civilian," insert the word "musicians;" and strike out the whole of line 10.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York to discharge the committee from the consideration of this resolution and consider it in the House?

Mr. SHAW. I hope it will be read as it will stand amended.

The Clerk read the resolution as amended, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That hereafter no enlisted musician in the service of the United States, the Army and Navy, respectively, shall be detailed, ordered, or permitted to leave his post to engage in any pursuit, business, or performance in civil life for emolument, hire, or otherwise, where the same shall interfere with the customary employment and regular engagement of local civilian musicians.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York [Mr. COX]? The Chair hears none.

The amendments were agreed to; and the resolution as amended was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time; and being engrossed, it was accordingly read the third time, and passed.

Mr. COX moved to reconsider the vote by which the resolution had been adopted; and also moved that the motion to reconsider be laid on the table.

The latter motion was agreed to.

ORDER OF BUSINESS.

Mr. KILGORE. I move that the House do now adjourn.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The Chair had recognized the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. CONGER].

Mr. CONGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask that the Committee of the Whole House be discharged from the consideration of the bill which the Clerk will read.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The gentleman from Iowa [Mr. CONGER] asks the committee be discharged from the further consideration of a bill, and the gentleman from Texas [Mr. KILGORE] moves that the House do now adjourn.

Mr. BAYNE. I hope the gentleman from Texas will not insist on that motion.

Mr. KILGORE. I want to hear what the bill is.

LAND OFFICE AT FOLSOM, N. MEX.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

A bill (S. 2040) to establish a land office at Folsom, in the Territory of New Mexico.

Be it enacted, etc., That all that portion of the Territory of New Mexico bounded and described as follows: Commencing at the northeastern corner of said Territory and running thence west on the northern boundary line of said Territory to the line dividing ranges numbered 24 and 25, thence south on said range line to the principal base-line running east and west through said Territory, thence east on said base-line to the eastern boundary line of said Territory, thence north on said eastern boundary line to the place of beginning, be, and is hereby, constituted a new and separate land district, to be called the Colfax land district, the land office for which shall be located in the town of Folsom, county of Colfax, in the said Territory of New Mexico.

SEC. 2. That the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, shall appoint a register and a receiver of public moneys for said district; and said officers shall reside in the place where said land office is located, and shall have the same powers and shall discharge similar duties and receive the same fees and emoluments as officers discharging like duties in the other land offices of the Territory of New Mexico.

Mr. MCMILLIN. I objected to this bill the other day, and it is proper, I think, that I should make this statement. I went to the Land Office, but I was unable to see either the Secretary of the Interior or the Commissioner of the General Land Office. It impressed me when the bill came up that it was a bill which the public demands did not require. I still hold the same opinion. In what purports to be an indorsement of the bill there is rather a peculiar indorsement, and a good portion of the territory embraced in this has been put in a new district since this was introduced. I think it is proper to make that statement to the House.

Mr. CONGER. Permit me to say that the eastern half of the Territory was divided into two land districts; the county of Lincoln, in the southeastern part, is in the bill already passed, and it was the understanding with Mr. JOSEPH that the two bills should go through together.

Mr. MCMILLIN. But Mr. JOSEPH is not the only person concerned in the matter, and that is why I made the investigation.

Mr. CONGER. I know, but this applies to the northeastern part, and the other land district organized is in the southeastern part.

Mr. MCRAE. If this bill covers any part of the territory covered by the bill I moved for Mr. JOSEPH, I shall object to it.

Mr. CONGER. It does not. The other bill comprises simply the county of Lincoln, and this is north of it.

Mr. MCMILLIN. I think the gentleman will find from the report that it does embrace a part of the same territory.

Mr. CONGER. I have the other bill in my desk, and there is no conflict between them at all.

Mr. MCMILLIN. Let the report be read.

The report (by Mr. JACKSON) was read, as follows:

The Committee on the Public Lands, having under consideration the bill (S. 2040) to establish a land office at Folsom, Colfax County, New Mexico, report:

That at present there is no land office nearer the northeastern portion of the Territory of New Mexico than Santa Fé; that by reason of the location and completion of railroads there is likely to be in the near future a large emigration to that part of the Territory. The district as proposed in this bill is of a fair size, embraces much good land, and emigrants have no public means of travel by any direct route from this part of the Territory to Santa Fé, the present office. That it would greatly accommodate settlers to establish this office at Folsom, which is on a railroad. The honorable Commissioner of the General Land Office, in a letter answering an inquiry of the Senate committee concerning the propriety of establishing this office, under date of April 5, 1888, says that—

"It may be done without serious inconvenience to the transaction of current business, and I have no objection to interpose."

In a letter of same date, answering an inquiry in regard to establishing a land district by House bill 5048, to be known as the Las Vegas district, the honorable Commissioner of the General Land Office says that—

"The eastern portion of the Territory proposed to be included within its limits is included in Senate bill 2040, upon which this office makes a favorable report. The creation of the (Folsom) Colfax district (bill S. 2040) it is believed will fully answer the public requirements."

The committee, believing that the establishment of this office will tend to promote the acquisition of public lands in the Territory of New Mexico of homestead settlers, recommend the passage of the bill.

Mr. CONGER. The bill has been on the Calendar for some time, and on several occasions I had an opportunity to call it up, but at the request of Mr. JOSEPH it was delayed until this bill should have come over from the Senate.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. Is there objection to considering this bill at this time?

There was no objection.

The bill was ordered to a third reading; and it was accordingly read the third time, and passed.

Mr. CONGER moved to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed; and also moved that the motion to reconsider be laid on the table.

The latter motion was agreed to.

The House then, on motion of Mr. MCMILLIN (at 4.30 p. m.), adjourned.

PETITIONS, ETC.

The following petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk, under the rule, and referred as follows:

By Mr. W. C. P. BRECKINRIDGE: Petition of John B. Martin and of estate of James L. Martin, for reference of their claims to the Court of Claims—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. NELSON: Resolution of the Lake Carriers' Association, protesting against the passage of Senate bill No. 2182—to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. McMILLIN: Petition of Eliza O. Prince, and of R. N. Miers, of Sumner County, Tennessee, for reference of their claims to the Court of Claims—to the Committee on War Claims.

PRIVATE BILL INTRODUCED AND REFERRED.

Under the rule a private bill of the following title was introduced and referred as indicated below:

By Mr. McMILLIN: A bill (H. R. 11606) for the relief of John J. Kelly, of Jackson County, Tennessee—to the Committee on War Claims.

SENATE.

FRIDAY, *October* 19, 1888.

Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. J. G. BUTLER, D. D.

The Journal of yesterday's proceedings was read and approved.

BILLS INTRODUCED.

Mr. TELLER. I present a petition of citizens of Milwaukee, Wis., praying that a bill be introduced in the matter of the pension claim of Mrs. Helen Lehman, guardian of Jonas Lehman (insane), late of Company H, One hundred and eleventh Pennsylvania Volunteers, and that she be placed upon the pension-roll. The junior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. SPOONER] has prepared a bill accomplishing that purpose, which I ask leave to introduce for him, and that the bill and petition be referred to the Committee on Pensions.

The bill (S. 3642) granting a pension to Jonas Lehman was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying petition, referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. HAMPTON introduced a bill (S. 3643) for the relief of the building and mutual loan associations of the District of Columbia; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

INVESTIGATIONS BY FINANCE COMMITTEE.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The Chair lays before the Senate a resolution coming over from yesterday under objection, which will be read.

The Chief Clerk read the resolution submitted yesterday by Mr. ALLISON, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Finance be authorized and directed to continue, during the recess of Congress, the investigation of such revenue matters, including House bill 9051, as have been referred to it by resolutions of the Senate, subject to the authority conferred by said resolutions.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

WAGONS MADE BY PRISON LABOR.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The Chair lays before the Senate a resolution coming over from yesterday under objection, which will be read.

The Chief Clerk read the resolution, submitted yesterday by Mr. TELLER, as follows:

Whereas it is reported that the Secretary of the Interior has purchased a large number of wagons for the Indian service that were manufactured with prison labor in the State of Tennessee, thus putting the honest labor of the country in competition with such prison labor: Therefore,

Resolved, That the Committee on Indian Affairs be authorized and directed to inquire as to the truth of such report, the number of wagons so purchased, the price paid for the same, whether the price paid was the fair market price thereof, and whether legislation is or is not required to protect the honest labor of the country from such prison convict-labor competition.

Mr. TELLER. Let that lie over. The Senator from Missouri [Mr. COCKRELL] objected to it yesterday, and it may lie over.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The resolution will be placed on the Calendar.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. CLARK, its Clerk, announced that the House had non-concurred in the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 2579) authorizing the President to appoint and retire Andrew J. Smith, late colonel of the Seventh United States Cavalry and a major-general of volunteers, asked a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and had appointed Mr. TOWNSHEND, Mr. MAISH, and Mr. GEAR managers at the conference on the part of the House.

The message also announced that the House had passed the following bills:

A bill (S. 3475) granting the use of certain lands in Pierce County, Washington Territory, to the city of Tacoma for the purposes of a public park; and

A bill (S. 2040) to establish a land office at Folsom, in the Territory of New Mexico.

The message further announced that the House had passed the following bill and joint resolution; in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

A bill (H. R. 11604) to amend an act approved March 3, 1885, to authorize the construction of bridges across the Cumberland and Caney Fork Rivers, in Tennessee; and

Joint resolution (H. Res. 24) in reference to the employment of the Army and Navy bands.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED.

The message further announced that the Speaker of the House had signed the following enrolled bills and joint resolutions; and they were thereupon signed by the President *pro tempore*:

A bill (H. R. 7964) granting to the Aberdeen, Bismarck and Northwestern Railway right of way across a portion of the Sioux reservation, in Dakota Territory;

A bill (H. R. 8074) to provide for the allotment of land in severalty to United Peorias and Miamies, in Indian Territory, and for other purposes;

A bill (H. R. 10735) for the removal of the political disabilities of Theodore Lewis;

Joint resolution (H. Res. 229) to print the Agricultural Report for 1888;

Joint resolution (H. Res. 231) authorizing the Secretary of the Senate and Clerk of the House of Representatives to pay to the officers and employés of the Senate and House borne on the annual rolls their respective salaries for the month of October, on the 20th day of said month; and

Joint resolution (H. Res. 232) making appropriations to enable the Secretary of the Senate and Clerk of the House of Representatives to pay session employés of the Senate and House for the full month of October.

THE REVENUE LAWS.

Mr. COCKRELL. Yesterday the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. ALDRICH], whom I do not now see in his seat, alluded to some letters referred to by the Commissioner of Internal Revenue in his letter to me presented a few days since, and which were not printed with that letter. It was an oversight that I did not have them handed to the Reporter at the same time that the letter of the Commissioner was submitted. I now have those letters, and if there be no objection I ask that they may be printed in their order in the RECORD.

Mr. ALLISON. I should like to hear them read.

Mr. COCKRELL. They are only copies of letters which have been written heretofore. There are no new letters. The Commissioner in his letter to me inclosed copies of various previous communications from his office. One of them is a letter to Hon. Charles J. Folger, dated December 18, 1882, from Mr. H. C. Rogers, Acting Commissioner. Another is a letter to Mr. Manning, of March 6, 1882, from Mr. Miller, the Acting Commissioner. Another is from Mr. Miller to Senator BECK, dated August 2, 1888, and there is a copy of a letter from Mr. C. A. Bates and Mr. T. A. Cushing, dated January 19, 1887. These are employés of the Department, and this was the report of an investigation that they made, addressed to the Commissioner. The letters can be read, as the Senator from Iowa desires to hear them. He may desire to say something in regard to them. I will have them read from the desk, and I ask that in the publication in the RECORD the Commissioner's letter to me may be republished, the other letters now to be read to follow, so that they will all appear together. I hope there will be no objection to that.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The Chair hears none.

The letter referred to is as follows:

TREASURY DEPARTMENT, OFFICE OF INTERNAL REVENUE,
Washington, October 8, 1888.

SIR: Referring to your request for an expression of my views respecting the proposed exemption from tax of alcohol used in the industrial arts, as provided in the amendment reported by the Senate Finance Committee to House bill 9051, inclosed please find copy of a letter addressed from this office to Hon. JAMES B. BECK, under date of August 2, in response to a similar request pending the consideration of this proposed measure in committee. No copy of the proposed amendment was furnished this office at the time, and this suggested change in the law was considered simply as a proposition, without regard to the conditions imposed, and solely from a revenue standpoint. Notwithstanding the many safeguards now contained in the bill against the fraudulent use of the alcohol so exempt from tax, the proposed measure is, in my judgment, still open to the objections noted in my letter referred to; and as a measure for the relief of the manufacturer and the tax-payer, the amendment, I think, is open to still further objection.

The many requirements contained in the bill respecting the storage, custody, and use of the alcohol in the cases provided, and the large bond security exacted and other conditions imposed for the prevention of fraud, would, in my opinion, prove so burdensome and so difficult of compliance in many instances as to prevent the average manufacturer from availing himself of the proposed exemption.

The quantity of alcohol used in small lots by retail druggists and other small manufacturers in this country for pharmaceutical purposes and in the prepara-

tion of cologne-waters, toilet articles, etc., is very considerable and possibly exceeds, in the aggregate, the quantity used by the large wholesale manufacturers for like purposes. But, in order to obtain alcohol free of tax in the manner provided for in the bill (except in cases where the alcohol has first been methylated) the applicant must first provide a separate and secure room on his premises for the exclusive storage of the alcohol so obtained, and must file with the collector of his district the necessary notices and entries and a bond in a sum of not less than $5,000; and no portion of the alcohol, however small, can be removed from such store-room unless for immediate use and in the presence of the Government storekeeper having the custody of the room and spirits stored therein.

The practical difficulties here involved in the case of a small manufacturer, in providing the required store-room and securing the attendance of a storekeeper at the proper time, are such as would, in my judgment, effectually exclude this class of manufacturers from any benefits under the bill. If such should prove to be the case the business of manufacturing articles where alcohol is used in any considerable quantities would, of course, soon pass into the hands of a few large manufacturers who could easily comply with all the requirements of the proposed law. Such a law would be manifestly unjust; and the benefits which the consumer of the articles so produced would derive under the law would be such as the manufacturers would graciously concede. The provisions made in the bill for the establishment of "bonded alcohol warehouses," into which all bonded alcohol withdrawn from the distiller's warehouse must pass before reaching the manufacturer, would also, in my judgment, be greatly to the advantage of the large manufacturer over his smaller competitor.

The large bond security ($100,000) required of the proprietor of such warehouse would necessarily limit the number of warehouses so established, and would of course effectually prevent the small manufacturer from establishing his own bonded warehouse. By a system of warehouse charges, commissions, etc., the small manufacturer would be entirely at the mercy of the proprietors of these bonded warehouses and the distillers of the alcohol. The opportunity afforded by this bill for a combination of alcohol distillers and large manufacturers to establish these bonded warehouses and control the spirits entered into and withdrawn therefrom is, to my mind, a most dangerous one.

One of the principal objections now urged to the present tax on distilled spirits, especially as to alcohol (on which this tax is nearly five times the cost of producing the article) is that, owing to the high rate of tax and the many onerous restrictions placed on the business, the manufacture of this article is controlled by a few distillers, who, by limiting their production, are able to fix their own price on the article produced. If, as I apprehend, the effect of this proposed amendment to the law imposing this large tax would be to confine the manufacture of articles from alcohol, free of tax, to a comparatively small number of manufacturers, the monopoly feature of the internal-revenue law, if it now exists, would, instead of being lessened, be greatly increased, and the whole system of revenue laws relating to distilled spirits would become so unequal and unjust as to invite their hasty repeal.

In view of this objectionable feature of the bill and the dangers to be apprehended from the fraudulent use of the alcohol as set forth in the accompanying letter, I can not but regard this proposed measure as inexpedient and dangerous in the highest degree.

Recent experiments conducted in this office with methylated spirits (the details of which will appear in my annual report of 1888) demonstrate the fact that such spirits, even when containing a large per cent. of methyl, can by a very simple and inexpensive process be so demethylated or cleansed as to admit of their being used in the compounding of liquors intended as beverages.

The provision found in the bill for the methylation of alcohol in the bonded alcohol warehouses, and the exemption of such methylated spirits from many of the restrictions applicable to pure alcohol, would seem to furnish another dangerous opportunity for fraud, instead of affording an additional safeguard against fraud as intended.

The proposed measure is open to the further objection that the employment of a force necessary to carry out the provisions of the bill, and to properly supervise the business therein authorized, would probably entail upon the Government an expense greater than any similar measure heretofore proposed, and perhaps equal to the present cost of collecting the entire receipts from distilled spirits, and that no provision is made in the bill for this large additional expense, or for the appointment of additional revenue agents, which would be absolutely necessary in case the bill should become a law.

Respectfully, yours,

JOS. S. MILLER, *Commissioner.*

Hon. F. M. COCKRELL,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

Mr. COCKRELL. The first to be read is the letter of Commissioner Miller to Senator BECK.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The letter will be read.

The Chief Clerk read as follows:

TREASURY DEPARTMENT, OFFICE OF INTERNAL REVENUE,
Washington, August 2, 1888.

SIR: I have to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of the 25th ultimo in reference to the proposed exemption from internal-revenue tax of alcohol used in the arts and manufactures.

In compliance with your request for references, etc., to similar measures heretofore introduced in Congress, and for my opinion in regard to the effect that the now proposed measure would have upon the collection of the revenue, I have to state:

1. That upon examination of this subject it appears that as early as the Forty-seventh Congress, first session, a bill (H. R. 5082) was introduced providing for the use of free alcohol in the industrial arts.

For debates on this bill, see CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 13, pages 5325, 5360, and 5364.

Similar bills (H. R. 901 and 10415) are also found to have been introduced during the first session of the Forty-ninth Congress, but owing to the fact that the records for that Congress now accessible to this office are incomplete, I am unable to refer you to the debates, if any were had, on these bills.

The position of this office in respect to the various plans heretofore proposed for exempting such alcohol from tax appears from the following letters and reports, copies of which please find inclosed:

a. Letter addressed by this office to the Secretary of the Treasury, under date of September 18, 1882, in reply to Senate resolution of July 26, 1882 (Forty-seventh Congress, first session), directing the Secretary of the Treasury to ascertain under what regulations methylated alcohol is prepared and sold, duty free, in Great Britain; and whether a system based on similar regulations can not be adopted in the United States.

b. Letter addressed by this office to the Secretary of the Treasury under date of December 18, 1882, inclosing printed copy of regulations referred to in Senate resolution of July 26, 1882, with suggestions thereon.

c. Letter addressed by this office to the Secretary of the Treasury under date of March 6, 1886, inclosing copy of House bill 901 (first session, Forty-ninth Congress), providing for the use of methylated spirits (except in certain cases) in the industrial pursuits, with objections thereto.

d. Report prepared in this office under date of January 19, 1887, on House bill 10415, authorizing the use of alcohol free of tax in the arts and manufactures, with objections thereto.

Your attention is also called to the report of the Secretary of the Treasury on the proposed use of methylated spirits (Senate Executive Document No. 24) 547. Also to objections to use of such spirits referred to in my annual report for 1885, pages lii-liii. Also to Senate Miscellaneous Document No. 85, Forty-eighth Congress, first session. Should any other document or report on this subject be found in this office the same will be furnished you.

2. From the inclosures now furnished, it will be seen that the several bills heretofore introduced in Congress on this subject, although mainly confined to methylated spirits, have not received the sanction of this office, and that the objections offered to the bills were more on account of the dangerous opportunities afforded by the proposed plan for the perpetration of frauds on the revenue, even when the exemption from tax was limited to methylated spirits, than from any loss of revenue likely to result from the use of the spirits as contemplated in the bills. If the present proposed measure authorizes the free withdrawal and use of pure spirits as well as methylated spirits for the purposes named, in my opinion the dangers of fraud on the revenue, should the bill become a law, would be greatly increased by this additional privilege. From the best data that this office has been able to obtain, the quantity of free alcohol which would annually be used in the arts and manufactures is estimated at about 7,000,000 proof gallons. This quantity of spirits, if exempt from tax, would, under the present rate of tax, result in a loss of revenue of some $6,300,000. As a revenue measure, therefore, the proposed exemption would be open to this objection. But the most serious objection, I think, that can be offered to the bill is the frauds likely to be committed in the use of such spirits.

Under the present laws relating to distilled spirits the exemption from tax on spirits used and consumed in this country is limited to withdrawals for scientific purposes by regularly constituted scientific institutions or colleges of learning (section 3297, Revised Statutes, and act of May 3, 1878), and for the use of the United States (section 3464, Revised Statutes). The purposes for which the spirits are withdrawn, and the high character of the persons withdrawing the spirits and having the custody thereof in such cases, is of itself a guaranty that the spirits will be used as contemplated by law, and the limited number of applications made for such withdrawals renders it an easy matter for the Department to regulate and supervise.

But should the privilege of withdrawing free alcohol become general, and its use extended to all the arts and manufactures (except as to certain prohibited articles), the business would soon assume such proportions, and would be taken advantage of by so many unscrupulous persons, that I am satisfied that this office, with its present force of local officers and revenue agents, would in many cases be unable to prevent, or even detect, the fraudulent use of the alcohol, in consequence of the great variety of ways by which such use could be accomplished. Indeed, it may be questioned whether with an increased force such a supervision could be exercised over the various kinds of business where free alcohol would be used as would insure the proper use of the spirits in all cases.

One of the principal safeguards now afforded by the law against the fraudulent evasion of the tax on distilled spirits is the bonded warehouse system, under which the product of each distillery is kept in a separate warehouse, in the custody of a revenue officer, and apart from any tax-paid spirits, or any other article or substance which would admit of a fraudulent concealment or removal of the spirits. Under this system, the identity of the spirits as an article upon which the tax is due and has not been paid is preserved; and the continuous custody of the spirits by the Government insures their removal only after the full amount of tax due has been paid. Experience has shown the wisdom of the Government in keeping its hand on the spirits so long as a tax liability attaches to the spirits. A release of the spirits from the Government custody before the payment of the tax would render the tax-lien on the spirits imposed by section 3251, Revised Statutes, of but little practical value, and would naturally encourage a fraudulent disposition of the spirits and the consequent evasion of the tax.

The present system of collecting the revenue on distilled spirits is, as is well known, the result of many years' experience, and an experience which, from both a moral and financial standpoint, is to be avoided in future, if possible; and any radical change in this system would, in my judgment, open the way to successful frauds, and would soon result in general demoralization of the wine and spirit trade.

That the same opinion is entertained by many persons in that trade is indicated by the inclosed slips taken from one of the leading trade journals.

It would, in my opinion, be far better from every point of view to reduce the rate of tax on all distilled spirits rather than exempt from tax, for any purpose not now authorized by law, the very spirits which can assume so many disguises and so easily escape the vigilance of the revenue officers after being removed from the distiller's warehouse.

Respectfully, yours,

JOS. S. MILLER, *Commissioner.*

Hon. JAMES B. BECK,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

Mr. COCKRELL. The next one is a letter to Secretary Folger, of September 18, 1882, from H. C. Rogers, Acting Commissioner of Internal Revenue.

The Chief Clerk read as follows:

TREASURY DEPARTMENT, OFFICE OF INTERNAL REVENUE,
Washington, September 18, 1882.

SIR: Your letter of 2d ultimo with one inclosure, relative to methylated spirits has been received (initials H. B. J. W.).

The inclosure is a copy of Senate resolution of July 26, 1882, directing the Secretary of the Treasury to ascertain under what regulations methylated alcohol is prepared and sold free in Great Britain, and whether a system based upon similar regulations can not be adopted in the United States in order to supply manufacturing chemists and others with methylated alcohol free of tax.

In reply to your inquiry for such information upon the subjects therein referred to as this office may be able to furnish, I submit herewith a statement showing by collection districts and in aggregate the quantity of alcohol used in the arts and manufactures during the year ended April 1, 1882. Also showing the quantity which would have been used if the tax had been 50 cents per gallon, and also if the use of the alcohol had been permitted free of tax, the quantities given in the last two cases being based as to each district upon an estimate furnished by the collector of the district.

It is understood that the regulations referred to are those which now govern the manufacture and sale of methylated spirits, permission for which was first obtained in 1856 by the late Mr. John Wood, chairman of the board of inland revenue. This methylated spirit is a mixture of 90 per cent. of spirit of wine of density not less than 0.830 specific gravity and 10 per cent. of purified wood spirit; reliance for safety from fraud is placed upon the fact that such a mixture is unfit for human consumption and that the wood spirit can not again be separated from the spirit of wine by any commercial process. (See page 317, volume 3, part I, Roscoe and Schorlemmer's treatise on Chemistry, Appleton & Co., New York, 1882.)

It is, however, stated on page 172, Wagner's Chemical Technology, also published by Appleton in 1882, that confirmed spirit drinkers had now and then used wood spirit instead of whisky and the like, and, it appears, without bad effects.

On the question of separation of the wood spirit from the spirit of wine, the following statements may prove of value: Dr. Ure's method for detecting the presence of ethyl alcohol in wood naphtha and for detecting the presence of wood naphtha in ethyl alcohol is given on pages 145 and 146 of Muspratt's Chemistry, William Mackenzie, publisher, London, Glasgow, Edinburgh, no date; also on pages 152 and 153, volume 1 of the Encyclopedia of Chemistry, J. B. Lippincott & Co., Philadelphia, dated 1877.

Alexander Wynter Blyth, in his recent highly prized work on the Analysis of Foods and the Detection of Poisons, furnishes (on page 132 of the latest edition, published by William Wood & Co., of New York) a method of determining the quantity of wood spirit in a suspected mixture.

It is stated in Roscoe and Schorlemmer's Chemistry that the unpleasant smell of the methylated spirit is partially removed by the means of acids or oxydizing agents, and that the spirits thus obtained, though still containing methylated alcohol, is sufficiently tasteless for use in adulterating whisky and other alcoholic liquors.

An examination of the methods of determining the quantity of wood-spirits, as set forth in Blyth's work, indicates that the method might possibly be employed as a commercial process for separating the wood-spirit from the spirit of wine.

This office is not in possession of a copy of the regulations under which methylated alcohol is prepared and sold duty free in Great Britain, nor of what are known to be the laws and regulations governing the collection of the excise tax in Great Britain on distilled spirits, and I am therefore unable to state at this time anything more definitely in reply to your request than what is above set forth. If you should procure a copy of these laws and regulations by correspondence with the British authorities through the Department of State or otherwise, and submit them for my consideration, I would respectfully suggest that a complete set of the laws and regulations governing the collection of this tax should be supplied. I am led to make this suggestion through the circumstance that the stamp system in use under existing internal-revenue laws is not employed in Great Britain, and that this fact would doubtless make it necessary to modify the British system in order to adapt it to the method employed in the United States.

Inclosed herewith please find the certified copy of the Senate resolution, transmitted in your letter.

Very respectfully,

H. C. ROGERS,
Acting Commissioner.

Hon. CHARLES J. FOLGER,
Secretary of the Treasury.

Mr. COCKRELL. The next letter which I ask to have read is a letter to Secretary Folger, of December 18, 1882, from the Commissioner of Internal Revenue.

The Chief Clerk read as follows:

TREASURY DEPARTMENT, OFFICE OF INTERNAL REVENUE,
Washington, December 18, 1882.

SIR: Your letter of 14th instant (initials H. B. J.), relative to supplying manufacturing chemists and others with methylated alcohol free of tax, has been received.

A set of printed documents referred to in the letter obtained through the Department of State from the United States minister at London, in compliance with request made in my letter of 18th of September last, has also been received.

In reply, I have to say that such portion of Senate resolution of July 26, 1882, as directs the Secretary of the Treasury to ascertain under what regulations methylated alcohol is prepared and sold duty free in Great Britain would be fully answered by submitting to the Senate the printed documents above referred to, and which are herewith returned in accordance with your request.

I would also say in reply to the second branch of the inquiry that, in my opinion, similar regulations can with a few modifications be adopted in the United States and made a part of the laws governing the tax on distilled spirits.

The adoption of the system would involve the creation, under internal-revenue laws, of two new classes of special tax-payers, namely: Methylated spirit-makers to pay a tax, say, of $48 per annum, and of retail dealers in methylated spirit to pay a tax of $2.40 per annum.

It would also be necessary to create officers whose duty would be to witness the mixing of the spirits with the required proportion of wood-naphtha, to exercise certain surveillance, to keep certain accounts, and make certain reports set forth in the regulations, or to devolve those duties on existing officers.

It is noted that samples of naphtha to be used are to be taken by the proper officer and forwarded to the "laboratory" for examination and approval of the board of commissioners of inland revenue. A literal adaptation of this regulation would appear to require such samples to be sent to this office. Owing to the great extent of territory comprised in the United States this regulation would seem to be impracticable. It would seem to be better to have arrangements made for testing naphtha at certain designated points.

Certain methods by which frauds could be committed were referred to in my letter of September 18, 1882, and I would respectfully suggest whether it would not be well to transmit to the committee a copy of said letter.

An examination of the British regulations indicates that they are best adapted to thickly settled countries. It would be necessary, therefore, to frame the law so as to admit of modifications in the regulations adapted to the sparsely settled portions of the United States, or to limit their manufacture and use of methylated alcohol to areas having not less than a certain density of population.

The foregoing crude suggestions are made upon a mere reading of the law and regulations returned herewith.

I can not venture any more definite suggestions without attempting to draught regulations which would provide for the manufacture, sale, and use of methylated spirit free of tax under internal-revenue laws. In this way the necessary legislation could be determined. This, however, would require time, and as the report received from the State Department did not arrive until ten days after the opening of Congress, the date set for the introduction of the bill, I have not deemed it advisable, without special authority, to create further delay in this matter.

No report has yet been received from the Academy of Sciences showing the result of experiments being made by that scientific body, referred to on page 18 of my report for 1882, to determine whether alcohol mixed with wood-naphtha can be restored to its original purity.

Very respectfully,

H. C. ROGERS,
Acting Commissioner.

Hon. CHARLES J. FOLGER,
Secretary of the Treasury.

Mr. COCKRELL. The next is the letter of Commissioner Miller to Secretary Manning, dated March 6, 1886.

The Chief Clerk read as follows:

TREASURY DEPARTMENT, OFFICE OF INTERNAL REVENUE,
Washington, March 6, 1886.

SIR: Inclosed please find House bill No. 901, Forty-ninth Congress, firs' session, referred to this office on the 4th instant for my opinion and suggestions by Hon. W. C. BRECKINRIDGE, Committee of Ways and Means, House of Representatives.

This bill provides for the withdrawal from distillery warehouses without tax of alcohol and other spirits to be used in industrial pursuits. It requires the Secretary of the Treasury to grant permit for the withdrawal of such spirits under certain limitations from distillery warehouses, free of tax, for the sole purpose of use in industrial pursuits.

Two classes of safeguards are provided. One is through the use of methyl or wood alcohol, which applies only to spirits which are not withdrawn for use in tobacco factories or such other industrial pursuits as should entail their complete destruction; the other safeguard is that which may be afforded by rules and regulations which the Commissioner of Internal Revenue, with the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury, shall adopt—specific penalties in the sale or use of the spirits withdrawn for any purpose other than that specified in the bill, also for any violation of the rules or regulations made in conformity with the act.

The bill having been submitted for my opinion and suggestions, you may say to Mr. BRECKINRIDGE, if you please, that in my opinion, if the manufacture, compounding, and preparation of medicines are industrial pursuits in the sense in which the term is used in the bill, the benefits of the bill would not extend to such pursuits unless the use of the spirits in the preparation of the medicine would entail their complete destruction. From reports received by this office and published on pages 31 and 32, No. 152, volume 13, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, it appears that alcohol was more often and more extensively used by chemists, druggists, and pharmacists than by others using it in arts and manufactures. It would seem, also, that it would be more to the interest of the public at large to authorize the use of alcohol, free of tax, in the preparation of medicine than to allow such use in other arts and manufactures.

It is presumed that the safeguard provided by methylation is intended to apply to alcohol to be used as a solvent, as by manufacturers of varnish, hats, chemicals used by photographers, and in the preparation of paints, white lead, etc.

In my report for the year ended June 30, 1885, page 53, the following statement is made: "The methylation also of grain alcohol by the addition thereto of a small proportion of wood-naphtha in order to permit the use of the alcohol in industrial pursuits without payment of tax thereon, as has been proposed, would hardly afford the degree of safety against the use of the alcohol as a beverage which has been attributed to it."

Hon. Abram S. Hewitt, in a speech on the subject of a tax on distilled spirits and tobacco, quotes Dr. Squibb, who says, "spirits may be cheaply methylated." This fact, which Mr. Hewitt, being now in the House, may readily affirm or deny, renders the protection by methylation of little or no value. On the other hand, the experiments made by the National Academy of Sciences at the request of this office, in 1882, indicated to the satisfaction of that scientific body that spirits could not be cheaply methylated.

The report of the committee of the National Academy of Sciences was transmitted to you on the 12th of January, 1883, with the suggestion that the same be forwarded to the Committee on Finance of the Senate.

I would also call attention to office letter to you of September 18, 1882, in answer to your letter of August 2, 1882 (initials H. B. J.), and to office letter of December 18, 1882, with printed documents forwarded pursuant to Senate resolution of July 26, 1882, directing the Secretary of the Treasury to ascertain under what regulations methylated alcohol is sold duty free in Great Britain.

If this bill should become a law, the expense of collecting the revenue would be increased and the receipts would be materially diminished, and I fear that quite a percentage of the reduction would be found to have occurred through frauds perpetrated under the law. Therefore, as an internal-revenue measure, the bill has nothing to recommend it.

Respectfully,

JOS. S. MILLER, *Commissioner.*

Hon. DANIEL MANNING,
Secretary of Treasury.

Mr. COCKRELL. The last is dated January 19, 1887, from C. A. Bates, and concurred in by T. A. Cushing, directed to the Commissioner.

The Chief Clerk read as follows:

To the Commissioner:

I have carefully examined the annexed bill (H. R. 10415) with reference to its provisions for the use of spirits, free of tax, in the arts and manufactures.

Sections 5 to 10, inclusive, provide for the withdrawal of methylated spirits from distillery warehouses, free of tax, for use in the "arts and manufactures."

Sections 11 to 13, inclusive, provide for the withdrawal from such warehouses, free of tax, pure spirits or methylated to be used in internal-revenue manufacturing warehouses of "all articles, preparations, and compounds intended for sale in or use in the United States," except wines, etc., used or sold as beverages.

Sections 14 to 19, inclusive, for the allowance of drawback of tax on spirits "used for mechanical and scientific purposes, or in the manufacture of any article, preparation, or compound," except wines, etc., used or sold as beverages.

In each of these cases special provisions are made for the filing of notices, entries, bonds, etc., and for the assignment of internal-revenue storekeepers (and in the case of drawback for the appointment of special inspectors not exceeding fifty in number) for the issuing of necessary regulations, and also impose fines and penalties for fraud committed or attempted in connection with the withdrawal or use of such alcohol.

The bill bears internal evidence that this portion of it is made up of several distinct bills on the subjects named, and on account of the needless repetitions, as also on account of the seeming inconsistencies in some of its provisions, the bill as now drawn is open to objections on these grounds.

The bill, I think, could be much simplified and shortened by a rearrangement (see slip annexed to bill), and yet contain all its provisions without materially changing its phraseology.

From a revenue point of view the bill, in my opinion, should not receive the sanction of this office.

While I have no very satisfactory data on which to base an estimate of the quantity of spirits that would be used for the purposes named, should the bill become a law, I venture to predict that the annual withdrawals for these purposes would at least amount to 9,000,000 taxable gallons, or about one-seventh of the average withdrawals of spirits for domestic purposes during the past five years.

In addition to this large falling off in receipts from distilled spirits, there would be a very large expense (officers' expenses and salaries) connected with the proper supervision of this business, and this extra expense, when added to the actual cost of collecting the tax on spirits, would make an amount so large when com-

pared with the receipts as would in my judgment furnish another and still stronger argument in favor of the total abolition of the tax on distilled spirits. Besides this, there are grave reasons for apprehending extensive frauds in connection with the proposed withdrawal of free spirits, and frauds of this kind if committed would further decrease the revenue and have a most demoralizing effect on the whisky business generally.

I may perhaps take a rather too gloomy view of this matter, but, as I regard it, the bill is a very dangerous one, so far as the revenue is concerned.

Respectfully,

C. A. BATES.

JANUARY 19, 1887.

I entirely concur in the above.

T. A. CUSHING.

Mr. ALLISON. Mr. President, I desire to say one word respecting these communications. The communications read from the Internal-Revenue Office, dating back in 1882, I think are of very little value as illustrating the matter before us. In the first place, the Commissioner there admits that he did not even have before him or accessible to him the spirit regulations of Great Britain, and therefore he knew practically nothing about the subject, as he himself states.

The subsequent letters relate entirely to a House bill, and are criticisms of a House bill which proposed three methods whereby spirits might be used in the arts, one by means of methylation, another by means of bonding, and another by means of free spirits with drawbacks; and the latter system, the drawback system, is especially condemned in those letters.

The Commissioner, in writing to Secretary Manning under date of March 6, 1886, also criticises the House bill, and does not express an opinion as to what could or could not be done under a proper system. All of the writers seem to think that as a revenue measure such a bill would be a mistake.

The letter of the Commissioner of Internal Revenue, dated August 2, 1888, addressed to the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BECK], in criticism of the *projet* for the measure now in the Senate substitute for the House tariff bill is a criticism that has no real application to that measure. It is a criticism made upon, I think, the second draught of the amendment of the Committee on Finance. That amendment, as it then stood and was submitted to the Commissioner of Internal Revenue, has practically no relation to the amendment as it now stands. Therefore, everything contained in all these letters must be thrown aside in any criticism of the substitute reported by our Committee on Finance.

The Commissioner of Internal Revenue in one of the letters read states that the great safeguard for the collection of the tax on distilled spirits now is the system of bonded warehouses. That is precisely the system of the substitute as it respects alcohol used in the arts. We follow through a bonded warehouse the spirits until they are finally absorbed in the chemical production specified in the amendment. Every safeguard suggested by the Commissioner of Internal Revenue is provided for as respects bonded warehouses. There is no provision in it whereby a drawback is allowed. There are only two methods. One is that of bonding, and the distilled spirits are followed by a Government officer through every stage of manufacture until they are absorbed in the production, whatever it may be; and the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized to say what thing can be produced by this method. Hence, excluding the idea that any production can be made from free spirits except such as can not again be recovered, as respects this provision of the bill, I think there can be no just criticism made upon it.

As to the question of methylation, I agree that there is room for argument. That is to say, there is opportunity for persons to say it can not be done. But I have to say in response that the most eminent chemists in this country were consulted by the subcommittee of the Committee on Finance before we reported the provision, and I do not hesitate to declare that Dr. Squibb, who is mentioned in one of the letters, and the eminent chemists of Philadelphia all agree that the ethyl in methylated spirits can not be recovered except by redistillation; and that is the great point in this case.

Some of these letters allude to the report of the committee of the Academy of Sciences. The question was referred to that committee, consisting of three eminent chemists, who, in 1882, made a report, which is found among our documents, in which they state in conclusion—I will only give the conclusion of their report—

> It is plain from the foregoing that, considering our experiments as final, it is impossible to purify the mixture containing wood naphtha to a sufficent extent to make it palatable without the aid of distillation. Hence, apparently, it would be as difficult to carry on the process of purification on the large scale as to carry on the illegitimate manufacture of alcohol. This fact in itself might be a sufficient protection against fraud, though the committee does not feel competent to express a decided opinion on this point.

They show that the only method of recovering the wood alcohol is by redistillation. Every one knows what that is. So if we have now on our statute-books a law which is sufficient to prevent the illegitimate distillation of alcohol, the provisions of the Senate bill applying to that law and making stringent restrictions respecting redistillation will be sufficient to prevent the redistillation of methylated alcohol. The matter is just as plain to my mind as that two and two make four.

It follows that if the Commissioner of Internal Revenue under existing law can prevent fraud in the distillation of alcohol, the same laws, the same regulations, and the same processes will prevent fraud in the redistillation of methylated alcohol.

But all these statements—and they are statements, as these letters indicate, made without any very great examination—have standing against them the fact that since 1853 (not 1856, as stated in the letters) in Great Britain, with a tax of $2.50 per gallon upon distilled spirits of the proof of our distilled spirits, making a much larger tax upon alcohol than we impose, under the regulations of the British Board of Trade methylated spirits have been sold and used in the industrial arts. The Committee on Finance have all these regulations. They are not cumbrous, nor are they difficult of enforcement. Many of them are embodied in our provisions here, and the remainder of them can be embodied in the regulations of the Commissioner of Internal Revenue and adapted to our system. Germany has the same thing under her system of withdrawing spirits not only for methylation but bonded spirits as well for use in the arts.

If that can be done there, why should it not be done in our country? Why should the Commissioner of Internal Revenue set himself up as sponsor of the revenue because he says as a revenue measure it will not be a success? Of course it will not. It is the intention of the bill to reduce the revenue to the extent of the tax on the spirits so used in the arts.

If these spirits can not be recovered except by redistillation, of course the Commissioner of Internal Revenue can easily protect the revenue as to all distilled spirits sold for use as a beverage. Do any of these letters say, is there any suggestion anywhere, that this wood alcohol or wood naphtha can be withdrawn from the spirits so as to enable them to be used as a beverage without redistillation? Nobody pretends that.

The question resolves itself simply into this, whether it is a wise or unwise thing for us to attempt such a revenue measure as will allow the industrial arts of this country to use alcohol without the payment of the tax, and thereby to the extent of such use free of tax reduce the cost of all the articles that are produced in this way? That is the only question; and I will say to the Senator from Missouri that if in the detailed discussion of these provisions he can find any more stringent provisions respecting the use of these spirits, either under our system of bonding or under our system of methylation, I shall be glad to adopt it.

I will add that these provisions have been submitted, I will not say to whom, because perhaps I ought not to state that, but these provisions have been submitted to the highest experts having charge of internal-revenue matters, and many of these stringent provisions are the result of their careful work.

Therefore it is, Mr. President, that I do not wish this question to be clouded or disturbed by the letters which are put in here, showing it is true upon their face that the men who have written them have not given that examination to this subject which they should have given.

Now, I will say to the Senator from Missouri that the clause as to alcohol for use in the arts is a provision that will be open to the criticism of the chemists between now and December. Every man who is familiar with the use of distilled spirits in the arts and the method of methylation, not only in our country but in Great Britain and Germany, will have an opportunity of criticism, and if the judgment of these experts shall show that there is any great opportunity for fraud, and wherein that opportunity exists, I will go hand in hand with the Senator from Missouri in making the bill more perfect in that respect.

But surely when Great Britain collects more tax from distilled spirits than we do, having more than twice the rate of tax that we have, and can furnish these spirits to her industries, we ought to be willing to make an honest attempt to do the same thing, unless we intend to abolish entirely the internal-revenue tax upon distilled spirits, and I do not understand that any proposition of that character comes from any suggestion in these letters.

That is all I have to say now upon this subject.

Mr. COCKRELL. Mr. President, as a matter of course it is almost impossible to determine in advance what will be the result and effect of the practical operation of these provisions in regard to the use of alcohol in the arts. I have no doubt the Senator is entirely sincere in his views with regard to it. There are other gentlemen who are equally as sincere in their views which are directly the opposite to those of the Senator from Iowa. I have not myself made any personal investigation of this matter, and, therefore, can not speak from personal information upon it; but my colleague [Mr. VEST] and others, who have examined it, say that the alcohol can be, as it were, demethylated and made into most excellent brandy. I have seen several times little bottles of it said to be very pure. I can not state whether it was pure or not.

Mr. ALLISON. Nobody denies that this can be done. Of course it can be done.

Mr. COCKRELL. But not by redistillation, as the Senator claims, or not by such a process of redistillation as can be prevented. If a redistillation had to occur of the same character and kind as an original distillation, as a matter of course if you can prevent the original distillation you can prevent the redistillation; but this is not the process that is used in demethylating this alcohol after it has been used in the arts, or after it has been prepared for use in the arts. That is the only difference in the world, as I understand the matter.

I am very glad that the Senator has disclosed the fact that this is only a tentative proposition, like all other provisions of the bill.

Mr. ALLISON. No, sir; it is not a tentative proposition.

Mr. COCKRELL. But it is to be subject to criticism and amendment and change and modification up to the time it is finally acted on.

Mr. ALLISON. Undoubtedly. In response to the intimation or suggestion of the Senator from Missouri that this provision as respects alcohol for use in the arts is like every other provision in this bill, I will say that it is open to public debate and criticism in this body, and to modification and change. This bill of ours is the bill of the subcommittee, and afterward of the Committee on Finance. Nobody claims that it is perfect in any respect. I know myself as regards this very provision that we had five prints of it. It was printed five times, and some of the most important features in it were inserted after the fourth print.

I have no doubt that the Senator from Missouri, putting his sharp eye upon it and having it held up to the public gaze between now and the time when it will be acted on, may be able to suggest some imperfections in it, and therefore the committee is willing to accept them in the spirit of the proposition, and that is to exempt, if we can exempt, this article from tax when it is used in the arts.

Mr. DOLPH. The proposition is not tentative that you propose to remove the tax. It is the method of doing it.

Mr. ALLISON. It is the method. That is all I mean. I mean to say that this measure is open to the just criticism of everybody, and we invite that criticism. The Commissioner of Internal Revenue, in the nature of things, can know very little more about it than we can. He is not a chemist; I assume that he has not studied the question with that care and attention which would be required to make him an expert. Therefore I submit this proposition to the experts of the country, and if they say to us that we can not do in this country what is done in Great Britain and in Germany as respects these spirits, then I will listen to their criticisms, and so far as I can, and I have no doubt other Senators will, act upon them in the direction of the improvement of the bill.

Mr. COCKRELL. The question remains just where it was before. Here are views conflicting. The Senator says they have determined to remove the tax upon alcohol used in the arts. I suppose that is to be regardless of whether it will lead to frauds which can not be prevented or not. That inroad is to be made upon the tax derived from distilled spirits regardless of what may be its results.

Mr. ALLISON. Oh, no.

Mr. COCKRELL. I understood the Senator from Iowa to say, in response to the language of the Senator from Oregon, that this tax had to be removed from alcohol used in the arts; that that was a settled fact, and the question was only as to the method of doing it.

Now, Mr. President, if that is a settled fact, then the tax has got to be removed regardless of whether frauds can be prevented or not.

Mr. ALLISON. I hope the Senator will be a little more candid in his statement.

Mr. COCKRELL. I ask the Senator if that is not what the Senator from Oregon said to him, and if he did not assent to it? I will ask him to say that.

Mr. DOLPH. I do not think that that is a fair construction of what I said or what the Senator from Iowa said.

Mr. COCKRELL. Did you not ask the Senator from Iowa if it had not been determined that that tax should be removed?

Mr. DOLPH. Not if it would result in fraud.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. Senators will address the Chair.

Mr. DOLPH. If the Senator from Missouri will yield to me now, I will make the explanation.

Mr. COCKRELL. Certainly, I always yield.

Mr. DOLPH. I say that I do not think the Senator from Missouri puts the proper construction either on the question I put to the Senator from Iowa or on his reply. Of course if it should be found impracticable to prevent frauds, no one would propose to remove the tax. I supposed that that was understood. That was admitted, as I understood, by the committee.

What I understood the Senator from Iowa to say to the Senator from Missouri was, that the committee were willing to perfect this measure and to listen to any person who would criticise it, and who could suggest any additional provisions which would be a safeguard against fraud, and that the committee of the Senate, so far as he could speak for them, and this side of the Chamber, would be glad to accept them.

Mr. COCKRELL. That was the explanation until the Senator put in the statement that the fact was that that tax was going to be removed. He is entitled to his explanation. I have no objection to his explanation, but my criticism was merely upon the language he used, that it was a fact that this tax had to be removed; and, as a matter of course, if it has to be removed, the consequences of it are immaterial whether frauds can be prevented or not.

As I said before, many persons who have investigated this matter declare that this alcohol can be demethylated and used as a beverage, and that a redistillation process, such as is required in the distillation of spirits in the first instance, is not necessary.

COMMITTEE ON INDIAN AFFAIRS.

Mr. MORGAN submitted the following resolution; which was considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to:

Resolved, That the Committee on Indian Affairs, or a subcommittee thereof, is authorized to sit in the recess of the Senate at Washington, D. C., to complete the examination as directed in resolutions of the Forty-ninth Congress, of the condition of the Indian tribes in the reservations in Minnesota, Dakota, and Montana, and the powers conferred on said committee under said resolutions are continued until the examination is completed, subject to the further orders of the Senate.

HOUSE BILL REFERRED.

The bill (H. R. 11604) to amend an act approved March 3, 1885, to authorize the construction of bridges across the Cumberland and Caney Fork Rivers, in Tennessee, was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

ARMY AND NAVY BANDS.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore* laid before the Senate the joint resolution (H. Res. 24) in reference to the employment of the Army and Navy bands; which was read twice by its title.

Mr. BLAIR. I ask that the joint resolution be read.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. It will be read at length for information, if there be no objection.

The Secretary read as follows:

Be it resolved, etc., That hereafter no enlisted musician in the service of the United States, the Army and Navy, respectively, shall be detailed, ordered, or permitted to leave his post to engage in any pursuit, business, or performance in civil life for emolument, hire, or otherwise, where the same shall interfere with the customary employment and regular engagement of local civilian musicians.

Mr. BLAIR. A bill similar to this joint resolution was introduced a long time since and referred to the Committee on Education and Labor and was somewhat discussed by the committee, but there was never any action upon it. This joint resolution comes to us from the other House, and I move that it be taken up and considered at the present time.

Mr. COCKRELL. I move that the joint resolution be referred to the Committee on Military Affairs, as it affects more largely persons engaged in the military service than in any other. I object to its third reading to-day.

Mr. BLAIR. I suppose that one motion is not superseded by offering another without action upon the first.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The Senator from New Hampshire will pause. The joint resolution can not be read a third time the same day on which it is read the first and second times except by unanimous consent. The Senator from Missouri has the right, under the rules, to object. The Senator from New Hampshire can only get leave to have the joint resolution considered now by unanimous consent.

Mr. BLAIR. Do I understand, then, that the Senator from Missouri objects?

Mr. COCKRELL. I move that the joint resolution be referred to the Committee on Military Affairs. I think it is a matter that ought to be examined and investigated.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. It will be so referred, if there be no objection. The Chair hears none.

RECESSES.

Mr. COCKRELL. I move that the Senate take a recess for thirty minutes.

Mr. BLAIR. I think there are other bills and resolutions from the House of Representatives.

Mr. COCKRELL. I say frankly that the Senator need not try to pass any bills now. It is just a farce. That is enough to say.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The Calendar, under Rule VIII, is in order.

Mr. COCKRELL. I move that the Senate take a recess for thirty minutes.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate thereupon took a recess for thirty minutes. At the expiration of the recess the Senate reassembled, at 1 o'clock and 40 minutes p. m.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The Secretary will report the first bill on the Calendar under Rule VIII.

The CHIEF CLERK. Order of Business 1996. A bill (H. R. 5080) for the relief of C. B. Wilson.

Mr. COCKRELL. I ask unanimous consent that the further call of the Calendar be suspended or that it be laid aside for the present, and that the Senate do nothing except such business as may be necessary. I think we shall have a message from the President and we may need an executive session. I simply suggest that we remain in *statu quo* without doing any business for a short time. Perhaps, however, it would be better to take a formal recess. I move that a further recess be taken until half past 2 o'clock.

The motion was agreed to; and thereupon the Senate took a recess. At the expiration of the recess the Senate reassembled, at 2 o'clock and 30 minutes p. m.

BILLS BECOME LAWS.

A message from the President of the United States, by Mr. O. L. PRUDEN, one of his secretaries, announced that the following bills, having been presented to the President on the 4th instant and not having been returned by him to the House of Congress in which they originated within the ten days prescribed by the Constitution, have become laws without his signature:

An act (S. 317) for the relief of William A. Bevans; and

An act (S. 2563) to compensate Mrs. Sarah L. Larimer for important services rendered the military authorities in 1864 at Deer Creek Station, Wyoming.

The message also announced that the President had on the 18th instant approved and signed the following acts:

An act (S. 70) to provide for warehousing fruit brandy;

An act (S. 1856) to establish a life-saving station on the Atlantic coast between Indian River Inlet, Delaware, and Ocean City, Md.;

An act (S. 3427) to amend section 4474 of the Revised Statutes of the United States;

An act (S. 1671) for the relief of the heirs of Martin Kenofsky;

An act (S. 741) for the relief of William Tabb;

An act (S. 2742) to incorporate the Brightwood Railway Company of the District of Columbia;

An act (S. 1291) granting a pension to David Heinbach;

An act (S. 2593) granting a pension to Sarah E. McNamara;

An act (S. 3175) granting a pension to Mrs. Caroline Taylor;

An act (S. 3197) granting a pension to Abbie L. Ham;

An act (S. 3230) granting a pension to Martha J. Cole;

An act (S. 619) granting an increase of pension to Leopold Mayer; and

An act (S. 3018) granting an increase of pension to John N. Bovee.

The message further announced that the President had this day approved and signed the act (S. 1089) for the relief of Henrietta M. Sands, widow of the late Rear-Admiral Benjamin F. Sands, United States Navy.

MISSOURI RIVER BRIDGE AT OMAHA.

Mr. ALLISON. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

Mr. PADDOCK. Mr. President——

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The motion is not debatable.

Mr. PADDOCK. I simply rise to ask the Senator to yield to me for a moment.

Mr. ALLISON. I will yield to the Senator from Nebraska.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. Does the Senator from Iowa withdraw his motion?

Mr. ALLISON. For the moment.

Mr. PADDOCK. I offer the following resolution:

Resolved, That the Committee on the Improvement of the Mississippi River and its Tributaries be authorized to continue during the recess of Congress, the investigation directed by the resolution of this body of October 10, 1888, with all the powers and privileges conferred by said resolution. And all necessary expenses of such committee shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the Senate.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The resolution will be referred, under the rule, to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate.

Mr. PADDOCK. I desire to ask a suspension of the rules as to the reference order of the resolution which I have presented.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The Chair does not feel at liberty to entertain a motion to suspend the rules at this stage of the business.

Mr. PADDOCK. I happen to be the only member of the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate who is present to-day. So far as that committee can give its assent to the resolution through me, that assent is given. I think under the circumstances it might be proper to suspend the rules for the purpose of passing this resolution, which is based upon a resolution of the Senate passed on the 10th day of the month, directing positively and imperatively the Committee on the Improvement of the Mississippi River and its Tributaries to make an investigation and inquire in respect to obstructions of the Missouri River occasioned by the improper construction of a bridge. I hope the Presiding Officer will find it proper and competent for him to allow the rules to be suspended, if the Senate is willing to suspend them.

Mr. BATE. A bill has just come from the other House to amend a previous act so as to enable bridges to be put across the Cumberland and Caney Fork Rivers in Tennessee. I should like very much to get unanimous consent to have that bill passed.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The Chair understood the Senator from Missouri [Mr. COCKRELL] to announce that objection would be interposed to the transaction of any legislative or other business. If the Senator from Missouri withdraws his objection interposed, the Chair will submit the request for unanimous consent for the consideration of any business that may be asked by any Senator present.

Mr. BATE. It is merely a question of the amendment of a charter that has passed the House so as to put some bridges across the Cumberland and Caney Fork Rivers. My colleague in the House [Mr. MCMILLIN] requested me to secure the passage of the bill here.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The first request was made by the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. PADDOCK] if business is to be transacted.

Mr. PADDOCK. I desire to state to the Senate that before I introduced the resolution I had a conference with the Senator from Missouri, and I have pursued that course which I understood to be suggested by the Senator from Missouri, and to be agreeable to him. I think he would so indicate.

Mr. COCKRELL. I did not catch what the Senator was saying.

Mr. PADDOCK. I say before presenting the resolution I had a conference with the Senator from Missouri, and I understood him if not exactly to suggest it to concur in the proposition which I have presented.

Mr. COCKRELL. I will state very frankly that I said to the Senator that he must consult his side of the Chamber. This is a question of the expenditure of the contingent fund of the Senate. The Senate is Republican; the Republicans are responsible for it; and they must take the lead in all such matters. Therefore, I have not said a word or interposed any objection. It is for that side of the Chamber to determine what shall be done in such a matter.

I think myself the subject mentioned ought to be investigated, and I suggested to the Senator from Nebraska that the only way for the Committee on the Improvement of the Mississippi River and its tributaries to investigate it was by an extension of the resolution of October 10th. That is the only way it can be done. It is for Senators on that side to determine whether they will at this late day entertain a resolution for incurring that amount of expense, whatever it may be. I do not know that there will be any material expense, but that is what I meant by saying to the Senator that I did not propose to interpose any objection.

Mr. PADDOCK. Then I understand the Senator withdraws his objection. I will state that the resolution is in the interest of economy.

This inquiry will have to be made at Omaha, and it is in the interest of economy that it should be undertaken. The inquiry should be made during the recess of the Senate.

Mr. COCKRELL. I understand, however, the ruling of the Chair to be that a resolution involving payment from the contingent fund of the Senate must necessarily go to the Committee on Contingent Expenses.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. It is the imperative requirement of the rule.

Mr. COCKRELL. So the question of objection or no objection would have nothing to do with it.

Mr. PADDOCK. If it is in order to do so, I move that the committee be discharged from the further consideration of the resolution. As a member and as acting chairman of that committee, I make that motion, if it is in order.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The Senator from Nebraska moves that the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate be discharged from the further consideration of the resolution.

Mr. COCKRELL. It has not been referred, has it?

Mr. PADDOCK. It has been referred.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The Chair announced its reference. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. COCKRELL. I think that is going a long way. As the matter can not be done without a suspension of the rules and all that, I appeal to my friends on the other side of the Chamber that they ought not to undertake to go that far. I think it is hardly right, and I do not think there is one of you but must see that it is a very bad precedent.

Mr. ALLISON (to Mr. PADDOCK). Let it go.

Mr. PADDOCK. All right.

Mr. COCKRELL. I think it is a dangerous precedent.

Mr. TELLER (to Mr. PADDOCK). Withdraw the motion.

Mr. PADDOCK. All right; I withdraw the motion to discharge the committee.

EXECUTIVE SESSION.

Mr. ALLISON. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business. After twenty-five minutes spent in executive session, the doors were reopened, and, on motion of Mr. ALLISON (at 3 o'clock and 5 minutes p. m.), the Senate adjourned until to-morrow, Saturday, October 20, 1888, at 11 o'clock a. m.

NOMINATIONS.

Executive nominations received by the Senate October 19, 1888.

PROMOTIONS IN THE ARMY.

Fourth Regiment of Cavalry.

Second Lieut. Charles P. Elliott, to be first lieutenant, October 2, 1888, *vice* Smith, appointed regimental quartermaster.

Quartermaster's Department.

Lieut. Col. Henry C. Hodges, deputy quartermaster-general, to be assistant quartermaster-general with the rank of colonel, October 19, 1888, *vice* Saxton, retired from active service.

Maj. George H. Weeks, quartermaster, to be deputy quartermaster-general with the rank of lieutenant-colonel, October 19, 1888, *vice* Hodges, promoted.

Capt. Lewis C. Forsyth, assistant quartermaster, to be quartermaster, with the rank of major, October 19, 1888, *vice* Weeks, promoted.

Ninth Regiment of Infantry.

Second Lieut. Albert S. McNutt, to be first lieutenant, October 17, 1888, *vice* Stivers, resigned.

Alfred Pleasonton, late major Second Cavalry, to be major in the Army, October 19, 1888.

Ninth Regiment of Infantry.

Additional Second Lieut. Matthew C. Butler, jr., of the Fourteenth Infantry, to be second lieutenant, October 17, 1888, *vice* McNutt, promoted.

Fourth Regiment of Cavalry.

Additional Second Lieut. John P. Ryan, of the Third Cavalry, to be second lieutenant, October 2, 1888, *vice* Elliott, promoted.

APPOINTMENTS IN THE NAVY.

Patrick H. Bryant, a resident of Tennessee, and Luther Lochman von Wedekind, a resident of Pennsylvania, to be assistant surgeons in the Navy, to fill existing vacancies in that grade.

COLLECTOR OF CUSTOMS.

Charles R. Bisbee, of Florida, to be collector of customs for the district of St. John's, in the State of Florida, to succeed Edward Hopkins, deceased.

POSTMASTER.

Charles J. Ackert, to be postmaster at New Paltz, in the county of Ulster and State of New York, the appointment of a postmaster for the said office having, by law, become vested in the President on and after October 1, 1888.

CONFIRMATIONS.

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate October 19, 1888.

APPOINTMENT IN THE ARMY.

Alfred Pleasonton, late major Second Cavalry, to be major in the Army.

COLLECTOR OF CUSTOMS.

Charles R. Bisbee, of Florida, to be collector of customs for the district of St. John's, in the State of Florida.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

FRIDAY, *October* 19, 1888.

The House met at 12 o'clock m. Prayer by Rev. Dr. CUTHBERT, D. D.

The Clerk read the Journal of the proceedings of yesterday.

THE JOURNAL.

The SPEAKER. If there be no objection, the Journal will be approved as read.

Mr. FARQUHAR. Mr. Speaker, I object to the approval of the Journal, upon the point of order that I made yesterday morning and which I now renew, and bring to the attention of the Speaker of this House. The Speaker *pro tempore* held yesterday that the custom of the House overruled the rule which requires the presence of a quorum when the Journal is read and approved, and I desire to have a ruling upon that point now from the Speaker of the House, in order that such a decision as was made yesterday shall not stand permanently on the minutes as a precedent. The same point was raised in the second session of the Twenty-seventh Congress, and I desire to call attention to the proceedings upon it and to the action in that case, which sustains the point I made yesterday, that there must be a quorum present and that the Speaker must take cognizance of the fact that there is a quorum present before the Journal of the preceding day is read. I ask the Clerk to read from the Journal of the Twenty-seventh Congress the portion which I have indicated, omitting the votes.

Mr. RICHARDSON. Mr. Speaker, how does this matter come up this morning?

The SPEAKER. The Chair stated in the usual form that unless objection was made the Journal would be approved as read. The gentleman from New York [Mr. FARQUHAR] objects upon the ground, as the Chair understands it, that there is no quorum present in the House, and states that the same objection was made on yesterday morning; and, of course, if that be a good objection, the approval of the Journal yesterday morning would not be valid. The Clerk will read, as requested by the gentleman from New York [Mr. FARQUHAR].

The Clerk read as follows:

SATURDAY, *April* 9, 1842.

At 11 o'clock, the hour to which the House stood adjourned, the Speaker took the chair and directed the Journal of yesterday to be read.

Mr. Russell, of Ohio, objected to the reading of the Journal on the ground that a quorum had not appeared.

The Speaker decided that it was in order to read the Journal in the absence of a quorum.

From this decision Mr. Russell took an appeal to the House, and the question was stated, Shall the decision of the Chair stand as the judgment of the House? when

A motion was made by Mr. Steenrod that the question on the appeal do lie upon the table. * * *

The Speaker here stated that his decision had been made hastily and without referring to the rule; that during the call of the yeas and nays he had looked into the subject and found that his decision was erroneous, the first rule providing that, upon the appearance of a quorum, he shall cause the Journal of the preceding day to be read. He therefore recalled his decision.

Mr. FARQUHAR. Mr. Speaker, I respectfully submit that that is a precedent which should govern this question, and I now ask for a decision by the Chair.

The SPEAKER. The first rule of the House provides that the Speaker shall take the chair on every legislative day, precisely at the hour to which the House shall have adjourned at the last sitting, immediately call the members to order, and, on the appearance of a quorum, cause the Journal of the proceedings of the last day's sitting to be read, having previously examined and approved the same. The Chair thinks that if the point is made before the Journal is read that there is no quorum present in the House, it is the duty of the Chair to cause the roll of the members to be called for the purpose of ascertaining the fact; because there is only one case provided for by the rules in which the Chair itself may ascertain by a count whether or not a quorum is present, and that is where the previous question has been ordered upon a measure. The rule provides that in such a case there shall be no call of the roll ordered until the Speaker shall have ascertained by a count that there is no quorum actually present. The rule also provides that the Journal shall have been previously examined and approved by the Speaker, but the Chair thinks that is merely a preliminary examination and approval, and that the proceedings of the House and the question as to whether or not they are correctly or incorrectly recorded by the officers of the House, must always be under the control of the body itself. If this were not the case the reading of the Journal would be an entirely useless proceeding.

In this case the Chair does not understand that the gentleman from New York [Mr. FARQUHAR] made the point of order before the Journal was read, but he makes the point now that the approval of the Journal, when objected to, can not be made by the House in the absence of a quorum; and the Chair thinks that point well taken, because the approval of the Journal is the transaction of business; it is a proceeding which affects the regularity and validity of the proceedings of the previous day. But until a vote is taken, and the fact that no quorum is present is disclosed, or until the roll is called and discloses that fact, the Chair, of course, can not say officially that there is not a quorum present in the House.

There may be no quorum actually on the floor at the present moment, and yet a quorum might appear upon a vote. The question, therefore, is, "will the House now approve the Journal of the proceedings of yesterday?" and in order to prevent any difficulty or misunderstanding hereafter, the Chair thinks the House ought also to approve or disapprove the Journal of the proceedings of the day before yesterday. As many as are in favor of approving the Journals of the proceedings of yesterday and the day before will say "ay."

Mr. RICHARDSON. I understand the gentleman from New York to have made the point this morning that there is no quorum.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman has not made it yet.

Mr. RICHARDSON. I understood the gentleman to state——

The SPEAKER. The Chair has decided that until a vote is taken it can not be determined whether a quorum is present or not; but when the gentleman objects to the approval of the Journal a vote must be taken on that question, as the Chair thinks, because the House alone has the right to approve its Journal.

Mr. RICHARDSON. I understood the Chair to state that he would at once proceed to ascertain whether there is a quorum present by directing a call of the roll.

The SPEAKER. The Chair stated that if before the reading of the Journal the gentleman had raised the point that no quorum was present, the Chair would not have directed the Journal to be read until the presence of a quorum was ascertained. But the Journal having now been read, the question is simply upon its approval; and this must be decided by a vote, which, if the point be made, will disclose whether or not there is a quorum present. As many as are in favor of approving the Journals of the last two days will say "ay."

The affirmative and the negative vote having been taken.

The SPEAKER said: The ayes have it, and these two Journals are approved.

Mr. FARQUHAR. I withdraw the point which I made——

The SPEAKER. The Chair does not understand the gentleman to have made any point since the vote was taken.

Mr. FARQUHAR. I mean that I do not now desire to press any point as to the absence of a quorum.

The SPEAKER. The Chair does not understand the gentleman to have made any such point since the vote was taken. There was a mere suggestion on the part of the gentleman that there was no quorum present, and that the point indicated by him had heretofore been made and decided.

Mr. FARQUHAR. I misunderstood the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. RICHARDSON. I misunderstood the gentleman from New York. I thought the gentleman had made the point.

Mr. FARQUHAR. I do not desire to raise any point now in regard to the absence of a quorum.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

A message from the Senate, by Mr. NEWELL, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment House joint resolutions of the following titles:

Joint resolution (H. Res. 231) authorizing the Secretary of the Senate and the Clerk of the House of Representatives to pay to the officers and employés of the Senate and House of Representatives borne on the annual rolls their respective salaries for the month of October on the 20th day of said month; and

Joint resolution (H. Res. 232) making an appropriation to enable the Secretary of the Senate and the Clerk of the House of Representatives to pay all session employés of the Senate and House for the full month of October.

CLAIM OF STATE OF PENNSYLVANIA.

Mr. O'NEILL, of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I have been requested by the executive authority of the State of Pennsylvania and its accounting officers to call up the bill for the purpose of reauditing an account in which that State is interested, and having the result of that reauditing reported to this House at the next session. This bill passed the Senate in April last, and has been unanimously recommended by the Committee on War Claims, the Senate report having been adopted by that committee and presented to the House by its chairman, the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. STONE].

I ask in these closing hours of this session that this bill may be taken up by unanimous consent and passed. The probabilities are, Mr. Speaker, that if passed to-day it may, between now and to-morrow at 1 o'clock, receive the approval of the President. The bill provides simply for reauditing—nothing else. It makes no appropriation. It simply requires a report to be made to this House. I ask, therefore, in behalf of the State of Pennsylvania that the bill may be taken up and passed. It is Senate bill No. 2329. I am sure that, if properly understood, it will meet no objection from any quarter.

Mr. TURNER, of Georgia. I would like the gentleman from Pennsylvania to state the character of the claim and its amount, the right to object being meanwhile reserved.

Mr. O'NEILL, of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, many years ago there was settled an account between the Government of the United States and the State of Pennsylvania for expenses which the State took upon itself to pay, expenses incurred in raising and paying certain Union regiments. So far as the principal of that account was concerned, amounting to some hundreds of thousands of dollars, it was paid by act of Congress of April 12, 1866. But the interest, amounting to about $41,000, which the State of Pennsylvania assumed and absolutely paid to the individuals who, in the first place, advanced this money, depending upon the State of Pennsylvania to see that it was settled and upon the assurance of Governor Curtin, then governor of Pennsylvania, that he would see to it that it should be settled, was never paid to the State, though authorized by the same act of Congress, this bill being designed to correct a mistake in the previous audit. The question came before the proper Departments of the Government—before the War Department and ultimately the Treasury Department. The matter was acquiesced in by the then Secretary of the Treasury, Mr. McCulloch, and more recently received some indorsement from the late Secretary of the Treasury, Judge Folger. The State of Pennsylvania now simply asks that there may be a re-examination and a reauditing of that account, and a report to the House of that reauditing. There is no appropriation made by it. It is, I will say in all frankness, preliminary, perhaps, to asking an appropriation. But to-day the State of Pennsylvania, through me, asks only the passage of the Senate bill.

Mr. TURNER, of Georgia. It is very hard to resist an appeal from the State of Pennsylvania; and especially so when made by my amiable friend who now represents the voice of that Commonwealth in this request. But the principle involved in this claim is one that is very far-reaching, as I understand. It is the question of interest on State claims of the character he mentions.

Mr. O'NEILL, of Pennsylvania. Let me interrupt the gentleman to explain there. Some patriotic citizens of the city of Philadelphia advanced certain money during the rebellion, amounting in all to $700,000.

Mr. WASHINGTON. In what year?

Mr. O'NEILL, of Pennsylvania. The State authorities then took upon themselves the repayment of these individuals through Congress; and the money was advanced for that purpose. The interest had been paid by them, and was due for eighteen or twenty months. The money had been paid, I repeat, by these patriotic citizens, and they are out of pocket for that sum, they or their representatives of the State of Pennsylvania up to the present time. The bill for which I now ask consideration does no more than provide for an audit of the amounts so paid.

Mr. TURNER, of Georgia. Why did not the State pay the interest?

Mr. O'NEILL, of Pennsylvania. Because the State had advanced the money, and to pay the principal took all the amount of the repayment that was made by Congress to the State of Pennsylvania. The State paid both the principal and interest, and Congress so provided by the act of April 12, 1866. But the entire amount was not paid. Congress appropriated $800,000, and the State received less than $700,000. The understanding was then that another settlement would be made; and the object of this bill is to carry out that understanding.

Mr. TURNER, of Georgia. As I understand it, then, the State of Pennsylvania has no interest in the question.

Mr. O'NEILL, of Pennsylvania. Oh, yes, it had, because the State undertook to see to the payment originally and the State to-day is seeking to have a reaudit of the account made. I am now simply asking, as one of the members from the State of Pennsylvania, to have this bill taken up and passed, which is at the instance of and in obedience to the desire of the executive authorities of the State of Pennsylvania.

As I said before, this bill passed the Senate unanimously many months ago, was unanimously recommended by the Senate committee, and was unanimously reported by the War Claims Committee of this House through the chairman, General STONE, of Kentucky. The report is very full, setting out all the facts from beginning to end. But I can not say, I will state in great frankness to my friend, what the bill proposes ultimately to do, but suppose, of course, an appropriation will be asked to pay what is due. At present it only authorizes the auditing of the claim. That is all I ask. That is all the bill does. Nothing is proposed by this bill in any respect touching the ultimate payment. It is simply for an examination and report as to the amount remaining due, that being the interest for this many months, which interest was paid by the individuals who advanced the money originally to the Government of the United States. They were told by those in authority at the time that they would be repaid. But Governor Curtin in his patriotic orders of that day took upon himself to have the matter brought before Congress then. That is the entire history of the transaction.

Mr. TURNER, of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Pennsylvania has suggested considerations which do great credit to his constituents on the score of lofty patriotism on their part; but I respectfully submit to him that if we were to pay them for their patriotism in this way, it would rob them of that credit.

Mr. O'NEILL, of Pennsylvania. This bill does not rob them of any credit.

Mr. TURNER, of Georgia. But in all kindness to the gentleman from Pennsylvania, whose wishes I have been always willing to second, as he knows, I desire to say that the principle of the bill involves a very large sum of money. The State of Massachusetts, as I happen to remember, has a claim of the same character, amounting to hundreds of thousands of dollars, and so with other States; the claims being scattered all over the United States. I think, before we commit ourselves to a principle of that sort, we ought to have more time to examine and a fuller attendance of members than we have now. I therefore feel bound to object.

Mr. O'NEILL, of Pennsylvania. The entire amount involved would not amount to more than $41,000. These patriotic gentlemen, at a time when patriotism was needed in this country, evinced this patriotic spirit, and paid the interest for twenty months or more, and they certainly ought to be remunerated for it, or the State which made itself responsible. It is nothing more than right and proper and just. But that is not the question to-day. The only thing I ask is to pass this bill permitting the re-examination and reauditing of the account. It does not involve, I think, any principle such as the gentleman from Georgia seems to apprehend.

The SPEAKER. Objection is made, and the matter is not before the House.

LABORERS IN CLOAK-ROOMS.

Mr. PETERS. I ask unanimous consent for the consideration of the resolution I send to the desk.

The SPEAKER. The resolution will be read subject to objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That the laborers employed in the cloak-room of the House be retained during the recess and until the convening of the second session of the Fiftieth Congress, at the same rate of compensation they are now receiving; said compensation to be paid out of the contingent fund of the House.

Mr. PETERS. Mr. Speaker, it is well understood that the employés of the House engaged in the cloak-room will have to take up the carpets and clean up the Hall immediately after the *sine die* adjournment, and prior to the beginning of the next session they will have to replace the carpets. They will be engaged here almost constantly during

the recess, and the object of the resolution is simply to give them compensation during the period of their employment.

There being no objection, the resolution was considered and adopted.

Mr. PETERS moved to reconsider the vote by which the resolution was adopted; and also moved that the motion to reconsider be laid on the table.

The latter motion was agreed to.

RECONSTRUCTION OF PUBLIC WORKS, MINNEAPOLIS, MINN.

Mr. RICE. I desire to ask consideration of a bill reported from the Committee on Commerce.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Minnesota asks for consideration of a bill the title of which the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 9768) to authorize the city of Minneapolis, Minn., to repair, alter, and reconstruct certain public works.

The bill was read at length for information.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. KILGORE. I object.

ORDER OF BUSINESS.

Mr. STONE, of Kentucky. I demand the regular order.

Mr. HOOKER. I hope the gentleman will yield to me that I may ask unanimous consent to substitute a resolution for a bill.

Mr. STONE, of Kentucky. I will yield for a moment.

Mr. HOOKER. I ask unanimous consent to substitute the resolution which I send to the Clerk's desk for a bill which was unanimously reported from the Committee on War Claims. The object of the bill was to refer a claim to the Court of Claims, and to accomplish that it would have to go through both Houses, which of course can not now be done. I therefore offer the resolution.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman has the right to offer a resolution. Does the gentleman ask unanimous consent for its present consideration?

Mr. HOOKER. I do.

Mr. STONE, of Kentucky. I will yield for that.

Mr. KILGORE. Let it be read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That the claim of J. H. Hurt, of Mississippi, with all the papers and proof in the same be, and the same is hereby, referred to the Court of Claims under the provisions of the act approved March 3, 1883, commonly known as the Bowman act, and the amendment thereto by section 14 of the act of March 3, 1887, commonly known as the Tucker bill.

Mr. KILGORE. Has the bill passed both Houses?

Mr. HOOKER. It has not passed either House. The object is to substitute the resolution for the bill in order to get a reference made of the claim.

Mr. KILGORE. I will be under the painful necessity of objecting; and I must demand the regular order.

The SPEAKER. The regular order is the call of committees for reports.

ENROLLED BILLS.

Mr. KILGORE, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that they had examined and found duly enrolled bills and joint resolutions of the following titles; when the Speaker signed the same:

A bill (H. R. 7964) granting to the Aberdeen, Bismarck and Northwestern Railway right of way across a portion of the Sioux reservation, in Dakota Territory;

A bill (H. R. 10735) for the removal of the political disabilities of Theodore Lewis;

Joint resolution (H. Res. 231) authorizing the Secretary of the Senate and Clerk of the House of Representatives to pay to the officers and employés of the Senate and House of Representatives borne on the annual rolls their respective salaries for the month of October on the 20th day of said month; and

Joint resolution (H. Res. 232) making appropriations to enable the Secretary of the Senate and Clerk of the House of Representatives to pay session employés of the Senate and House for the full month of October.

ORDER OF BUSINESS.

Mr. STONE, of Kentucky. I move to dispense with the call of committees for reports.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. WHEELER. I understand that the regular order is to go on with the call of the roll of the House for the consideration of bills on the Private Calendar, in the order that has been followed for several Fridays.

The SPEAKER. Those bills are in Committee of the Whole House, and the present occupant of the chair could not state what the order would be in committee.

Mr. STONE, of Kentucky. I move that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole House for the purpose of considering bills on the Private Calendar.

Mr. RYAN. I desire to ask the gentleman from Kentucky whether he intends to have the order of taking up business on the Private Calendar which has been observed heretofore?

Mr. STONE, of Kentucky. I would ask of the committee that we follow the same order that we followed for two private bill days prior to this.

The question was put; and the Speaker announced the "ayes" seemed to have it.

Mr. KILGORE. I ask for a division.

The House divided; and there were—ayes 17, noes 4.

Mr. WHITE, of New York. I move that the House do now adjourn.

The question was put; and the Speaker announced that the "ayes" seemed to have it.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE, of Kentucky. Is that a motion to adjourn? I hope the gentleman will withdraw it for a moment that I may have an opportunity to correct the RECORD. I had a somewhat warm colloquy yesterday in which I am made to say that I had a certain conversation with Mr. Havemeyer on the sugar schedule, when I expressly stated I had not had such a conversation. The whole connection shows that it is a mistake; but it is about a matter that I prefer thus publicly to make the correction. I ask to do so now, as I have just got into the city.

The SPEAKER. The correction will be made.

Mr. TURNER, of Georgia. Will the gentleman from New York [Mr. WHITE] allow me to make a single remark? By the resolution which passed yesterday the House will adjourn at 1 o'clock to-morrow, and if the House adjourn now to meet at 12 o'clock to-morrow it will hardly give time for the usual committee to wait on the President and report to Congress. I therefore suggest to the gentleman from New York that he withdraw his motion and allow a motion to be made for a recess until some time before 12 o'clock—say half past 11.

Mr. WHITE, of New York. I will withdraw the motion to adjourn for the purpose of permitting that motion to be made.

Mr. O'NEILL, of Pennsylvania. If the House adjourn now, will it deprive us of the usual Friday evening session?

The SPEAKER. It will.

Mr. O'NEILL, of Pennsylvania. Then I hope that the House will not adjourn, because it will deprive the poor people who have pension bills on the Calendar of the last chance to have their pension granted. [Laughter.]

Mr. TURNER, of Georgia. I move that the House take a recess until 12 o'clock to-morrow.

Mr. WHEELER. I move to amend that motion so as to take a recess until 8 o'clock this evening.

Mr. KILGORE. I want to say in reference to what the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. O'NEILL] has said about getting a bill passed so that it might reach the President to-morrow by 1 o'clock, that there is more business now before the President than he can dispose of before adjournment.

Mr. O'NEILL, of Pennsylvania. But to pass the bill is a great gratification to those having bills on the pension Calendar of the House.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the amendment of the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. WHEELER] to the motion of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. TURNER], that the House take a recess till 11 o'clock to-morrow morning.

Mr. BAYNE. Mr. Speaker, I rise to make a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. BAYNE. Would it be competent for the House to take a recess to-night, after the consideration of pension bills, until to-morrow at 11 o'clock?

The SPEAKER. The Chair thinks so.

The question was put on the amendment of Mr. WHEELER, and it was rejected.

The question then recurred on the motion to take a recess until 11 o'clock to-morrow.

The question was put; and the Speaker announced that the noes seemed to have it.

Mr. TURNER, of Georgia. Division.

The House divided; and there were—ayes 19, noes 9.

Mr. O'NEILL, of Pennsylvania. But for the fact that I want to save the voice of the Clerk, I would endeavor to have the yeas and nays called.

Mr. STONE, of Kentucky. No quorum.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will appoint as tellers the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. TURNER] and the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. STONE].

The House divided; and the tellers reported—ayes 12, noes 5.

Mr. WHITE, of New York. I move that the House do now adjourn.

The SPEAKER. There is a motion pending that has priority over that.

Mr. TURNER, of Georgia. The House is now dividing.

The SPEAKER. If objected to, of course the gentleman's motion can not be made when the House is dividing.

Mr. BAYNE. I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourn to-day it be to meet at 11 o'clock to-morrow.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BAYNE]?

Mr. STONE, of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, if that is agreed to by unanimous consent, will it necessarily vacate the taking of the vote upon the present question?

The SPEAKER. If the House decides that when it adjourns to-day it will adjourn to meet to-morrow at 11 o'clock, it makes no decision whatever as to the hour at which it will adjourn to-day. The House is left still in session.

Mr. WHEELER. But the House can adjourn immediately, can it not?

The SPEAKER. It can adjourn immediately, in an hour, or at whatever time it chooses. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BAYNE] that when the House adjourn to-day it adjourn to meet to-morrow at 11 o'clock a. m.

Mr. WHEELER. I do not wish to object to the motion, but ask indulgence to remind the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BAYNE] who made the request that he forgot on yesterday to answer my question regarding the sugar trust and the sugar schedule. [Laughter.] The gentleman said he would come to that matter in a moment, but he became so absorbed with other subjects that he forgot to give the desired information.

I also wish to call attention to the apparent severity with which the Senate tariff bill deals with the industries of the three States whose electoral vote was so manipulated in 1876 by the Republican party managers as to enable them to seat Mr. Hayes in the Presidential chair.

Having used those States to carry out their purposes, as illegal as that whereby Louis XIV seated his grandson on the throne of Spain, or Frederick the Great despoiled Maria Theresa of a part of her dominions and annexed Silesia to Prussia, the Republicans now propose a change in the tariff laws which, if their theories are correct, would inflict great injuries upon Florida, Louisiana, and South Carolina.

South Carolina is chastised by reducing the duty on rice from 2½ cents per pound to 1 cent per pound, and rice uncleaned is reduced from 1½ cents to one-half of 1 cent per pound, and tar, pitch, and turpentine are put on the free-list. The industries of Florida are to suffer by having the duty on her oranges reduced from 13 cents to 10 cents, while lemons are reduced from 16 cents to 10 cents, and sponges are placed on the free-list, and poor Louisiana has her sugar duty reduced from 83 to 41 per cent., and molasses below 56 degrees is placed on the free-list, which substantially puts all molasses on the free-list; for statistics show that while we imported 37,000,000 gallons of molasses below 56 degrees, we imported only 2,000 gallons above 56 degrees, and all molasses can be easily diluted to a point below 56 degrees.

Now, it must be borne in mind the Republican party contends that high protection is a cure for all evils. That those industries are specially blessed whose products are protected by a high or prohibitory tariff. They also contend that the tariff law of 1883 reduced the tariff upon all articles to the very lowest limit, and that the slightest change in the direction of reduction must be followed by ruin, bankruptcy, pauperism, death, and destruction; and with such a picture of possible desolation before them they, without a pang, attempt to change the tariff on the products of the States of Louisiana, Florida, and South Carolina, so as to bring about these dreadful results.

Mr. EZRA B. TAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that there is no question before the House, and I call for the regular order.

Mr. WHEELER. I wish to place in the RECORD a table which I have prepared, showing some of the extraordinary changes which are made in the Senate tariff bill to the detriment of the masses of the people. The table shows the increase in tax proposed by that bill upon some articles of wool and manufactures of wool. I do this under the general permission.

Table showing the tariff on wool and manufacturers of wool, as proposed by the House and Senate bills.

Class.	Articles.	House bill.	Senate bill.
		Per cent.	*Per cent.*
1	Scoured wool, value 30 cents or less per pound	Free.	82
2	Combing wool, scoured, value 30 cents or less per pound	Free.	73
3	Carpet wool, scoured, value 30 cents or less per pound	Free.	42
3	Woolen rags, shoddy, waste, etc., per pound	Free.	26
3	Woolen cloths, valued not above 80 cents per pound	40	75
3	Woolen shawls, valued not above 80 cents per pound	40	68
3	Woolen yarns, valued between 30 and 40 cents per pound	40	134
3	Woolen manufactures not otherwise provided for, valued between 30 and 40 cents per pound	40	148
3	Woolen balmorals, valued between 30 and 40 cents per pound	40	130
3	Flannels, valued above 30 cents per pound	40	87
3	Blankets, valued not above 30 cents per pound	40	80
3	Blankets, valued between 30 and 40 cents per pound	40	64
3	Wool hats, valued not above 60 cents per pound	40	73
3	Women and children's dress goods, weighing 4 ounces or less per square yard, per square yard	40	93
3	Same, weighing over 4 ounces per square yard, per square yard	40	74
3	Bunting, per square yard	40	90
3	Woolen cloaks, dolmans, etc., per pound	40	73
3	Woolen druggets and bockings, printed, etc., per square yard	40	74
3	Belts or felts for paper or printing machines, per pound	40	53

I also wish to place in the RECORD a table which I requested to be furnished by the Bureau of Statistics, showing the value and duties collected on certain articles under existing law, and also showing the excess in amounts of duty under the Senate substitute over and above like amounts under existing law, as well as under the bill passed by the House on July 21, 1888. A table somewhat similar to this has been printed in the RECORD, but the bureau discovered errors in their calculations which are corrected in this table.

Values of and duties collected on the below-named manufactured articles entered for consumption in the United States during the year ending June 30, 1887, with the estimated amounts of duty accruing on like imports under the provisions of House bill 9051 and the Senate substitute; also, showing the excess in amounts of duty under the Senate substitute over like amounts under the present laws and House bill 9051.

Articles.	Values.	Duties collected under—						Excess of duties under Senate substitute over—			
		Present laws.		House bill.		Senate substitute.		Present laws.		House bill.	
		Amounts.	Av. ad valorem rates.	Amounts.	Av. ad valorem rates.	Amounts.	Av. ad valorem rates.	Amounts.	Per cent.	Amounts.	Per cent.
Woolens:			*Per cent.*		*Per cent.*		*Per cent.*				
Cloths	$10,022,370.67	$7,055,824.94	70.40	$4,008,948.26	40.00	$7,531,853.64	75.15	$476,028.70	6.75	$3,522,905.38	87.88
Dress goods	17,199,141.02	12,398,974.92	72.09	6,879,656.41	40.00	13,419,025.95	78.02	1,020,051.03	8.23	6,539,369.54	95.05
Knit goods	1,980,453.74	1,243,689.31	62.80	792,181.49	40.00	1,423,935.33	71.90	180,246.02	14.50	631,753.84	79.44
Shawls	1,029,998.19	654,008.00	63.50	411,999.27	40.00	703,154.00	68.27	49,146.00	7.51	291,154.73	70.67
Yarns	1,747,562.00	1,207,734.64	69.11	699,024.84	40.00	1,980,236.45	113.83	781,501.81	64.71	1,290,211.61	186.00
Cottons:											
Thread, not on spools	919,702.30	423,759.58	46.08	355,035 58	38.60	466,497.26	50.72	42,737.68	10.09	111,461.68	31.39
Cloths	3,555,347.28	1,617,300.80	45.49	1,422,138.91	40.00	1,777,010.63	49.98	159,809.83	9.88	354,871.72	24.95
Flax, hemp, and jute:											
Brown and bleached linens, etc	13,589,418.55	4,756,296.50	35.00	3,397,354.64	25.00	5,435,767.42	40.00	679,470.92	14.29	2,038,412.78	60.00
Laces and embroideries	1,142,473.35	342,742.00	30.00	342,742.00	30.00	571,236.67	50.00	228,494.67	66.67	228,494.67	66.67
Yarns	789,013.50	276,154.73	35.00	118,354.02	15.00	315,605.40	40.00	39,450.67	14.29	197,251.38	166.66
Iron and steel:											
Steel, in forms not specified	6,091,898.65	2,614,385.43	42.92	2,614,385.65	42.92	3,488,080.52	57.26	873,695.09	33.42	873,695.09	33.42
Railway bars	1,000,329.00	843,347.49	84.30	545,853.04	54.57	777,672.29	77.74	*65,675.20	*7.79	231,819.25	42.47
Tin-plates	16,883,813.95	5,706,433.89	33.80	Free		5,706,433.89	33.80			5,706,433.19	100.00
Needles, not for machines	307,484.44	76,871.10	25.00	Free		76,871.10	25.00			76,871.10	100.00

*Minus.

NOTE.—The amounts of duty stated as "collected" under House bill and Senate substitute are estimated upon the imports of 1887.

TREASURY DEPARTMENT, BUREAU OF STATISTICS, *Washington, D. C., October 11, 1888.*

W. F. SWITZLER, *Chief of Bureau.*

To Hon. JOSEPH WHEELER.

I will also submit a table, likewise prepared by the Bureau of Statistics, showing comparative ad valorem rates. The table gives ad valorem rates under existing laws, under the House bill, and under the Senate bill. It also gives values and duties and average rates under each bill.

Comparative statement.

Schedules.	Average ad valorem rates of duty collected on merchandise dutiable under—					Merchandise dutiable under present laws and placed on the free-list under—					
						Values.		Duties collected under present laws.			
								Total duties.		Average ad valorem rates of duty.	
	Present laws.	House bill 9051.		Senate substitute.							
		At present rates.	At rates of House bill 9051.	At present rates.	At rates of Senate substitute.	House bill 9051.	Senate substitute.	House bill 9051.	Senate substitute.	House bill 9051.	Senate substitute.
	Per ct.	*Per ct.*	*Per ct.*	*Per ct.*	*Per ct.*					*Per ct.*	*Per ct.*
A. Chemicals	32.83	34.35	29.11	30.01	28.72	$4,535,557.96	$2,673,972.27	$1,278,150.20	$1,389,411.07	28.18	48.34
B. Earthen and glass ware	59.56	59.12	53.09	59.56	57.82	30,789.97	.....	6,157.99	.....	20.00	.....
C. Metals	40.77	44.56	41.12	40.77	42.13	18,323,612.91	.....	6,075,656.65	.....	33.16	.....
D. Wooden ware	18.00	34.00	29.32	18.00	18.88	6,679,202.12	.....	1,039,207.35	.....	15.56	.....
E. Sugar	78.15	78.15	63.41	82.03	41.02	.....	5,336,364.13	.....	1,496,690.60	.....	28.04
F. Tobacco	83.32	83.32	83.32	83.32	70.36	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
G. Provisions	24.33	24.38	23.34	22.16	23.58	3,334,013.86	1,232,605.00	794,903.38	400,850.55	23.84	32.52
H. Liquors	72.64	72.64	72.64	72.64	76.21	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
I. Cottons	39.99	39.99	39.07	39.99	40.74	.....	172.00	.....	34.40	.....	20.00
J. Hemp, flax, and jute	28.09	34.37	24.81	31.73	35.47	14,490,501.40	9,004,675.00	2,858,908.15	1,627,652.66	19.73	18.08
K. Wool and woolens	58.80	68.99	40.08	58.80	66.12	18,206,987.97	.....	6,390,054.73	.....	35.10	.....
L. Silk goods	49.71	49.71	49.71	49.71	50.67	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
M. Books, papers, etc.	22.14	22.13	22.07	22.14	23.54	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
N. Sundries	26.86	26.80	24.78	27.92	28.20	4,842,346.45	7,884,026.98	1,330,559.89	1,566,583.92	27.48	19.87
Total	47.07	50.60	42.77	48.10	42.75	70,413,012.64	26,331,815.38	19,773,598.34	6,481,223.20	28.07	24.61

NOTES.—This table shows a deficiency of $389,050.37 in the value of, and of $220,791.41 in the duty collected on dutiable merchandise in 1887, as reported in the annual report of the Chief of the Bureau of Statistics. This difference is principally due to the omission from this table of dutiable merchandise ($177,909.59) withdrawn free of duty from warehouse and of merchandise not dutiable under any of the schedules. If these amounts had been included, the average ad valorem rate of duty under the present laws would be 47.10 instead of 47.07 per cent.

The interpretation of House bill 9051 is that of the Committee on Ways and Means, House of Representatives, as published by the clerk of that committee, and of the Senate substitute that of the Senate subcommittee on tariff.

The values and duties under both House bill and Senate substitute are computed on the importation of 1887, without speculating upon any possible increase or decrease consequent upon a decrease or increase in the rates of duty imposed by the proposed bills. The computations have been made as accurate as practicable, but in many cases under the Senate substitute a calculation was made impossible by the change from an ad valorem to a specific rate of duty. In such cases no account has been taken of the proposed change.

TREASURY DEPARTMENT, BUREAU OF STATISTICS, *Washington, D. C., October* 11, 1888.

WM. F. SWITZLER, *Chief of Bureau.*

Hon. JOSEPH WHEELER.

I also submit, in tabular form, a comparative statement showing the operations of the tariff under the existing laws, under the bill passed by this House, and under the substitute proposed by the Senate.

Comparative statement showing the operations under the present tariff laws, under House bill No. 9051, *and under the Senate substitute, respectively, based upon the quantities and values of dutiable merchandise entered for consumption in the United States during the year ending June* 30, 1887.

Schedules.	Values of merchandise dutiable under—			Duties collected on merchandise dutiable under—				
					House bill 9051.		Senate substitute.	
	Present laws.	House bill 9051.	Senate substitute.	Present laws.	At present rates.	At rates House bill 9051.	At present rates.	At rates Senate substitute.
A. Chemicals	$18,864,257.96	$14,328,700.00	*$16,027,271.69	$6,199,811.99	$4,921,661.79	$4,170,945.61	$4,810,400.92	*$4,602,661.78
B. Earthen and glass ware	13,056,150.43	13,025,360.46	13,056,150.43	7,776,202.42	7,770,044.43	6,914,682.12	7,776,202.42	7,548,760.03
C. Metals	55,111,922.37	36,788,309.46	55,111,922.37	22,469,401.89	16,393,745.24	15,126,379.16	22,469,401.89	23,218,901.21
D. Wooden ware	7,697,357.06	1,018,154.94	7,697,357.06	1,385,356.19	346,148.84	298,561.65	1,385,356.19	1,454,309.11
E. Sugar	74,242,279.20	74,242,279.20	68,905,915.07	58,016,686.34	58,016,686.34	47,079,512.20	56,519,995.74	28,265,431.09
F. Tobacco	10,955,125.03	10,955,125.03	10,955,125.03	9,127,758.26	9,127,758.26	9,127,758.26	9,127,758.26	7,107,710.12
G. Provisions	39,165,566.07	35,831,552.21	†41,198,052.10	9,529,091.81	8,734,188.43	8,364,587.33	9,128,241.26	†9,736,699.98
H. Liquors	10,190,946.40	10,190,946.40	10,190,946.40	7,402,242.82	7,402,242.82	7,402,242.82	7,402,242.82	7,766,684.81
I. Cottons	30,208,851.83	30,208,851.83	30,208,679.83	12,081,297.43	12,081,297.43	11,803,687.14	12,081,263.03	12,306,648.04
J. Hemp, flax, and jute	33,807,282.55	19,316,781.15	24,802,607.55	9,497,981.74	6,639,073.59	4,793,111.06	7,870,329.08	8,798,021.87
K. Wool and woolens	60,586,613.61	42,379,625.64	60,586,613.61	35,629,534.13	29,239,479.40	16,984,966.61	35,629,534.13	40,060,648.41
L. Silk goods	31,264,278.58	31,264,276.58	31,264,278.58	15,540,300.70	15,540,300.70	15,540,300.70	15,540,300.70	15,842,061.96
M. Books, papers, etc	5,214,635.21	5,214,635.21	5,214,635.21	1,154,369.41	1,154,369.41	1,150,812.51	1,154,369.41	1,227,455.61
N. Sundries	59,580,006.88	54,737,660.43	‡51,703,440.90	16,001,597.36	14,671,037.47	13,567,845.57	14,435,013.44	‡14,581,616.00
Total	449,945,271.18	379,502,258.54	426,922,993.83	211,811,632.49	192,038,034.15	162,325,392.74	205,330,409.29	182,516,820.02

*$36,996; duty, $3,773.60 from free-list. †$3,235,091.03; duty, $574,843.44 from free-list. ‡$7,461; duty, $2,934.40 from free-list.

These tables clearly show the superiority of the House bill to the Senate bill as a measure of relief for the people—particularly for the farmer.

The Senate bill proposes to deprive the farmer of whatever small protection they have heretofore accorded him, and to increase the burdens he has to bear wherever it can be done. Heaven knows his burden is grievous enough without increasing the exactions.

Under the present law his flannel shirt is taxed 95 per cent., his coat 55 per cent., his shoes 35 per cent., his hat 85 per cent., his bucket 55 per cent., his tin wash-basin 55 per cent., his cotton towel 45 per cent., his plates 50 per cent., his knives and forks 35 per cent., his salt 60 per cent., his pepper 60 per cent., his tobacco 180 per cent., his cigar 110 per cent., his window-glass 60 per cent., his bridles 35 per cent., horseshoe nails 55 per cent., his hammers 20 per cent., his plows 45 per cent., his trace-chains 55 per cent., his Bible 25 per cent., his carpet 50 per cent., his sheets 45 per cent., and his blankets 85 per cent.

Nor does this list include all the taxes the poor agriculturist must pay. His wife's broom is taxed 30 per cent., her cooking utensils 40 per cent., her cooking soda 50 per cent., her needles 25 per cent., her spool thread 74 per cent., her calico dress 55 per cent., and the yarn she knits into socks for her husband and children is taxed 80 per cent.

In fact, whether in his house, in his field, at his table, in his bed, or on his knees the farmer is taxed by every possible device, on every conceivable article he must use.

MILLIONAIRES AND MORTGAGED FARMS.

One statement of an unquestionable and undeniable fact will suffice to show that the tendency of Republican legislation has always been to oppress the farmer.

When the Republican party came into power the millionaires of the country could have been counted on the fingers of one pair of hands, and mortgages on farms were, comparatively speaking, unknown. To-day, as the logical outcome of the Republican policy, millionaires are countless and most of the farms in the West and Northwest are mortgaged to the money barons of the manufacturing States of the East and Northeast.

That this is no exaggerated statement is shown by the dispatches which constantly appear in the public press. One of recent date is in these words:

MINNEAPOLIS, MINN., *October* 17.

M. J. Horsemann, of this city, who has been investigating the condition of the farmers in Ramsey County, Dakota, who were reported to be starving to death, returned last night. He says there are seventy families who are absolutely destitute of food and fuel, and something must be done, and immediately, or they will starve to death. The real condition of the people is beyond description.

Men, women, and children are in rags, and they have not a cent in the world. Their crops were totally destroyed, and their land, stock, and farm implements are mortgaged up to their full value, and the mortgagers are threatening foreclosure.

The most absolute distress prevailed everywhere. Women and children were crying, and men were going barefooted and in rags.

Do the gentlemen of the Republican party believe that the people, the great body of workers whose sacrifices in war and labors in peace have made this country great, glorious, and wealthy, would ever knowingly have imposed such burdens upon themselves?

No, Mr. Speaker, they can not believe it themselves and can not expect such an absurdity to be credited by others. Thanks to the sagacious leadership of our courageous President, the people have been aroused. Day by day they are learning how they have been through many weary and sorrowful years made victims of an unparalleled system of wrong and extortion.

The intelligent and impartial jury of the American people is now called upon to decide this great and momentous question. That it will be decided in the interest of right and justice I can not doubt. That we must ultimately triumph in this righteous contest I believe as firmly as I believe that to-morrow's sun will rise.

The SPEAKER. The point of order is well taken. There is nothing before the House, except a request for unanimous consent. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BAYNE]?

Mr. WHEELER. I would like an answer to my question.

The SPEAKER. But the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. EZRA B. TAYLOR] insists upon the regular order.

Mr. BAYNE. Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that the deficiency bill has not yet been returned with the President's signature, and that several other bills are in the same position, it seems quite important that the House should have two hours to-morrow, and I do hope that unanimous consent will now be given that when we adjourn to-day it will be to meet at 11 o'clock to-morrow, and I do trust that neither the tariff question nor any other will be allowed to interfere with that simple, single proposition.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

Mr. STONE, of Kentucky. I object.

The SPEAKER. Objection is made. Gentlemen who desire to vote will please come forward and pass between the tellers.

Mr. WHITE, of New York. I move a call of the House.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will announce the result so far. Upon this question the yeas are 12 and the nays 6. Does the gentleman still insist upon the point of no quorum?

Mr. STONE, of Kentucky. I do.

The SPEAKER. No quorum has voted and the gentleman from New York [Mr. WHITE] moves a call of the House.

The question was taken on the motion to order a call of the House, and it was not agreed to.

Mr. WHITE, of New York. I move that the House do now adjourn.

The question was taken; and there were—ayes 14, noes 18.

So the House refused to adjourn.

DISTRIBUTION OF DOCUMENTS.

Mr. RICHARDSON. Mr. Speaker, I want to ask unanimous consent, pending the count by tellers, to offer a resolution which applies to the distribution of publications to members of the House. I think every member of the House is interested in the matter, and while this is not a question of privilege, yet it trims very close to it, and I think no member will object to the passage of the resolution. It will be remembered by gentlemen who were here at the time that on the last day of the Forty-ninth Congress Mr. Hammond, of Georgia, introduced a resolution providing that publications ordered by the Forty-ninth Congress should be continued to members of that Congress although their terms expired on the 3d day of March, 1887. The resolution I desire to offer now is simply intended to repeal that one, so as to permit books ordered by the Forty-ninth Congress to be apportioned by the Doorkeeper as they come in to members of the Fiftieth Congress who were not members of the Forty-ninth. I think it is right and proper and ought to pass.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the presentation of the request? If not, the resolution will be read, after which the Chair will ask for objection.

Mr. RICHARDSON. The original resolution was introduced by the gentleman from New York [Mr. LAIDLAW], whom I do not now see in the House. The Committee on Printing thought that his resolution did not exactly cover the matter, and therefore recommend a substitute. The reading of the report will explain this matter.

The Clerk read as follows:

The Committee on Printing, to whom was referred a House resolution "that all documents and books published by the authority of the Forty-ninth Congress which now stand to the credit of such members of the Forty-ninth Congress as are not members of the Fiftieth Congress shall be, and the same hereby are, placed to the credit of their successors, respectively," report the same back with a recommendation that it do not pass, but that the following resolution be adopted as a substitute in lieu thereof:

"*Resolved*, That the Doorkeeper of the House of Representatives be, and he is hereby, instructed to apportion to the members of the Fiftieth Congress all books which have not yet been apportioned, including all the volumes of the second edition of Wharton's Digest, notwithstanding the resolution of the House of March 2, 1887, introduced by Mr. Hammond, which is hereby repealed."

There being no objection, the House proceeded to the consideration of the resolution reported by the Committee on Printing; which was adopted.

Mr. RICHARDSON moved to reconsider the vote by which the resolution was adopted; and also moved that the motion to reconsider be laid on the table.

The latter motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. If there be no objection, the original resolution, for which the resolution just adopted was a substitute, will lie on the table.

There was no objection, and it was ordered accordingly.

Mr. RICHARDSON. I ask that a resolution on the same subject, introduced by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. WALKER], be also laid on the table.

The SPEAKER. In the absence of objection, that order will be made.

ORDER OF BUSINESS.

The SPEAKER. The question now recurs on the motion that the House take a recess until 11 o'clock to-morrow morning. Gentlemen desiring to vote on that question will pass between the tellers and be counted.

Mr. TURNER, of Georgia. I renew the request made by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BAYNE] that when the House adjourns to-day it adjourn to meet at 11 o'clock to-morrow.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. TURNER, of Georgia. I now withdraw the motion for a recess.

The SPEAKER. The question recurs on the motion made by the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. STONE] that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole for the consideration of bills on the Private Calendar.

Mr. MILLIKEN. I wish the gentleman would withhold his motion for a moment while I present a proposition to which I understand there will be no objection.

Mr. KILGORE. I understood there was a motion pending to adjourn.

The SPEAKER. That has been decided in the negative.

Mr. KILGORE. Upon the motion that the House go into Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar the point of "no quorum" was raised.

The SPEAKER. Therefore that question is still pending. No quorum having voted, the Chair appoints as tellers the gentleman from Texas [Mr. KILGORE] and the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. STONE].

Mr. SOWDEN. I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; there being—ayes 19, noes 8.

The House accordingly (at 1 o'clock p. m.) adjourned until to-morrow morning at 11 o'clock.

PRIVATE BILLS INTRODUCED AND REFERRED.

Under the rule private bills of the following titles were introduced and referred as indicated below:

By Mr. G. A. ANDERSON: A bill (H. R. 11607) granting a pension to John Cummings—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MCSHANE: A bill (H. R. 11608) granting a pension to Albert A. Palmer—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

PETITION.

The following petition was laid on the Clerk's desk, under the rule, and referred as follows:

By Mr. HOOKER: Petition for reduction of taxes on dental and surgical goods—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

SENATE.

SATURDAY, *October* 20, 1888.

The Senate met at 11 o'clock a. m.
Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. J. G. BUTLER, D. D.
The Journal of yesterday's proceedings was read and approved.

NOTIFICATION TO THE PRESIDENT.

Mr. ALLISON submitted the following resolution; which was considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to:

Resolved, That a committee of two members of the Senate be appointed, to join such committee as may be appointed by the House of Representatives, to wait upon the President of the United States and inform him that Congress, having finished its business, will be ready to close the present session by an adjournment to-day at 1 o'clock p. m.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. How shall the committee be appointed?

Mr. ALLISON and others. By the Chair.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The resolution being silent, the Chair will designate, if there be no objection, to serve upon the committee named in the resolution the Senator from Iowa [Mr. ALLISON] and the Senator from Delaware [Mr. SAULSBURY].

CIVIL-SERVICE INVESTIGATION.

Mr. BLACKBURN. I desire to submit the views of the minority of the select committee appointed to examine into the condition of the civil service. I ask that the order hitherto made by the Senate for the printing of the majority report be extended so as to include these views of the minority.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The Chair hears no objection, and it will be so ordered.

BILLS INTRODUCED.

Mr. MITCHELL introduced a joint resolution (S. R. 117) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States providing for the election of Senators by the votes of the people of the States; which was read twice by its title.

Mr. MITCHELL. The joint resolution is introduced in pursuance of instructions of the Legislature of my State, and I will state that it is also in accordance with my own judgment. I ask that the joint resolution be printed in the RECORD, and referred to the Committee on Privileges and Elections.

The joint resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD and referred to the Committee on Privileges and Elections, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That the following amendment to the Constitution of the United States be proposed to the Legislatures of the several States; which, when ratified by three-fourths of said Legislatures, shall become and be a part of the Constitution, namely:

Strike out the word "Legislature" in the first clause of section 3 of Article I, and substitute in lieu thereof the word "people;" so that said clause shall be as follows:

"The Senate of the United States shall be composed of two Senators from each State, chosen by the people thereof for six years; and each Senator shall have one vote."

Mr. MORGAN introduced a joint resolution (S. R. 118) to amend and enlarge the provisions of a joint resolution approved July 25, 1866, entitled "Joint resolution to refer the claim of the administrator of Richard W. Meade, deceased, to the Court of Claims; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

WITHDRAWAL OF PAPERS.

On motion of Mr. MITCHELL, it was

Ordered, That leave be granted to withdraw from the files of the Senate the papers accompanying the bill (S. 2563) to compensate Mrs. Sarah L. Larimer for important services rendered the military authorities in 1864 at Deer Creek Station, Wyoming, and for loss of property taken by the Sioux Indians.

RECESS.

Mr. ALLISON. I move that the Senate take a recess until 12 o'clock.

Mr. COCKRELL. Would it not be better to take a recess nominally and yet be in a condition to receive any message that may come, with the understanding that no business shall be transacted until the hour named?

Mr. ALLISON. I have no objection to that course.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore* (at 11 o'clock and 12 minutes a. m.). By unanimous consent, the Senate will informally take a recess, and business will be resumed as occasion may require.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore* (at 11 o'clock and 30 minutes a. m.). The Senate will receive a message from the House of Representatives.

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. CLARK, its Clerk, announced that the House had passed a joint resolution (H. Res. 233) authorizing the exhibits made by the Government at the centennial exposition of the Ohio Valley and Central States at Cincinnati, Ohio, to remain at said exposition until and including the 15th day of November, 1888; in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message also announced that the House had passed a resolution providing that a committee of three members on the part of the House be appointed, to join a similar committee on the part of the Senate, to wait upon the President of the United States and inform him that the two Houses of Congress are ready to adjourn, and to respectfully inquire whether he has any further communication to make to them.

The message also announced that the Speaker had appointed Mr. MCMILLIN, Mr. TURNER of Georgia, and Mr. RYAN as the committee under the foregoing resolution of the House.

GOVERNMENT EXHIBITS AT CINCINNATI EXPOSITION.

Mr. TELLER. I ask for the present consideration of the joint resolution which has just come from the House of Representatives.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The joint resolution will be read the first time by its title.

The joint resolution (H. Res. 233) authorizing the exhibits made by the Government at the centennial exposition of the Ohio Valley and Central States at Cincinnati, Ohio, to remain at said exposition until and including the 15th day of November, 1888, was read the first time by its title.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. If there be no objection, the joint resolution will be read the second time at length.

By unanimous consent the joint resolution was read the second time at length, and considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The joint resolution was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATION.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore* laid before the Senate a letter of the Secretary of War, transmitting, in response to a resolution of July 16, 1888, a report from the Chief Signal Officer of the Army, together with charts and tables prepared under his direction, upon the climate of Oregon, and upon the climatic and other conditions of the agricultural districts of Eastern Oregon and Washington Territory, etc.; which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and ordered to be printed.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

At 12 o'clock and 35 minutes p. m. a message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. CLARK, its Clerk, announced that the Speaker had signed the enrolled joint resolution (H. Res. 233) authorizing the exhibits made by the Government at the centennial exposition of the Ohio Valley and Central States at Cincinnati, Ohio, to remain at said exposition until and including the 15th day of November, 1888; and it was thereupon signed by the President *pro tempore*.

PRESIDENTIAL APPROVALS.

A message from the President of the United States, by Mr. O. L. PRUDEN, one of his secretaries, announced that the President had on the 19th instant approved and signed the following acts and joint resolutions:

An act (S. 45) for the relief of Col. James C. Duane;

An act (S. 1190) for the relief of the estate of Joseph Fenno, deceased;

An act (S. 1137) for the relief of Adam L. Epley;

An act (S. 307) for the relief of Margaret Kennedy;

An act (S. 1482) granting a pension to Sarah C. Taylor;

An act (S. 2663) granting an increase of pension to Mrs. Mary M. Ord;

An act (S. 2110) granting the right of way for the construction of a railroad through the Hot Springs reservation, State of Arkansas;

An act (S. 1494) to secure to the Cherokee freedmen and others their proportion of certain proceeds of lands under the act of March 3, 1883;

An act (S. 3597) to provide for the disposal of the Fort Wallace military reservation in Kansas;

An act (S. 2802) to fix the number of unbound and bound Journals of the Senate and House of Representatives and to provide for their distribution;

An act (S. 3620) supplementary to the act approved February 3, 1887, entitled "An act to fix the day for the meeting of the electors of President and Vice-President and to provide for and regulate the counting of the votes for President and Vice-President and the decision of questions arising thereon;"

An act (S. 3433) authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to accept the surrender of and cancel land patents to Indians in certain cases;

Joint resolution (S. R. 59) authorizing Brig. Gen. Absalom Baird, United States Army, to accept from the President of the French Republic a diploma conferring the decoration of commander of the National Order of the Legion of Honor;

Joint resolution (S. R. 112) authorizing the Secretary of War to receive for instruction at the Military Academy at West Point Henry Lecomte, of Switzerland; and

Joint resolution (S. R. 116) authorizing the Secretary of War to protect the Washington Aqueduct tunnel.

NOTIFICATION TO THE PRESIDENT.

At 12 o'clock and 42 minutes p. m. Mr. ALLISON and Mr. SAULSBURY, of the joint committee appointed to wait upon the President of the United States and notify him that Congress was ready to adjourn, appeared at the bar of the Senate, and

Mr. ALLISON said: Mr. President, the committee appointed by this body, in association with a similar committee from the House of Representatives, have the honor to inform the Senate that they communi-

cated to the President of the United States the fact that the two Houses were now ready to adjourn unless he had some further communication to make, and in response he stated that he had no further communication to submit.

THANKS TO PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE.

Mr. SAULSBURY. Mr. President, I offer the following resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MORGAN in the chair). The resolution will be read.

The Chief Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That the thanks of the Senate are due, and hereby are tendered, to Hon. JOHN J. INGALLS, President *pro tempore* of the Senate, for the uniformly able, courteous, and impartial manner in which he has presided over its deliberations.

The Senate, by unanimous consent, proceeded to consider the resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution. [Putting the question.] The resolution is unanimously adopted.

FINAL ADJOURNMENT.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore* (at 1 o'clock p. m.). Senators, gratitude impels and usage permits the Chair to postpone for an instant the moment of our separation to acknowledge the honor of your resolution of confidence and approval.

But justice demands the admission that if the Chair has succeeded in the discharge of the delicate and important duties of his position; if order has been maintained in debate; if the laws have been impartially administered; if promptness, facility, and correctness in the transaction of public business have been secured; if the traditions of the Senate, which are its noblest heritage, have been preserved inviolate, it is due to your considerate indulgence, to your constant and cordial co-operation. Without these the greatest abilities could not succeed; with these the humblest faculties could not fail.

The termination of the longest continuous session of the Senate since the foundation of the Government approaches; and trusting that the Supreme Power, which controls the destinies of nations as well as the fortunes of men, may, during the brief interval of your labors in this Chamber, continue His beneficence to each of you personally, to the families of which you are members, to the States of which you are representatives, and to the country of which you are citizens, the Chair announces that the Senate stands adjourned without day.

CONFIRMATION.

Executive nomination confirmed by the Senate, October 16, 1888.

SURVEYOR-GENERAL.

Charles W. Irish, of Nevada, to be surveyor-general of Nevada.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

SATURDAY, *October* 20, 1888.

The House met at 11 o'clock a. m. Rev. J. H. CUTHBERT, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Oh, Thou whose throne is in the heavens, and whose kingdom ruleth over all, the Judge of the earth, the Sovereign of the universe, our God and our Father! draw nigh unto us as we attempt to draw nigh unto Thee. Let Thy blessing be upon all who are in authority in the land, both State and National; Thy servant, the President of the United States, both Houses of Congress, the members of the Supreme Court, and especially this assembly. Grant unto these Thy servants, O God, that they may be faithful stewards of the trust committed unto them, and by their zeal and devotion may truly represent the people and approve themselves as ministers of God to them for good and not for evil. And grant unto the people they represent that appreciation of this high and responsible service that will lead them profoundly to sympathize with Thy servants here.

We thank Thee for all that Thou hast done during this session by Thy servants. Whatever has been wrong in spirit or in action, in mercy forgive. Whatever has met with Thy approval, confirm, O Lord, and establish; establish Thou the work of their hands upon them; yea, the work of their hands establish Thou it.

We thank Thee, most merciful Father, that in so large an assembly, so few of Thy servants have been summoned away by death, and that many who have been sick well nigh unto death have been in Thy merciful providence restored. The shadows have fallen upon their households, but the goodness and mercy of our God have been extended to them all.

And now let Thy blessing be upon them in this parting interview—Thy servant, the Speaker of the House, all its officers, all the members, present or absent; the representatives of the press, who have recorded these proceedings, the witnesses of these proceedings. The Lord watch over and between us all. Our fathers, where are they? and the prophets, do they live forever? Like shadows they have gone; like shadows we follow them. Whatever time we are in trouble be Thou our helper; whatever time we are in darkness, uncertainty, and doubt, be Thou our guide, our guide even unto death, and through death to the general assembly and church of the first-born in heaven.

Our Father, who art in heaven; hallowed be Thy name, Thy kingdom come. Thy will be done upon earth even as it is in heaven. Give us this day our daily bread. Forgive us our trespasses as we forgive those who trespass against us. Lead us not into temptation. Deliver us from evil. For Thine is the kingdom, and the power, and the glory, forever. Amen.

THE JOURNAL.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read.

The SPEAKER. The Journal, if there be no objection, will be approved, with a slight correction in reference to a part which relates to the decision of the Chair yesterday morning. It is simply a verbal inaccuracy. The Chair hears no objection.

OHIO CENTENNIAL EXPOSITION.

Mr. EZRA B. TAYLOR. I ask unanimous consent to submit at this time for consideration a joint resolution.

The SPEAKER. The resolution will be read, subject to objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Joint resolution authorizing the exhibits made by the Government at the centennial exposition of the Ohio Valley and Central States at Cincinnati, Ohio, to remain at said exposition until and including the 15th day of November, 1888.

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives, etc., That authority is hereby granted to continue until and including November 15, 1888, the exhibits made by the Government at the centennial exposition of the Ohio Valley and Central States at Cincinnati, Ohio, under authority of the act approved May 28, 1888.

Mr. EZRA B. TAYLOR. This is simply to authorize a continuance of the exhibits until the date mentioned.

Mr. MCMILLIN. I see no objection to the joint resolution.

There being no objection, the joint resolution (H. Res. 233) was considered, read a second time, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading; and being engrossed, it was accordingly read the third time, and passed.

Mr. EZRA B. TAYLOR moved to reconsider the vote by which the joint resolution was passed; and also moved that the motion to reconsider be laid on the table.

The latter motion was agreed to.

COMMITTEE TO WAIT ON THE PRESIDENT.

Mr. MCMILLIN submitted the following resolution; which was read, considered, and agreed to:

Resolved, That a committee of three members of the House be appointed to join a similar committee on the part of the Senate to wait on the President of the United States and inform him that the two Houses of Congress are ready to adjourn, and respectfully inquire if he has any further communication to make to them.

The SPEAKER appointed Mr. MCMILLIN, of Tennessee, Mr. TURNER, of Georgia, and Mr. RYAN, of Kansas, members of the committee on the part of the House.

ORDER OF BUSINESS.

Mr. TURNER, of Georgia. I move that the House take a recess until 12 o'clock and 30 minutes p. m.

Mr. RICHARDSON. I ask the gentleman to withdraw that motion for a moment to permit me to submit a resolution authorizing the Doorkeeper to employ certain laborers now on the roll, and who will be necessary in his department during the recess.

Mr. TURNER, of Georgia. Very well; I will hear the resolution.

LABORERS UNDER DOORKEEPER.

Mr. RICHARDSON. I submit the resolution I send to the desk, and hope the House will agree to its adoption.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That the Doorkeeper of the House be authorized and directed to retain in the service and pay of the House during the month of November all persons employed by the session in his department now on the laborers' roll, including T. K. Hackman, the riding page, and the assistant folder in the seal-room, at the same rate of compensation now paid said persons; and the Clerk of the House be directed to pay said persons out of the contingent fund of the House.

Mr. RICHARDSON. These employés are necessary principally in the care of the furniture under the Doorkeeper. There are seven or eight of them in all; and the Doorkeeper desires to be permitted to retain them during the time mentioned.

There being no objection, the resolution was considered, and agreed to.

Mr. RICHARDSON moved to reconsider the vote by which the resolution was adopted; and also moved that the motion to reconsider be laid on the table.

The latter motion was agreed to.

ORDER OF BUSINESS.

Mr. TURNER, of Georgia. I now renew the motion that the House take a recess until 12 o'clock and 30 minutes p. m.

Mr. WHEELER. I move to amend the motion by making it 12 o'clock. We are compelled to adjourn at 1 o'clock to-day, and something may transpire to occupy the remaining hour of the session that would be of great importance to the country.

Mr. TURNER, of Georgia. I will state to the gentleman that the half hour remaining of the session has been decided to be ample.

Mr. WHEELER. But the gentleman can not know what may transpire to require a session of the House during that half hour.

Mr. TURNER, of Georgia. I think the time fixed is ample.

The amendment of Mr. WHEELER was rejected.

The motion of Mr. TURNER, of Georgia, was then adopted.

And accordingly (at 11 o'clock and 12 minutes a. m.) the House took a recess until 12 o'clock and 30 minutes p. m.

AFTER THE RECESS.

The recess having expired, the House, at 12 o'clock and 30 minutes p. m., resumed its session.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

A message from the Senate, by Mr. NEWELL, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed, without amendment, the joint resolution (H. Res. 233) authorizing the exhibits made by the Government at the centennial exposition of the Ohio Valley and Central States at Cincinnati, Ohio, to remain at said exposition until and including the 15th day of November, 1888.

Also, that the Senate had appointed, as members on the part of the Senate of the joint committee to wait upon the President of the United States and inform him that Congress, having finished its business, was ready to adjourn, Mr. ALLISON and Mr. SAULSBURY.

ENROLLED JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED.

Mr. KILGORE, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that they had examined and found duly enrolled a joint resolution of the following title; when the Speaker signed the same, namely:

Joint resolution (H. Res. 233) authorizing the exhibits made by the Government at the centennial exposition of the Ohio Valley and Central States at Cincinnati, Ohio, to remain at said exposition until and including the 15th day of November, 1888.

RICHARD E. RHEA.

Mr. FARQUHAR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the resolution I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives, That the Doorkeeper be authorized to retain in his employment for the month of November Richard E. Rhea, mail-page of the House, at the same rate of compensation he now receives; and the Clerk of the House be authorized to pay said sum out of the contingent fund of the House.

Mr. FARQUHAR. I will state, Mr. Speaker, that this morning when the resolution was offered by the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. RICHARDSON] providing for certain employments during the recess, this was seemingly omitted. There is a demand for his services for ten days after the conclusion of a session, and for the ten days preceding the next session.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

Mr. KILGORE. I understand from the Clerk of the House that the contingent fund of the House is exhausted, or will be when the appropriations already made by the House are provided for. It will therefore be unnecessary to pass any other resolution making drafts upon that fund.

Mr. FARQUHAR. This will take very little money, not more than $30.

Mr. KILGORE. But I understand from the Clerk that there was not enough money in the fund to pay what has been already voted.

Mr. FARQUHAR. Then this will simply go into the pro rate. I can say to the gentleman that it is imperative that these services should be performed, and if the money to pay for them is not in the fund it can be provided for in the deficiency bill.

Mr. KILGORE. I do not think it is necessary to pass any further resolutions of this character, for the reason I have stated.

Mr. RICHARDSON. I suggest to the gentleman that this will be provided for in the deficiency bill.

Mr. KILGORE. Very well. I will not object further.

The resolution was agreed to.

Mr. FARQUHAR moved to reconsider the vote by which the resolution was agreed to; and also moved that the motion to reconsider be laid on the table.

The latter motion was agreed to.

JULIA A. NUTT.

Mr. LAGAN. I ask unanimous consent to take up for consideration at this time the bill (H. R. 11580) for the relief of Julia A. Nutt.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

Mr. KILGORE. I think we ought not to pass any more bills.

CLERK TO COMMITTEE ON MANUFACTURES.

Mr. WASHINGTON. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the resolution which I send to the desk.

The resolution was read, as follows:

Resolved, That the clerk of the Committee on Manufactures be continued on the roll, at the rate of $6 per day, during the recess of the present Congress, the committee having been authorized to sit during the recess; and that the Clerk of the House be authorized to pay the same out of the contingent fund of the House.

Mr. WASHINGTON. I want to state that the Committee on Manufactures has been authorized to sit during the recess, but in the resolution giving that authority no provision was made for a clerk, so that unless the resolution be adopted they will be without a clerk.

Mr. SOWDEN. Is the clerk of that committee an annual clerk?

Mr. WASHINGTON. No; he is a session clerk.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of this resolution?

There was no objection.

The resolution was agreed to.

Mr. WASHINGTON moved to reconsider the vote by which the resolution was agreed to; and also moved that the motion to reconsider be laid on the table.

The latter motion was agreed to.

REPORT OF COMMITTEE APPOINTED TO WAIT ON THE PRESIDENT.

Mr. MCMILLIN, Mr. TURNER of Georgia, and Mr. RYAN, the committee appointed to wait upon the President, having returned, presented themselves at the bar of the House, and

Mr. MCMILLIN said: Mr. Speaker, the committee appointed to wait upon the President to inform him that both Houses were ready to adjourn and to ask whether he had any further communication to make to Congress, instruct me to report that they have performed that duty and have received the response from the President that he has no further communication to make.

LEAVE TO PRINT.

Mr. O'NEILL, of Pennsylvania. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the paper which I hold in my hand, which is a reply to the report on "free quinine" prepared by Mr. John W. Springer at the request of Hon. WILLIAM M. SPRINGER, a member of this House, and heretofore printed in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

Mr. WASHINGTON. A few days ago objection was made to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. OATES] having printed in the RECORD something in relation to the tariff, because it was not his own production. From what I know of the paper presented by the gentleman from Pennsylvania it comes under the same head, and therefore I object.

RECESS.

Mr. MCMILLIN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House now take a recess until seven minutes to 1 o'clock.

Mr. STONE, of Kentucky. I ask the gentleman to withhold that motion for a moment in order that I may offer a resolution.

Mr. MCMILLIN. I yield for that purpose.

EMPLOYÉS OF HOUSE POST-OFFICE.

The resolution was read, as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the employés in the post-office of the House of Representatives be paid out of the contingent fund of the House for two weeks' services next preceding the beginning of the next session of Congress which they are required to perform; the sum to be fixed upon the present rate of their compensation.

The resolution was agreed to.

Mr. STONE, of Kentucky, moved to reconsider the vote by which the resolution was passed; and also moved that the motion to reconsider be laid on the table.

The latter motion was agreed to.

RECESS.

The motion of Mr. MCMILLIN was then agreed to; and the House accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 40 minutes p. m.) took a recess until seven minutes to 1 o'clock.

The recess having expired, the House reassembled at 12 o'clock and 53 minutes p. m.

THANKS TO THE SPEAKER.

Mr. MCMILLIN having taken the chair as Speaker *pro tempore*,

Mr. RYAN offered the following resolution:

Resolved, That the thanks of this House are hereby tendered to Hon. JOHN G. CARLISLE, the Speaker, for the courtesy, ability, and fairness with which he has presided over the deliberations of the first session of the Fiftieth Congress.

The resolution was adopted unanimously.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT.

A message from the President, by Mr. PRUDEN, one of his secretaries, announced that he had approved bills and joint resolutions of the following titles:

An act (H. R. 10112) granting to the Duluth and Winnipeg Railway Company the right of way through the Fond du Lac Indian reservation, in the State of Minnesota, and for other purposes;

Joint resolution (H. Res. 101) providing for the printing of decisions of the Department of the Interior regarding public lands and pensions for sale;

An act (H. R. 7516) to increase the pension of Sylvester Stearns;

An act (H. R. 10896) making appropriations to supply deficiencies in the appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1888, and for prior years, and for other purposes;

An act (H. R. 10606) to constitute Lincoln, Nebr., a port of delivery, and to extend the provisions of the act of June 10, 1880, entitled "An act to amend the statutes in relation to immediate transportation of dutiable goods, and for other purposes," to the said port of Lincoln;

An act (H. R. 2972) authorizing the President to appoint and retire Alfred Pleasonton with the rank and grade of major;

An act (H. R. 4765) for the relief of G. W. McAdams;

An act (H. R. 11181) making an appropriation for the enforcement of the Chinese exclusion act;

An act (H. R. 8962) for the relief of Anthony L. Woodson;

An act (H. R. 4601) to amend the naval record of Nickolas Leuschen, Peter Leuschen, and Loth Possum;

An act (H. R. 7421) for establishing a light off Pamlico Point, North Carolina;

An act (H. R. 6514) for the allowance of certain claims reported by the accounting officers of the United States Treasury Department;

An act (H. R. 11599) to authorize the Postmaster-General to rent a suitable building in the city of Washington to be used as a mail-bag repair-shop, and for other purposes;

An act (H. R. 1641) for the erection of a light-house, at or near a point midway between Barnegat and Navesink lights, in the State of New Jersey;

An act (H. R. 1249) for establishing a light-house and fog-signal on Roe Island, Suisun Bay, California;

An act (H. R. 5700) to facilitate the transportation of life-saving and light-house supplies at Hog Island, Virginia;

An act (H. R. 7604) for the establishment of a light-house and fog-signal at or near Gull Shoal, Pamlico Sound, North Carolina;

An act (H. R. 6619) for the relief of Eliza A. Cutter Jones;

An act (H. R. 2196) for the relief of S. T. Marshall;

An act (H. R. 10735) for the removal of the political disabilities of Theodore Lewis, of Louisiana;

Joint resolution (H. Res. 229) to print the agricultural report for 1888;

Joint resolution (H. Res. 231) authorizing the Secretary of the Senate and the Clerk of the House of Representatives to pay to the officers and employés of the Senate and House of Representatives borne on the annual rolls their respective salaries for the month of October on the 20th day of said month;

Joint resolution (H. Res. 232) making appropriations to enable the Secretary of the Senate and Clerk of the House of Representatives to pay the session employés of the Senate and House for the full month of October; and

Joint resolution (H. Res. 233) authorizing the exhibits made by the Government at the centennial exposition of the Ohio Valley and Central States at Cincinnati, Ohio, to remain at said exposition until and including the 15th day of November, 1888.

NOTE.—The message also announced that the following bills having been presented to the President on October 5, 1888, and not having been returned by him to the House of Congress in which they originated within the ten days prescribed by the Constitution, had become laws without his signature:

An act (H. R. 6022) granting a pension to Smith Bodkins;

An act (H. R. 10171) granting a pension to Rachel Rogers;

An act (H. R. 10173) granting a pension to Catharine Mulligan;

An act (H. R. 10274) granting a pension to Joseph W. Filler;

An act (H. R. 10672) granting a pension to Mighill H. Patten;

An act (H. R. 9148) to grant a pension to Jane Robinson; and

An act (H. R. 3908) increasing the pension of Jesse L. Garrett.

THANKS TO OFFICERS OF THE HOUSE.

Mr. HOPKINS, of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the resolution which I send to the desk.

The resolution was read, as follows:

Resolved, That the thanks of this House be tendered to the Clerk and the officers of this House for the courteous discharge of their duties.

The resolution was unanimously agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The hour of 1 o'clock having arrived, I now declare this House adjourned *sine die*.

PRIVATE BILL INTRODUCED AND REFERRED.

Under the rule a private bill of the following title was introduced and referred as indicated below:

By Mr. BUNNELL: A bill (H. R. 11609) granting a pension to Hellen A. Moore—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

PETITIONS, ETC.

The following petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk, under the rule. and referred as follows:

By Mr. C. H. ALLEN: Petition of Eunice G. Saunders, widow of William Saunders, for a widow's pension—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, petition of John Tynen, Stephen Winningder, Daniel Whitman, and Horace Merrill, for pension as veterans of the Mexican war—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, memorial of John Tynen and others—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. CONGER: Petition of citizens of Massachusetts, Maine, Alabama, Missouri, Mississippi, Virginia, Oregon, Pennsylvania, Michigan, Indiana, Georgia, and California, in favor of pure lard and pure food and drugs—to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. WASHINGTON: Petition of citizens of Pickett County, of Henderson County, and of Sunbright, Tenn., in favor of pure lard and pure food—to the Committee on Agriculture.